



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### **Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### **About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



3 3433 06912982 7











57 831..

THE



# FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

CONDUCTED BY AN ASSOCIATION.

VOLUME VII.



Truth and Progress.



DOVER:  
FREEWILL BAPTIST PRINTING ESTABLISHMENT.

WM. BURR, PRINTER.  
MDCCLXIX.

DONATED BY THE  
MERCANTILE LIBRARY ASSOC  
NEW YORK CITY





863462

863462<sup>37</sup>

EMERGENCY AND  
RELATIONS

863462  
863462  
863462

## INDEX---PRINCIPAL PAPERS.

	PAGE.
Africa and her Civilization, . . . . .	416
Backus, Rev. Isaac, Memoir of the Life and Times of, .	223
Baptism—Its Design and Import, . . . . .	338
British Power in India, . . . . .	420
Christianity the World's Great Need, . . . . .	1
Cursory Reflections upon the Evidences of God Revealed in His Works, . . . . .	143
Christian Baptism, . . . . .	197
Christ Crucified, . . . . .	306
God in Matter and in Mind, . . . . .	32
God not Separated from His Works, but a Hearer of Prayer, . . . . .	67
Grace as a Nature, . . . . .	77
Kincaid's Missionary Life, . . . . .	208
Natural or Moral Ability, . . . . .	216
Relation of Modern Philosophic Thought to Faith in the Gospel, . . . . .	176
Sentiment and Principle, . . . . .	253
Sin—Its Nature and Conditions, . . . . .	390
The Revival of 1858, . . . . .	53
The Relation of the Human Intellect and the Inspired Word, . . . . .	94
The Baptismal Question in the Light of the Scriptures and Church History, . . . . .	121
The Bible, . . . . .	161
The French Ultramontanists, . . . . .	241
The Religious Bearings of Modern Spiritualism, . .	271
Thought and Action, . . . . .	318
The True Province and Aim of Philosophy, . . . .	361
The Nature of Religion, . . . . .	399
The Roman Catholic Church, . . . . .	457

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

## NUMBER 1.

1. Nature and the Supernatural, p. 107. 2. On the Authorized Version of the New Testament, p. 110. 3. The New Testament, p. 112. 4. Discourses on the Nature of Faith, p. 114. 5. Wells' Natural Philosophy, p. 114. 6. Select Discourses, p. 115. 7. Blind Bartimeus, p. 115. 8. History of Civilization in England, p. 115. 9. The Electron, p. 116. 10. University Algebra, p. 116. 11. Memoir of Rev. David Tappan Stoddard, p. 117. 12. The Living Epistle, p. 117. 13. The Power of Prayer, p. 118. 14. Spurgeon's Gems, p. 119. 15. Wells' Principles and Applications of Chemistry, p. 116. 16. Words that Shook the World, p. 119. 17. The Science of Common Things, p. 120. 18. The New American Cyclopæda, p. 120.

## NUMBER 2.

1. History of the Reign of Philip the Second, p. 226. 2. The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table, p. 227. 3. The State of the Impenitent Dead, p. 227. 4. The True and the Beautiful in Nature, etc., p. 228. 5. History of the Christian Church, p. 228. 6. Rural Hand-Book, p. 229. 7. The Citizen's Manual of Government and Law, p. 229. 8. Salvation by Christ, p. 230. 9. The Evening of Life, p. 230. 10. The Great Day of Atonement, p. 230. 11. The Extent of the Atonement, p. 230. 12. The Whole Works of Robert Leighton, p. 231. 13. The Sheepfold and the Common, p. 231. 14. The Pilgrim's Progress, etc., p. 231. 15. The Hand-book of Standard or American Phonography, p. 232. 16. The Juvenile Speller, p. 232. 17. The Word and Works of God, p. 233. 18. The National Reader, p. 233. 19. The Life of John Milton, p. 233. 20. The Land and the Book, p. 234. 21. The New England Theocracy, p. 235. 22. The History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century, called Methodism, p. 236. 23. Hymns of the Ages, p. 237.

## NUMBER 3.

1. Lectures on Metaphysics, p. 350. 2. The Limits of Religious Thought, p. 351. 3. A New History of the Conquest of Mexico, p. 352. 4. Frank Elliott, p. 353. 5. A Compendious Introduction to the Study of the Bible, p. 353. 6. Palissy the Potter, p. 354. 7. First Things, p. 354. 8. Christian Brotherhood, p. 355. 9. Popular Geology, p. 355. 10. Acadia, p. 356. 11. New Star Papers, p. 356. 12. Plain and Pleasant Talk about Fruit, Flowers and Farming, p. 357. 13. The American Home Garden, p. 357. 14. Three Visits to Madagascar in 1853, '54, '56, p. 357. 15. The Romance and its Hero, p. 358. 16. The Laird of Norlaw, p. 358. 17. Love Me Little, Love Me Long, p. 358. 18. The Immortality of the Soul, etc., p. 359. 19. The Mother's Mission, p. 360. 20. The Poet Preacher, p. 360. 21. My Sister Margaret, p. 360. 22. The Congregational Quarterly, p. 360.

## NUMBER 4.

1. Fables of Infidelity and Facts of Faith, p. 470. 2. The Greek Testament, p. 472. 3. The French Revolution of 1789, p. 473. 4. The Monarchies of Continental Europe, p. 473. 5. The Empire of Russia, p. 473. 6. The History of the Religious Movement of the Nineteenth Century, called Methodism, p. 474. 7. Moral Philosophy, p. 474. 8. A Commentary, Explanatory, Doctrinal, etc., p. 475. 9. A Compendium of English Literature, p. 475. 10. A Compendium of American Literature, p. 475. 11. British Novelists, p. 476. 12. Lectures on various Subjects, p. 476.



THE

# FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

---

NO. XXV.—JANUARY, 1859.

---

## ART. I.—CHRISTIANITY THE WORLD'S GREAT NEED.

Everything is in action, from the smallest particle of matter that floats on a sunbeam as a mote invisible to the naked eye, to the largest planet, balanced in infinite space by the subtle law of gravitation.

The trees and plants and flowers are in a state of advancement or retrogression. The very stones are on their way to human bodies. Their particles are being picked away by the disintegrating fingers of time, and thrown into nature's crucible in her great chemical laboratory, to be transmuted to the form of vegetation, and from vegetation to the animal kingdom. The law of all nature is action, change—either from the higher to the lower, or from the latter to the former. To this law man is no exception. Physically, mentally, and spiritually, he is in action. His axe is cutting through the century forests, the hoary beard on the weather-beaten countenance of earth, and revealing the beauty of creation's childhood. He is everywhere ornamenting nature by his invention, and bedecking her with reàrranged drapery. He is driving his rail-cars through tunneled mountains of granite, and over Niagaras on suspended wires. He has caught, bitted and harnessed the steeds of lightning, and is guiding them over his telegraphic turnpikes from country to country in the twinkling of an eye. His steamships, great, floating palaces of luxury, are ploughing the waters of every ocean and lake. The musical hum of his machinery, as

one of the voices in nature's great concert, is rising in an unbroken strain from an almost countless number of manufactories the world over. Cities are springing up as rapidly as though built by the magic power of some Aladdin's lamp. The press is sending forth its myriad pages of the mental products of man. Inventions and discoveries tread in the warm footsteps of their predecessors. Everywhere man is toiling and pressing anxiously onward in his daily pursuits. The human world is one great bee-hive of activity. Every bee is on some mission, earnestly engaged in some enterprise or labor. The air is filled with their buzzing music.

And yet with all man's nervous pursuit in business, with all the commotion he keeps up in the world, with all his splendid successes in the arts and sciences, his wisdom and almost god-like power over the elements of nature, with all his luxury and means of sensual gratification, he is unhappy, a prey to discontent, and there is within him a deep consciousness of a need of something—something, he knows not what, but something he has not yet received. From the loop-holes of retreat peer out upon the great fermenting mass of humanity, or go out and mingle with mankind in their various activities, gain their confidence, and learn from their lips and heart-sighs what is the secret spring that sets and keeps the whole human world in motion, and you will find it is the feeling of a want of what, in all his toil, anxiety and accumulation, he has not found in the world. That something, that want, is vital godliness.

#### CHRISTIANITY IS THE GREAT NEED OF THE WORLD.

Upon examination, it will be found, we think, that the world has four principal wants. It needs the *spirit of conservatism, progression, something to satisfy the cravings of man's spiritual nature and redemption from the reign of evil.* We shall endeavor to show that Christianity meets all these wants, and is therefore the great need of the world.

I. The spirit of Christianity is conservative; man is a conservative being; therefore this want of his nature is met by Christianity.

The journey of life is not so much a heroic epic as it is a history written in matter-of-fact prose. It may have its poetical

episodes, its short quotations in verse, but the great bulk of the work is made up of the statistical details of the dull, plodding cares and labors of every-day life. To ride, therefore, through the sky in a chariot of the imagination, or in the half-formed balloon of some Utopian speculation, may be pleasing enough for a holiday excursion, but it is not what man would desire for the daily routine of his earthly existence. He cannot live on bubbles, however beautiful upon them may glow the hues of the rainbow.

Whatever may be on the surface, there is a substratum of conservatism in human nature. Man is averse to change. It is the fondly-cherished hope of early youth, of manhood in its prime, of even old age, to possess a permanent abode, a spot consecrated by the name of home. The rented-tenement life of a large portion of the race is not a choice, but a stern necessity. Of the great numbers who thus live, how many have most sacredly mirrored before them in the future a permanent home. How many times mentally man builds his house, plants around trees of ornament and flowers of beauty, and in his day-dreams beholds his doors and windows festooned with roses and wood-bines. How he yearns

“For a home of sweet affection, where the music-warbling bird,  
Waking morning from its slumbers, in each leafy tree is heard;  
Where the fruit in summer ripens, whilst the flower is still in bloom,  
And the cheerful blaze of winter lightens up the family room.”

How hard it is, too, for man to forsake an old friend! His love is like the Indian banyan. It germinates in one heart, and, as it shoots upward towards God, its branches droop over and take root in another and another, and so, nourished by all, it becomes a mighty tree, a family of trees, from whose great circle not one can be taken without making a vacancy that may never be filled. All this teaches us that man is conservative; and that nothing which does not minister to this feeling can satisfy fully that conscious want within him, to which reference has been made. Christianity does this. It supplies this conscious need.

1. The religion of Christ manifests its conservative spirit by preserving the world from the evils of anarchy. The yoke may be galling, the burden may be heavy; but true Christianity counsels no mob violence, but it trusts alone to the leavening influences of its own spirit. It teaches toleration to existing laws and customs till the world is prepared intellectually and spiritually for those which are higher. Christ never headed a mob, or commanded an army; because, a deeper philosopher than Mahomet or any of the propagators of false religions, he knew that whatever temporary advantage might be gained by such means would, in time, react against himself and his principles; for it is not in the power of the sword to sustain a law either far above or far below the intelligence and piety of the great mass of the people.

It is this conservative spirit of Christianity that keeps the civilized world in the enjoyment of peace undisturbed by anarchy and bloodshed. In those old countries, it was very difficult for the mass of the people to advance in morality and knowledge of the truth, because of the frequent insurrections and revolutions.

On the sunny slopes of the volcanic mountain, the soil is fertile and the air salubrious. The husbandmen build their houses there, plant their vineyards and fields of corn, fill their pastures with flocks and herds, and gather in abundant harvests. But all the time they experience a feeling of uncertainty. At every changing phenomenon in the atmosphere, they cast anxious glances towards the crater of the volcano. Years of safety may pass away; but their solicitude is not lessened in the least. They feel that its awful belching forth is only the nearer, when its molten current of lava shall sweep over their lands, consuming all before it. And thus all improvements were kept at bay; and everything wore a temporary appearance. So of the wars of the ancients. They desolated so often the people, that they had no courage or opportunity to advance. Christianity alone has changed all this. Whoever imagines differently is but a poor reasoner, and has but a small knowledge of human nature. Any man who has mentally surveyed the world, and beheld the unequal distribution of wealth and power, nay,

even the comforts of life, who has seen how the many are but the slaves of the few, toiling day and night, often far, far beyond their strength, to produce luxuries of which they never partake, and who has seen these hard toilers deprived of education, of social privileges, and very frequently the bare necessaries of life, by their crushing poverty, must have asked himself many and many a time why the world is so quiet, what is it that maintains the old order of things when it would be so easy for the great masses, in their physical power, to spoil the goods of the small number of their rich brethren, the upper-ten of society, who not only live upon their labors, but often by their haughty, overbearing manners, add insult to age and virtue, for which the law offers no redress? There can be but one answer to this great question. The history of the past, philosophy, imagination can give but one reply. It is because the conservative spirit of Christ in the hearts of the people restrains from anarchy. Withdraw from man the belief in a God, the belief in an eternity of rewards and punishments, and rest assured it would be apparent very soon that the world was undermined by an explosive fire-damp, needing but the slightest touch of a spark of excitement to produce the most mighty upheavals in society. Poverty would not as now wear tamely and peaceably its servile chains, and bear its more than Atlas burdens. In proof of this, we would refer you to that anarchy and bloodshed in the Reign of Terror in the French Revolution which followed that formal declaration by the legislature, *that there is no God*. It seemed as though the very spirits of Pandemonium were let loose. Licentiousness, disgustingly loathsome from its revolting beastliness, murder in the most horrible and unheard-of ways, and the whole catalogue of crimes became the common, everyday occurrences. And not content with dethroning God, they blasphemously deified a frail woman, publicly, as the goddess of reason, and those grave legislators who thought it superstition to worship Jehovah, sung praises of adoration and bent the knee in reverential devotion before a disreputable woman. It was an awful time. Nothing was safe. The law was entirely powerless for rulers and ruled, high and low. There was no discrimination. Fully convinced at length that the world could



not exist without God, that same legislature formally enacted, *there is a God*. Robespierre himself saying, "Were there no God, it would be necessary to create one."

Voltaire, infidel, doubtless though he was, understood well the restraining influence there is over the wicked in the belief of a God, and he wisely remarked to the atheist Damilaville, "My friend, after you have supped on well-dressed partridges, drank your sparkling champagne, and slept on cushions of down in the arms of your mistress, I have no fear of you, though you do not believe in a God. But if you are perishing of hunger, and I meet you in a corner of a wood, I would rather dispense with your company." So plain is it that the fear of God restrains men from crime, that even this professed infidel could not help seeing it and acknowledging it. Let no one forget, therefore, that were it not for the conservative spirit of Christianity, this world would soon be a Babel of confusion and bloodshed.

2. But not only does the religion of Christ keep the world from anarchy, it also preserves it from fanaticism.

Animals run mad, bite each other, and finally die of their terrible disease. There is also a moral hydrophobia, which seizes on men with the most fearful malignity. How many absurdisms like a pestilential epidemic have spread far and wide within the past few years! Almost any one can enumerate friends who have been swept off by one or the other of these moral choleras. Some persons are always going to extremes. They cannot understand that the wheat and tares must grow together till the harvest, but up sleeves and in zeal uproot both wheat and tares. They are all for tearing down. Their particular subject of interest, like Pharaoh's lean kine, swallows up everything else. If they take hold of any one of the sciences, or any form of education, there is then nothing else in the universe but this. A man is a madman or a fool if he disagrees with them. All the experience and opinions of the wisest men before them, or cotemporaneous with them, do not weigh so much as a feather in an exhausted receiver of an air-pump. If they join a political party, all who are in opposition to them are knaves, blacklegs, disunionists, and soft-headed. If they become interested in

any special moral reform, there is nothing of so much consequence on earth or in heaven. Because Church and State do not come up to their standard at once, they are denounced to perdition with most fearful imprecations. There is no doubt to them but that Church and State are the great bulwarks of all evil. And yet how inconsistent all this is! The Church and State are composed of individuals who are no different from being associated together from what they would be if that organization were dissolved. How much abuse has been heaped upon the church by unbalanced fanatics! Just as though the church could move as one man! The church is composed of many individuals, and all differing the one from the other in natural abilities, culture of mind, social position, and growth in grace. Now who but a madman, instead of appealing to the individual members, would bang away his vituperations against such an institution, because it did not move as a solid phalanx on some new question of moral or social reform? Who does not know that in such a body of men, even, if they all mean right, there will be vast differences of opinions, of mental and spiritual advancement? Thus we see, from the nature of the case, it is an utter impossibility for the church to do at once what, for not doing, these fanatics, in their spasms of moral hydrophobia, denounce it. There are lambs in the flock, and the advance journey must be gauged according to their strength. The babe in Christ cannot be expected to have progressed as far in a knowledge of the truth as he who has grown to the stature of a spiritual man. But if these extremists become interested in religion, the same fanatical tendencies are observed. Everybody who does not pray and exhort as often as they, or with their peculiar voice and manner, is denounced as a hypocrite and a dead weight in the cause of Christ. They themselves are the patterns of super-excellence in dress, in food, in benevolence, in everything. Their religious hydrophobia seems to attack them periodically. Their business must be given up, families forgotten, every-day duties neglected, health sacrificed, and soul and body, for weeks and even months together, till midnight or later, must be completely abandoned to a wild animal excitement in the holy name of religion, till their physical

frames are exhausted by fatigue, and colds, and fevers contracted by their exposures; and then as soon as the strange mania is over, nine-tenths of them backslide into sin a thousand-fold worse than ever before. And this is not all the evil. There is gathered in a quantity of similar inflammable material un-sanctified, but half converted, that in after years gives almost infinite trouble, and finally, in many cases, results in the division and utter destruction of the church itself. We trust we shall not be understood as saying anything against true revivals in religion. As things are, we fully believe in their necessity. We are speaking against fanatical extremes in the best of causes. Now Christianity preserves its true disciples from all such causes. He whose soul is leavened with the spirit of Christ is fortified against the attack of any of the isms that annually sweep away so many. For he who has a feast at home, need not go abroad for joy. And religion gives that feast in its daily enjoyment, and its hope of a glorious immortality; so that he whose soul is feasting on heavenly manna has no disposition to try any of the foolish isms that prevail with others. He is satisfied with what he has found in Christ, and for him that is enough. It is the great glory of the church that Millerism, spiritualism, and infidelity in its various forms, denounce it as the great bulwark in the way of their success. Religion, also, teaches us charity towards those who differ from us. It forbids not the man to cast out devils, though he follow not the Savior in just the manner we do. The best Christians that have ever lived, have been those who have had the most charity. The spirit of denunciation comes not from Jesus. By his spirit we are kept from all extremes, even in his own service. No man was ever thrown into a wild animal excitement by reading the Sermon on the Mount, or offering up the Lord's Prayer. On the other hand, no man can properly read the words of the Redeemer without having the very fountain depths of his feelings stirred in regard to the salvation of his soul. If the religion of Christ preserves from any extreme, it is from that of apathy, coldness, or dead formality in spiritual matters. It teaches us in the service of God to shun the course of midnight revellers, excited politicians, or crazy fanatics, as one extreme,

and to avoid indifference, deadness of heart-feeling, and mere intellectual theory as the other. It assures us that in all things we shall go the safest in the middle course.

3. The conservative spirit in Christianity preserves to the world what is good in governments, learning, the arts and sciences, and literature.

If, as men hope, the democratic form of government is yet to prevail universally, to the church will belong the glory. The earliest real democratic government was the church government of the primitive Christians. With the people of God, true republicanism first had birth. The spirit of Christianity in all ages has thrown its conservative arms tenderly, yet protectingly, over human liberty. Virtually the people never had any real political freedom where the religion of Christ did not prevail. When in the *Mayflower* the principles of the gospel crossed the ocean and came to the wilds of America, where they could be free from kingly rule, those sturdy pilgrims, as soon as the prejudices of despotism had been worn from their own minds, established freedom in church, in state and thought. Human liberty results as a necessity from our religion. For it teaches that the worth of an individual soul is more than the whole world. Therefore it is one of the greatest sins to oppress or wrong a human being. And thus Christianity preserves his inalienable rights to each one.

Christianity also throws its protecting conservatism over institutions of learning. These flourish only under the genial influences of the gospel of Christ. In all the wars of intelligent professing Christians, the treasures of learning have been sacredly preserved. It was Mahometanism, not Christianity, that, standing before the Alexandrian Library, said, "If these Grecian books agree with the Koran, they are useless, if not, they should be destroyed."

The religion of Christ has no Vandal hand to lay upon the arts and sciences. From the Old Testament we learn that the patriarchs were conversant with astronomy. The art of writing very probably had its origin with the Hebrews. The Jews were a musical people. The sweet Psalmist of Israel played upon the harp and other instruments of music. John the Revelator

represents the saints in glory as playing upon golden harps. To Christianity is due the preservation of the arts and sciences. In all the Eastern countries where they had their birth, except where the gospel has shed its benign influences, it may be said of them that they have—

“Gone glimmering through the dream of things that were :

A school-boy's tale, the wonder of an hour.”

Christianity also has been the patron of literature. The oldest poetry in the world is the tragedy of Job. Had it not been for the religion of Christ, the classical literature of Greece and Rome to-day would have been with that of Egypt and Babylon. Paul himself, in his celebrated sermon on Mars-hill, when he declared the unknown God to the Athenians, by his skilful quotation of heathen poetry shows his familiarity with Greek literature, and also the importance to the Christian teacher at times of being acquainted with books. Now, in view of all these considerations, let no one be afraid of injury from literary excellence. The refined and intelligent age in which we live demands more care in this respect than heretofore. Especially in our own country the mass of the people are more cultivated than in any former age. It may be said of almost any New England congregation of worshippers on the Sabbath, that it is an audience of scholars.

During the few years past, the Lyceum has sprung into being among us. The most eloquent, educated and talented men we have, have been called into all parts of the country to deliver lectures to popular assemblies. The influence on the public taste has been tremendous. It has changed almost entirely the style of preaching. The people have demanded, and the most successful ministers, to a great extent, have complied with, the request, that sermons should be more simple, more practical, better illustrated with the familiar every-day occurrences; more polished, and delivered in more natural, life-like tones of voice. The outcry against the prevailing innovation has been loud and earnest. It has been said that preaching is all for rhetorical effect, that the Bible is not preached, that sermons

are but literary essays, and that the gospel is not in them, and they are doing no good. But the unprecedented great revival in religion the past year has forever, it is hoped, put to silence all these dismal croakers. For the religious interest has not only been wonderfully extensive, but it has been free from all the objectionable features of animal excitement that have often attended previous revivals in the cause of Christ. The work has been calm, deep, clear, and rational; and just such a work as we might expect from the kind of preaching instrumental in carrying it forward. We need not look for reaction, for great backslidings, after such a healthy interest. Be not, therefore, afraid of literature in the most sacred of all causes. As the reception of the person in society is much dependent upon the dress he wears, and the refinement of his manners, so is the reception of Divine truth in the human heart much dependent upon the drapery with which she is adorned. We all know how the same ideas delivered by different speakers affect us differently, simply from their difference in the choice of words, arrangement of sentences and style of speaking. Of course when religious teachers have no higher interest in their calling than the Lyceum lecturer, when they labor solely for rhetorical effect, and just to entertain, when all their energies are put forth to preach every Sunday what the gratified intellect will delight to eulogize as great sermons, they are ruining their hearers and destroying themselves both soul and body. They are taking upon their shoulders a burden which no human being can possibly bear, and which no people have a right to demand.

But as Christianity in all ages has been the patron of the arts and sciences, the foster-mother of literature, we may be assured that not only is he the most successful who can deliver eloquently the most polished and finished discourse, but, other things being equal, when these gifts are the result of his labor, he is also the most pleasing to God.

Such is the conservative spirit of the Christian religion; and by this conservatism it meets that great want in the human heart for the permanency of all that is good.

II. But Christianity is not only conservative in its spirit, it is progressive also.

Progression is a law of the human mind; and nothing can satisfy man that does not feed his desire for advancement. The Christian religion leads the vanguard of civilization, freedom, learning, and, in short, everything good.

1. Its progressive spirit is seen in the spiritual advancement of the church. We know we often hear men sighing over the degeneracy of the times, and weeping for the return of the purity of the primitive Christians. But we confess we never could see the subject in their light. It always seemed to us that looking through the mists of ages, by a kind of optical illusion of the spiritual eye, they see the form of giants in those days. From our heart, we firmly believe that the church never was so intelligent, moral, spiritually pure and prosperous as at the present. If we go back to Calvin, we shall find that this great man, who was the spiritual leader of his times, persecuted Servetus with the utmost rigor on account of a difference in abstract doctrinal views, and finally caused him to be burned at the stake. If we go back to Luther, we shall ascertain that this eminent apostle of the Reformation believed in consubstantiation, a doctrine to us as absurd as the Roman Catholic dogma of transubstantiation. From this we may learn the light of the church, as from the fountain we can judge what the stream will be. If we go back to Augustine, or farther back still to Athanasius, we shall discover the church sunk in the greatest errors, deciding their religious dissensions and doctrinal views by an appeal to the Emperor's sword. If we go back to Patmos Isle, what good shall we hear from the rapt Revelator's lips of the seven churches of Asia? Would these deplorers over the degeneracy of the times have us like them? Yet we will not stop here, but we will go back to those of whom John speaks as denying that even Jesus Christ came in the flesh. What has even modern infidelity, Parkerism itself, done worse than this! Ah! how the giants of those days dwindle as we approach them. But let us go back a little farther, to those Corinthian brethren whom Paul tells us were licentious, and made even the Lord's Supper an occasion for drunkenness. Surely there are not worse backsliders now. There were also others mentioned by this same apostle who denied the resurrection of the dead, and

others that said it was already past. Certainly this heresy has grown no blacker since. But let us go back to that little church gathered by Jesus himself, composed of the twelve apostles alone. Thomas lacked faith. Peter denied his Lord; and Judas, traitor-like, betrayed him. And, sometimes, inflamed by worldly ambition, they disputed by the way who should be the greatest, and sit on his right hand and on his left in the kingdom of his power.

Thus, with the exception of the apostles, *after their special inspiration*, in all ages of the church we find men of like passions with ourselves, in whom the spiritual life was often very imperfectly developed. And we might just as well go back to the emperor Constantine for a model government, as to Augustine for a model church. The truth is, and history will sustain me in the assertion, that there never was a time when, in the Christian church, there was so much charity, zeal, intelligence, deep heart piety, consistency of action, and so few deserters and hypocrites as at the present. From the beginning the church has been on a steady advancement.

2. But another proof of the progressive spirit of Christianity, is the enlistment of the young into its services.

It is to the young we must look for progress. The old are slow to leave the beaten track where they have travelled for years, even though you demonstrate to them that a shorter and better road could be struck out by which they would save time and many a hard hill of difficulty. They have had so many sad experiences, disappointments and afflictions by changing, that they distrust all change. They feel, like the mill-boy, that dividing the grist on the back of the horse does not seem as well as carrying the balancing stone in one end of the bag as his father and grandfather did. Hence inventions and improvements come from the young. The greatest Captains of the world have fought all their important battles before forty. With a very few exceptions the same is true with the distinguished men in letters. As a general rule, if a man has accomplished nothing before that age, you need not expect anything afterwards. When Dr. Harvey discovered and advanced his theory of the circulation of the blood, it is said that not a



physician over forty embraced his views. After a man is fifty he is generally afraid of new enterprizes. You may advance argument. He shakes his head. He has tried that twenty years ago. And it is in vain that you urge that circumstances are different, it is time and breath all thrown away. For though he cannot answer you, he will continue to oppose. For

"He that's convinced against his will,  
Is of the same opinion still."

Young men, therefore, must not blame the old, or expect them to engage in new schemes. This always has been the work of the young. Who commenced the present great missionary enterprise? The old grey headed saints ripe for heaven? Nay, verily. A few young men while pursuing their course of education conceived the mighty idea and carried it into effect. They were laughed at and their scheme stigmatized as a visionary dream of a sentimental school girl. But they cared for none of these things. So of those who commence the great enterprise of a religious life, nearly all of them are in their youth. All these facts teach us that youth is the season for improvement. Then, or never is the general rule. Let not therefore the old restrain the young overmuch. It is well to hold back properly. Youth is impetuous and sometimes visionary. But do not hold too hard upon the bit. The plans of men as old as Christ was at his crucifixion are sometimes passed by with a sneer as though a man at that tender age was not yet out of his swaddling clothes. This is ungenerous. Of course there is a proper respect to be paid to the experience of age. I have no sympathy with that self-conceit which prompts the over-confident youth, "at home where angels bashful look," before the first down appears on his chin, at the age when he ought to be tied to his mother's apron string, to set himself up as a master in Israel, a propounder of a new theory in religion and a despiser of his father and all before him.

But after all, youth is the time of labor. The young heart is full of zeal, energy, strength and daring. It needs employment, and will have it in good or evil. It may be guided, but not stayed. Chain it? Never! no, never. Christianity meets

this want. Its progressive spirit enlists the young. The great Founder himself was but about thirty years of age. All the apostles were probably young men. The Sabbath school opens its arms and receives little children as did Christ of old and preoccupies the mind with religious truth, and thus trains them up to usefulness. To no class does the Bible so often and urgently appeal as to the young. None but young men enter the ministry. The whole spirit of Christianity seems especially adapted to the young, and thus meets one of the greatest wants in the human family; for if you take care of the children, the men and women will take care of themselves. It is in this enlistment of the young that we see the progressive spirit of our religion. Were its spirit simply conservative, this provision for the wants of the young would not be made.

3. But it also manifests its progressive spirit by its reformatory movements.

The religion of Christ is aggressive in the true sense of the term. It is a sword. It battles most fearfully. And defeated or victorious, for the time, it never surrenders. It not only fights the enemy in open field and regular pitched battles, but it pursues him to his strongholds of defence and lays siege at once to his mightiest fortresses. It batters down his walls, and thick as meteors, sends its bombshells of destruction into his very dwellings. It mines his cities, and when he is saying, peace and safety, it touches the mine with a spark of etherial fire, and the whole city is exploded into a myriad of fragments. Christianity is reformatory. I do not mean that all of its professors will be alike so. Some are intellectually and spiritually taller than others. The rays of the rising sun gild first the blue peaks of the highest mountain; and then, streaming down its side, light up the tops of the loftiest trees, and finally chase away the shadows of night from its very base and bathe the whole valley in a sea of glory. So it is with moral light. It strikes first the intellectually and spiritually high. The humbler sons of men are still in the dark, and the course of their advanced brothers they cannot comprehend; and so they call them hard names, and if possible persecute them even to death.

Years after, when the same light reaches them, they build and garnish their sepulchres. So it is, and so will it be with many of the moral and religious reformers of to-day. They are heretics, fanatics and fools now. By and by many of them will be canonized as saints, sages and benefactors, while the children of their abusers will be ashamed of their fathers' record on the pages of history and tradition.

The mighty Canute sat by the seaside with the high officers of his court and army around him. He drew a line upon the beach, and said to the coming wave, thus far and no farther. The white crested billow, tossing its foam as if in derision, swept proudly over the monarch's mark and obliterated every trace of it forever. How many men have thus set bounds to the onward march of truth in religion, in social or moral reform! But the incoming wave of spiritual light has rushed irresistibly over all their puny obstructions, and made its own mark far up on the shore. It is no use to stand against truth. The old barriers of error must give away. Earnest men, tall in intellect and piety, who have received the light sooner than their brethren, have labored always and always will labor to correct, improve and advance the world. Christianity leads the van of these noble hearts. When was there ever a reformer like Jesus? And following down the stream of time, we come to that great reformer, Martin Luther, who held a pen in Germany whose point wrote in Rome the death-warrant of popery. In later times the Puritans were the next prominent reformers. At present, the two most marked evils against which reform has opened its battery, are slavery and intemperance. Let the church of Christ not forget that the true spirit of Christianity always has been, still is, and always must be, reformatory; and let her lead the advance guard in attacking these more than giant sins against God and humanity. If she does not, infidelity, baptized by the name of philanthropy, will surely drive her from the hearts of men. And if she does not, the spirit of the Master will leave her. But she will lead. She is leading, thus proving that the spirit of Christianity is reformatory, and that she has that spirit. From these considera-

tions we see that there is a progressive spirit in the religion of Christ which satisfies fully all the desires in the human heart for upward and onward advancement.

III. Our third proof that Christianity is the great want of the world, is seen in its completely satisfying the cravings of man's spiritual nature.

In the great equation of life there is an important unknown quantity which man has ever been seeking to find. He wants wisdom, rest, peace, happiness. How shall he find that for which his heart so often and deeply yearns? It is a great problem to be wrought out. The wise men of the world have worked upon it long and earnestly, but none of them by their wisdom have been able to solve it. Archimedes could move the earth, had he only a place outside on which to stand. But with all his mathematical knowledge, he did not and could not solve the great problem of life, and discover to man that unknown quantity the longings of his heart are ever seeking. Socrates could not do it, though he approximated nearer than others. Simplify it as you may, transpose from one side to the other as often as you please, state it and restate it, square it, cube it, or extract its root, add to it, or subtract from it, multiply or divide it, it is a hard equation to solve. Human wisdom worked upon it for centuries and was giving it up in despair as an impossibility, similar to the perfect quadrature of the circle, or the extraction of a surd root, when Christ Jesus made his advent and disclosed the mystery, solved the problem. "Whosoever shall drink of the water that I shall give him," said he, "shall never thirst." Glorious words! That insatiable thirst of man's heart, that neither glory, power, wealth, nor pleasure could satisfy, is quenched at last. Christianity is this living water which gives satisfaction to all of man's desires.

1. This is evident first, because it satisfies the intellect.

Man has an intellect as well as a heart, and no religion can be perfect which meets not the wants of the mind. Love without intelligence may charm for awhile, but the mental cravings will soon be felt. Here has been made the fatal mistake of many religious teachers. Their whole effort has been to make men feel well, as though religion consisted chiefly or entirely in

emotional excitement. By this course they met with a greater immediate success. Blinded by this and their prejudices, they went on to their ruin. Possessing fluency of speech, a pathetic voice in singing and speaking, an excitable temperament by which they could easily warm up their feelings even to tears, by frequent changes from church to church, they have succeeded for awhile better than those even of more solid endowments. They appealed right to the passions of their hearers. With them doing religious duty, being faithful for Christ, simply meant giving an exhortation in a prayer meeting. Their success was short. As soon as the novelty of their exciting appeals wore off, their power was gone. Soured, murmuring against God and man, they have retired from the position they might have occupied had they been wiser. How many such the church has lost! But the people were not to blame. Their intellects craved food, and these teachers could not give it. From them let others take warning and not hasten too soon from their preparatory studies. Nothing is worse in our view than fluency to a young teacher in religion. He better be obliged to dig, dig, dig for his thoughts. For if he is fluent he will depend upon it, neglect study, and soon lose his usefulness. Now there is feeling in religion; but that religion is worth but little which consists alone in a happy feeling—a pleasing emotion. All men have minds; and some have more mind than heart, and you can only reach the latter through the former. Many are made Christians by powerful arguments addressed to the intellect alone, who would become so in no other way. Some are first interested in religion by having their refined taste gratified by the finished discourses and eloquence of the preacher. Some are drawn to the house of God, where they are converted, by the music of the choir. Some, like the eccentric Randolph of Roanoke, are convinced of the existence of a God only by the grandeur and beauty of his works as seen in nature. Many a one has gone to heaven on a star-ray, or rode up to that blissful world in a chariot of moonbeams, or been wafted there on an evening zephyr, or carried there on the golden tints of a summer sunset. Over some minds and hearts natural scenery has a most powerful influence. The Rev. John

Todd relates, that when a boy of six years old he was looking at a beautiful sunset when his mother, who was pious, but unhappily insane, came out wild with her madness, and he pointed to the setting sun. In a moment she was calm. She took my little hands in hers, he goes on to say, and said, "The great God made the sun, stars, the moon, the world and everything. He it was that made my little boy and gave him an immortal spirit. Yonder sun, the stars and world and green grass one day will be burned up. But the spirit of my little boy will then be alive, for he shall live when heaven and earth shall be no more. He must pray to the great God, love and serve him forever."\* Her madness then returned and she hurried away.

The power of that sunset over the disordered mind of this woman illustrates what I mean by going to heaven on star-rays or golden sunsets. There are spiritually insane persons. These scenes in nature first arrest their attention to the great truths of God's existence and their own immortality. Perhaps they could have been reached in no other way than through some faculty of the intellect. God has not forgotten this class. The religion of Christ satisfies this craving of the intellect by giving it the Bible to study and pointing it to the natural works of the Creator, upon which, as two great pillars, it may erect all systems of art, science and literature. What such persons cannot read in the inspiration of holy men of old, they may read on the pages of God's natural Bible, on which his own finger has traced his laws, the history of creation and the life to come in the hieroglyphics of fragrant flowers, noble trees, running streams, ebbing tides, mountains and plains, singing birds and distant planets. Thus does our religion provide for all the wants of man's intellect.

2. Again. It also meets the wants of the physical nature.

It restrains man from those fearful excesses in sensual indulgence which shatter prematurely the house God has given him in which to dwell for his threescore and ten years. The voyage of life is strewn all the way with human wrecks. Ruined constitutions, old young men, stooping, narrow-chested con-

\* This is quoted from memory.

sumptives, faded dispeptics, saffron-eyed, bilious sufferers, scrofulous swine gormandizers, rheumatics from unnecessary exposures, and trembling drunkards, may be seen all around us thick as leafless trees after the running of a fire through the forest. Christianity forbids all the excesses that produce these diseases, and if obeyed in time would cure every ill to which flesh is heir. It also teaches us by precept and example the duty of physical exercise—of manual labor. In the beginning, man's body was made to be active. Before the Fall, God commanded him to cultivate the garden of Eden. Christ labored with his hands till thirty years of age. It is difficult to find a healthy minister now. There must be something wrong in their mode of life. The body is not exercised enough. The apostles were men of manual labor and probably pursued their secular callings more or less through life. It tells us we are God's stewards, and, by a proper allotment of time to mind, heart and body, shows us that there is enough to be done to keep every faculty active, healthy and refreshed. And it likewise denounces idleness as a sin in the sight of Heaven, the penalty of which is often received as physical suffering in this world. The best read physician on earth could not prescribe better conditions of bodily health and real enjoyment than has the Bible. It is our part to read and obey.

3. But once more, Christianity meets the wants of man's social nature.

Man is a social being. Give him leisure, give him luxury, give him wisdom and the enjoyment of physical health, still there will be a want, a void not filled. He is alone. He pines for human converse and sympathy. How many a one tenderly nurtured, for the love of another, and that other an untried heart, has bidden farewell to the endeared home of childhood, to all that wealth could bestow to gratify vanity, indolence, the appetites and the mind, and willingly, cheerfully, nay, eagerly and joyfully crossed the ocean to the new world, or sought a home in a comfortless cottage of unhewn logs in the distant prairies of the west. Those gloomy ascetics, the sourness of whose spirit within is but too plainly depicted upon the grim countenance without, and who freeze every social circle they

enter, as a winter night congeals to icicles the dropping water melted by the midday sun, whatever their professions of piety, are no more fit for the society of heaven than they are for that of earth. For, one chief element in the happiness of heaven will be social enjoyment with the angels and the spirits of the just made perfect. I often think of the little boy that came to his mother one day, and asked her if his grandfather, one of those fearfully dignified guide-posts, called ministers of the gospel in olden time, would go to heaven. Upon hearing her reply, "Why certainly, my child," he said, "Well, I do not wish to go there then: for he never speaks pleasantly to me, and he is always scolding me when I am near him." We think there are others also, who would not care to go to heaven if it were to be made up with these crabbed-spirited, disagreeable, unsocial beings, who go through the world with starched dignity of manners, frowning upon innocent and necessary recreations, and casting shadows of coldness into every family or social gathering they enter. For our part, we love proper amusement, a good, hearty laugh, a play with children, and social enjoyment at suitable times and places. And this is human. Nay, it is Christ-like. The mind and heart as made by God crave it.

Now there is a social element in the Christian religion. No true follower of Christ can be a misanthrope. It was said anciently of his disciples, "See how they love one another." No tenderer scenes of human friendship are recorded than are related as existing between him and his chosen believers, especially that one who leaned on his bosom at the last Supper, or between him and his mother, or the family of Bethany. No asceticism, no moroseness, no notions of false dignity kept Jesus from the marriage festivity, from eating and drinking and mingling freely with all classes in society.

No one, however, should infer from this that the Savior was light and trifling in his conversation, or gave any encouragement to social improprieties. Nothing could be farther from the truth. But he taught by precept and example, that we should be social, familiar, cheerful and happy. Such is religion to the wants of society. It robs us of nothing really good. But it enhances all our social enjoyments.



“ The sorrows of the mind  
Be banished from the place ;  
Religion never was designed  
To make our pleasures less.”

4. But Christianity in satisfying the other wants of man does not overlook his affections, but meets all the wants of his heart.

We have spoken of the cravings of the intellect, have shown that a system of religion adapted to man must furnish food for these cravings, and have demonstrated that Christianity does this and, therefore, that it is satisfactory in this respect. We would now speak of the heart, which has its wants no less than the intellect. Any religion that should neglect the heart would be most woefully defective and unsuited to man. We would give but little for that religion which has no feeling in it. Religious teachers often forget this part of religion.

Graduating at the seminary, with little or no experience in the actual life of the people, with their tastes formed by the lectures and intellectual sermons of their teachers—intellectual because they are to be delivered on special occasions, or to an exclusively scholarly audience in the technical sense of the term—they enter upon their pastoral duties by preaching long, prosy disquisitions upon abstract doctrines, dry enough to scorch and wither up, root and branch, the mustard tree of piety in the heart of a saint. They fail of success of course. Some small-minded, uncultivated, uncouth, self-conceited exhorter comes along, with a heart beating warm with religious fervor of feeling, and sweeps the whole field before him. The pastor blames the people for running after such, but the people are not to blame. He has something to satisfy the cravings of the heart, something which intellectual essays, however finished, cannot give. The flock kept without salt, will leave their own shepherd for a stranger when he offers to feed them upon it. To meet the great want of the world, it is all-important to satisfy the longings of the heart. Man's affections crave a God to love. He must have one. If he has no other he will carve him one from wood or stone, or scoop him one up from the mud which the next shower of rain will wash away, or deify

beasts and inanimate things. He has peopled with his gods the mountains, the valleys, the woods, streams and ocean, and the skies above. But they have been all of like passions with himself, and unsatisfactory; for the true God was not there, and, therefore, man's heart-yearnings found in them no rest. The heart demands a fatherly God sympathizing with our labors and trials, and not an abstraction of the intellect, or of superstitious fear. The great heart-want of the world has been the true God. And the great heart-search of the world has been after the true God.

Sometimes a child wanders into a deep forest and loses his way. Completely bewildered, all idea of the direction of home is gone. The neighbors assemble and search the woods night and day. At length some of the party hear a sound. It is the cry of the lost. They approach with all speed nearer and nearer that cry, till from a hilltop they can see down in the tree-covered valley below the little one running from place to place, and with tears rolling down his tender cheeks, calling with all the power of his weary voice, "FATHER, FATHER, FATHER!"

Thus has it been with man in this world. Lost in the wilderness of sin, filled with beasts of prey, he has wildly wandered from one object to another, vainly endeavoring alone to find his way through the tangled thickets of temptation, anxiety and afflictions; and his great heart-cry has been from generation to generation—FATHER, FATHER, MY GOD, MY GOD! Christianity alone satisfies this heart-want, and reveals to him a God, more powerful than the Fate of the ancients, and possessing, besides, all the good attributes of their fabled deities in an infinite degree. It takes man in his lost condition and brings him home to his Father. It does even more than this. It tells him of a mansion up yonder, not made with hands, prepared for him. Man has no home on earth. The clime is uncongenial to the most of men. Constant labors, pains of body and mind and heart, the hard hand of poverty binds on a large portion of the human family. Men with minds almost like archangels you will find like the dray horse harnessed to coarse drudgery which they never can but hate—perfectly loathe, while others, their next-door neighbors, no better than they, are surfeiting in lux-

ury. What a world is this, when viewed by itself alone! But when taken in connection with that higher world how much brighter it appears! Well, now, the religion of Christ comes to the burdened children of earth and shows them the New Jerusalem, and the dwellings there for them, if faithful here. And so they take heart and plod on to the end of life, ever and anon, as some chain galls a little harder, with tearful eyes looking up and wishing they might be at home. Thus Christianity comforts and cheers man on his way to his heavenly mansion. It may not do this always with a rushing sound, an ecstasy of joy, but it may do it by a gradual, every day work of the Holy Spirit, which, gently stealing into the heart, when it breathes among its chords, as the fingers of the zephyr touch the strings of the Æolian harp, causes to vibrate a harmony so sweet and so much in unison with the angel music above, that as its sacred cadences die away, it leaves behind it a calm so peaceful in the breast that every troubled feeling is hushed and the whole being is happy—bathed in its holy influences.

The little daughter, the idol of the whole household, is tossing in pain on her bed. A burning fever is raging in her veins. Delirium has seized her mind. Her weeping friends stand around her. The dreaded moment approaches. The mother in an agony of feeling too strong to be controlled turns away and walks to the window, that she may not see the last, sad struggle. "Mother, come here," whispers the now conscious child; and taking the hand of her weeping parent, imprints a kiss upon it, and *looking* a good by, which the lips strive in vain to speak, she sinks into the arms of death. In due time they prepare her for burial. Friends gather at the funeral. The man of God offers the consolations of religion. And the little coffin is lowered into the ground, and the grave is filled. The mother all the while has hardly been conscious, so fearfully poignant is her grief. Every time she thinks of her buried child she bursts forth in uncontrollable sobs and weeping. Whisper to her, her child is in heaven. She says, "I know it; but that does not make the loss any the less." And all you can say may not stop a single tear in the first bitter paroxysms of her sorrow. But the religion of Christ will not prove a failure

here; it is sufficient. It will yet meet the want of her heart and heal its wound. Gradually she will receive its consolations. Day by day, as months and years glide by, the thought that her little one is better off will steal upon her and soften her grief, till by and by as she thinks of meeting her own angel child above, she will feel perfectly, yes, perfectly resigned to her early death. It is even so that the religion of Christ meets as nothing else ever did, or can, every want of the heart in all our labors, anxieties, disappointments and sufferings the entire way along our earthly pilgrimage, giving us strength when needed and peace when peace is required.

IV. We will consider now our last proof that Christianity is the great want of mankind: It promises the final redemption of this world from the reign of evil.

The religion of Christ might be all that we have shown, and meet all the wants to which we have made reference; and yet if the world must continue as it has been, the great battle field of good and evil, in which evil seems the oftener to claim the victory, we might well say that mankind need something else. Look at it from whatever view you may, this world presents a sad picture. This life is nothing to sport with. It is tragic. Like the contestants in the Olympic games we prepare and strive for the mastery, as for life itself. At the end disgrace or honor awaits to crown us. If the angels are permitted to take a panoramic view of this world, its strifes, its strugglings, its labors, pains, anxieties, oppressions and sorrows, as the old earth in its daily revolution rolls up country after country from the shades of night to the light of heaven, the sight must be most heart-rending to their pure minds. Our own heart sickens when we think what a miserable world this always has been and now is. Its catalogue of woes is endless. It is full of sin, injustice and suffering. Must it always continue so? No, thank God! Christianity promises its redemption.

1. It promises its redemption from all these evils by the purification of the heart as its first reformatory labor.

They are but surface theologians who represent mankind in a healthy, normal state. To a poetic imagination it may be so; but to no one else. The world is sick with the fearful dis-

case of sin. Her wisest and best men of all ages have been conscious of her deep seated malady, and labored for its removal. But the evil is chronic; and for centuries their prescriptions have failed to cure it.

Quacks also gravely have shaken their empty heads as they have witnessed the old world's terrible spasms of suffering; and gone away and compounded their patent nostrums of relief. At one time her ills could be cured by the sword. Her blood was full of bad humors. She needed a purgative medicine to cleanse these away. And so they made up pill boxes of the implements of war by the million. They fully prescribed the doses, and the name of the inventor was duly signed to prevent counterfeits. The old world swallowed the pills. They threw her into convulsions at first, and then most fearfully weakened her, both physically and morally. Some of the inventors grew rich and great, built palaces and received kingdoms and crowns; but the world grew only the worse from their treatment. "And well she might," said another set of quacks who then came in, "It was not the right medicine. The location and nature of the disease have been mistaken. War elevates the ambitious few and crushes the great mass to perpetual slavery. There must be put in operation a system of checks and balances. The various offices must be so arranged that the incumbents will watch and restrain each other; and when all are in their place and nicely adjusted, the machinery of the world will move without the least friction, and everybody will be obliged to do right. *Similia Similibus*—Like cures like." And so they administered to the diseased world little vials of "Reorganized Society on the principle of a Joint Stock Community," and then as many powders as you may take on the point of a pen-knife of "New Systems of Government," and after that, in small doses, pills of "Theatrical Amusements." Yet, strange to say, the patient was in no wise benefited, but rather grew worse. "Could not be otherwise, could not be otherwise," cry out another school of empirics. "She can be cured only by allopathy, or *contraria contraries*. The world needs law. She is insane. She must be bound. Your principle of treatment is wrong. You have left her too long

to herself. In the rage of her delirium she tears herself, and you have been sharpening her finger nails and putting pointed instruments into her hands that the pain of her increased inflictions might cause her to desist. Wrong, wrong, all wrong. Bind her limbs and she will soon recover." And so under the label of law, they applied whole boxes of "shoulder braces," "supporters," "strait-jackets," and cords of various sizes. But the world writhed terribly, and every little while a limb would get loose, and then she would tear herself most fearfully. What shall be done? "Done? Why, educate her," exclaim the whole corps of worldly wisemen. "Give her a breathing tube. Let her inhale education. Let her understand the physical and moral laws of her system. Let her mind be refined by the study of music, painting, science and literature. Do you not see by the daily papers as you read the court-record that it is the uneducated who as a general rule commit all the crimes? Do you not know that those who are sick the most are the uneducated? Look into the damp cellars of our large cities, and you find only the ignorant there. None but the ignorant can be kept in slavery. Educate the southern slaves and they would be free in six months. The degraded poor, the abandoned and profligate the world over are unlearned. Education is all that is needed." And so they prescribe for the patient great bottles full of spelling books, grammars, arithmetics and philosophies; and boxes of pianos, and cover the walls of her room with paintings, and read to her beautiful poetry of flowers, running brooks, singing birds, and the far-off stars. There was an apparent reviving at first, but the relapse was immediate. What shall be tried next? Even empiricism, self-abashed, for once, is silent. Is there no remedy? "Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there?" that "the health of the daughter of my people" is not "recovered"? Yes, there is a Physician, and there is a balm, and the world shall be made whole of its disease. That Physician is Christ. That balm is his religion applied to the heart. The evil is interior. And whilst the fever of sin is burning and raging inwardly, it is in vain to make outward applications. Cleanse first the fountain, and then the stream will be clear. "YE MUST BE BORN

AGAIN," is the remedy of Christ. And when this remedy is applied to every heart, the work is done: the world is redeemed. The process may be thought slow, but such is the nature of the disease, it can be reached in no other way. Brother, whoever thou art, suffering from sin, go wash in and drink of that spiritual stream that issues from the Rock, Christ Jesus, and be purified from that deadly malady.

2. This leads me to remark that Christianity promises to redeem the world only by individual redemption.

Very many persons seem to have ideas exceedingly indefinite in regard to the redemption of the world. They have a kind of belief that the Bible prophecies of a Millennium which is to be ushered in miraculously with great glory—a whole nation in a day literally turning to the Lord. The mountains are to be levelled, the valleys filled up, the crooked ways to be made straight and cross each other at right angles. There is to be an even temperature of weather the year round. Plenty is to crown every man's board without labor. Sickness is to be unknown. Every one is to do just right. Christ is to come through the clouds in great splendor and glory, and sit on a literal throne; and there surrounded by the high officers of his church he is to reign in royal luxury and magnificence like an eastern prince. Now if there is to be a Millennium, or rather a reign of righteousness on earth, in which we firmly believe, it never will be ushered in in such a manner as this, for it would be contrary to the spirit and whole history of the Christian religion. The Reign of Righteousness will have a gradual inauguration; for this is the way in which God always works.

No man, after looking out upon a mid-winter scene—the snow-covered ground, the leafless trees, the ice-bound lakes and rivers, the stars twinkling in the keen air—and retiring to his couch of rest, has ever awaked in the morning, and found the landscape dressed in tall, green grass and fragrant flowers, the trees clothed in verdure and adorned with blossoms, the birds singing merrily, and in the atmosphere the warm geniality of summer. And yet in a few months this surprisingly great change is effected just as surely and just as thoroughly as though accomplished suddenly in a single night. This illus-

trates God's method of working, not only in the physical but also in the moral world.

And this Reign of Righteousness, prefigured in the Bible by the reclining of the lion and the lamb together beneath the protection of the same tree, Christianity teaches us will be introduced gradually, by the rational manner of individual reformation; for it assures us that each one, God assisting, must work out his own salvation. It also assures us that if mankind hear not Moses and the prophets, neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead—plainly indicating that God will use no other means than now in operation for the conversion of the world. The Reign of Righteousness is hastening. Christianity is making rapid strides towards the fulfilment of prophecy. And it is all being done by an individual—turning to the Lord.

3. But finally. As our strongest argument, we would remark that the religion of Christ promises the redemption of the world by the very divinity of its origin.

Jesus Christ was a Divine being. Infidels, philosophers and modern skeptics may call him whatsoever they please, they cannot tarnish the brightness of his Divinity. The simple fact alone that there existed such a being in that age of the world and among a people so bigoted as the Jews, is proof enough to us of his superhumanity. Account for the fact, how a Galilean peasant, a common laboring carpenter in the obscure mountain town of Bethlehem, who had no advantages of school, who had never travelled in other countries, who was strictly brought up in the narrow prejudices of his nation, account for the fact, how such a one could have been so wise above all philosophers of the world, so liberal and charitable, free from all bigotry, so loving at heart and unassuming, so above all temptation, with such a power to perform miracles, and could have lived, taught, and died in all respects as Jesus did if he were only a mere man. To believe him only man would be too much for our credulity. Whence came his wisdom so in advance of the sages of the learned Athens? Of old men who had devoted their lives to philosophy? Whence came his religious doctrines so above the narrow prejudices of his countrymen? Whence, in



short, came his whole character, so in advance of the world at his age, or any other age before, or since his advent? What is it, that, without the power of the sword, has made his religion the faith of the civilized world?

He kindled a little fire in the moral world on the hills of Judea, and the Jews labored, might and main, to extinguish it; but Jordan had not water enough to quench it. The pagans attacked it with the fury of demons; but the more they fought it the wider it spread. The Mahometans raised the crescent against it; and in later times infidel philosophers have studied profoundly hard to prove it was no fire at all, and only a spectral delusion of the superstitious fancy; but still that purifying flame has burnt on, till at the present it illumines the civilized nations of mankind. Now, we want all this accounted for, if Jesus was not Divine. How has he done so much more than everybody else? We challenge all history, written and traditional, to produce, in any age of the world, another character that can be compared, at all, with him.

But we have not time now to attempt any labored proof of the Divine origin of Christianity. We assume it as granted. If, then, the religion of Christ is Divine, be sure it will yet redeem the world. God never experiments. He sees the end from the beginning. He has undertaken the redemption of the world from the reign of evil, and he will yet accomplish it. Hold on to that. The battle may be long and fierce, there may be signs in heaven and earth, but there is no doubt on which side victory will ultimately perch. Sometimes we hear people talk as though they feared that the devil would finally circumvent the Almighty, dethrone him and take the sceptre of power into his own hands. They seem to think that Satan is just about an equal match for God, or rather, a little too much for him generally. There never was a weaker, or greater absurdity.

Homer, in Pope's free translation, represents Jupiter as calling a celestial council and saying to the gods—

“ League all your forces then, ye powers above,  
 Join all, and try the omnipotence of Jove;  
 Let down our golden, everlasting chain,  
 Whose strong embrace holds heaven and earth and main;

Strive, all, of mortal, or immortal birth,  
To drag by this the Thunderer down to earth ;  
Ye strive in vain ! If I but stretch this hand,  
I heave the gods, the ocean and the land ;  
I fix the chain to great Olympus' height,  
And the vast world hangs trembling in my sight !  
For such I reign, unbounded and above ;  
And such are men and gods compared to Jove."

Now, are the attributes of the great Jehovah less than those of the fabled Jupiter ? Why, were this whole universe filled with Beelzebubs a thousand times more wily and mighty than the arch fiend himself, and were they all marshalled in war's bristling array before the battlements of heaven, the Almighty, by one simple volition, could blast them all in an instant into the eternal silence of annihilation. There need, therefore, be no fear but that God can redeem the world. Christianity assures us that he has promised it and undertaken it, and thus meets this great want of mankind for the world to be freed from the dominion of evil.

Such is the Christian religion to humanity. It satisfies every want. It comes to us with an infallible remedy for all our woes. It is a heavenly atmosphere for the spiritual lungs. The world has its moral swamps emitting forth pestiferous miasma. It has its deep caverns of ignorance and filthy degradation, abysses of death, where the poisonous gas of moral carbon yearly murders its victims, soul and body, by thousands and thousands. But the genial atmosphere of heaven is bathing this world of corruption with its purifying influences. Already the highlands are salubrious with its celestial oxygen, and the gentle breezes from their sunny tops are sweeping along, laden with Divine fragrance, over the marshy wastes and hidden recesses of sin, which shall yet be cleansed, so as to become homes of spiritual health.

But to each one personally its promises are conditional. We may reject it, breathe the poison of evil, and live in misery, and die from the effects of our choice. Without religion, what is man ? Whence came he ? For what is he here ? And where is he going ? All is mysterious.

“This should have been a noble creature; he  
 Hath all the energy that would have made  
 A goodly frame of glorious elements,  
 Had they been wisely mingled; as it is,  
 It is an awful chaos—light and darkness—  
 And mind and dust—and passions and pure thoughts,  
 Mixed and contending without end or order.”

But Christianity enlists man in the great work of redeeming himself and the world from sin, harmonizes his discords, soothes his passions, solves to him the enigma of the present life, and sends him Zionward, singing as he journeys on over his daily labors and enjoyments, and in happy anticipations of future glories. May it not, therefore, be said, in the final summing up of earthly existence, that no one who has breathed the healthful air of Christianity, who has read the sweet words of life, that, springing from the great heart and mind of the Savior, dropped lovingly from his Divine lips upon the ears of his first disciples, and who has felt the promptings of the Holy Spirit, has sadly forgotten through his earth-life that “Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.”

#### ART. II.—GOD IN MATTER AND IN MIND.\*

There are three prevalent theories respecting the Divine agency in material and psychological operations. 1. The first is, that God having created the universe, and impressed on it certain self-acting forces, leaves it to the influence of these forces,

\* The present relations of God to Nature and Grace, and the relations of Nature and Grace to each other, and hence the subjects of conversion, Prayer and Providence must always be regarded by earnest minds, as of the first importance. This article and two others in this issue on these topics, present an earnest discussion of them. While we commend them to patient study, it is hardly necessary for us to say that they are presented to the reader on the responsibility of their respective authors.—ED. QUAR.

without any further intervention on his part. 2. The second theory makes Deity the motive-power of the vast machine, but represents him as operating through innumerable series of subordinate causes and by invariable laws. 3. Finally, God is considered the immediate agent in every event. Something like a combination of the last two, is doubtless the true doctrine. It is not important to determine whether God acts through second causes if we acknowledge that the *power* is his, that it never acts unintelligently, and that it is never modified by accidents of matter, nor unforeseen fortuities of any kind.

The Scriptures uniformly represent God as performing all the operations of nature. "He sendeth rain upon the just and upon the unjust." "He giveth snow like wool, and scattereth the hoar frost like ashes." "The Lord thundereth in the heavens." "In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind." "The very hairs of your head are all numbered." "Not a sparrow falleth on the ground without your Father." All the promises of temporal good, and threatenings of temporal evil, which are so abundant in the Bible, necessarily imply that all the elements are under the immediate control of the Divine hand, and that there is no law but that of his own will which limits him in the disposal of them. The facts that prayer is required, and that prayer is answered, imply the same thing. On any other theory miracles would be impossible, and revelation an absurdity.

There is a mischievous philosophy widely spread abroad, which has a show of plausibility, and which is therefore the more dangerous, though exceedingly superficial. It represents all things as done *by law*. *Nature* is defined as a system of laws, uniform in their action and unvarying as to the penalties for their violation; when these laws are obeyed, the results are always happy—when disobeyed, the consequences painful. There is something of truth in this, and, if the form in which the statement is made did not imply more than is expressed, it might be harmless. There is a sense in which *everything* is done by law—miracles, answers to prayer, special providences and all. But if, as seems to be the fact, it is meant that *law* DOES *anything*, and that God does nothing, we must at once repudiate it.

It has no authority in any system of religion, nor even of real philosophy. Very few of the advocates of such a theory can give an intelligent answer to the question, *What is natural law?* Many persons, from the fact that certain operations of nature are uniform, jump to the conclusion that natural law is a *force* which produces these operations. If we ask why the stone falls towards the earth, we are told "it is caused by the *law of gravity*." But what is the law of gravity? "Oh, it's the tendency which all material bodies *have* towards the centre." (A young skeptic once assured us it was a *force at the centre of the earth*. As he had never been at the centre, and of course, could not very well explain the nature of this force, we suppose *there is* no such force either in the centre or in the theory.) But what gives this tendency to falling bodies? "Why it's *natural* to them—it's their *law*." So we get to the *ultima thule* of their philosophy, and find ourselves resting in the sublime conclusion that an event occurs because other similar events occur in the same way—that stones fall because they have got into the habit of falling—or because they do fall!

Common sense and common usage both declare *law* to be a *method*, not a *power*. It is a rule of action; a principle of government; an adjustment of elements in the relation of cause and effect. A law never executes itself. We never think of appointing the Revised Statutes to keep order in the Commonwealth. The laws are necessary, but there must be some intelligent person to execute them, (the intelligence may be inconsiderable as is possible in politicians appointed to office—still a very small mind is vastly better than none). So there are scientific laws, and rules of art. We never think of sending Bowditch's Navigator in command of a ship going on a foreign voyage. The child in the common school does not expect that the "Rule of Three," or the "Law of the Cube," will work out his problems for him, however much he may desire it. There is a rule or law by which the carpenter frames a building; but it has never yet been known to make a house.

*Natural law* is *God's method* of working. Part of this method is seen by us, and part—by far the larger part—is unseen. The part we can see is regular in its operations and is

uniform; so that where one thing occurs we may judge with tolerable accuracy that something else which we have in our mind will also occur. It may be regarded as a well settled truth that all force or power resides in mind or spirit, and that it is impossible to impress self-acting forces on matter. Whatever of force appears to be in material things must come from immaterial sources. There is power in the implements of manual labor as wielded by the hands of a workman. But the chisel and hammer and spade must receive their power from man. We never think of sending an axe into the woods to cut down trees; nor a mere saw to work up our wood-pile. So if God leaves alone the winds and the water, or the steam, electricity and gravitation, they will have no power at all and no existence. If he cease to operate in the universe, all motion must cease, and all laws become lifeless.

It is said by some whose idea of God's standard of small and great is deduced from their own, that it detracts from the majesty of the Creator to regard him as acting in every event that occurs. How it can thus affect any thoughtful person we cannot very well understand. To us it connects itself naturally and almost necessarily with the ubiquity, the omniscience and the infinite benevolence of the Divine character—this thought, that in all the multiform operations of the universe, the small and the great, the vast and the delicate, he is personally present, shaping every event, whatever its contingencies, by his own wisdom and skill. However this may be, we are, of course, certain that Deity is either at work or in repose. Now which of these two conceptions of God is the nobler, and which the more belittling? There are those, to be sure, whose idea of dignity and majesty necessarily includes that of indolence and stupidity; but certainly their opinion ought not to be influential with practical thinkers. To such, it may seem to detract from the dignity of Deity to suppose him constantly at work. But we find for our own mind a nobler idea in the words of Christ, "*My Father worketh hitherto.*" If God is at work anywhere in the universe, he is either at work on what has already been created, or he is creating anew. The former supposition accords with our idea of Providence. But on the latter supposition, we cannot con-

ceive of a new creation anywhere in the universe, apart from the fact that this will be a new force affecting the relations of all previous creations, thus calling for the attention of Infinite Wisdom and Power everywhere to readjust the whole system. An increment of half an inch in the diameter of the earth would cause a serious disturbance in all organic and inorganic existence—such irregularity and disorder as could not be remedied without a new adjustment of all the properties of matter. We might reason similarly concerning the introduction of a new planet into a system, or a new system into the universe. If God works anywhere, he must at the same time work *everywhere*, adjusting previous creations to the new one, or the most direful disorder would ensue.

There is no philosophy that can account for the continued existence of matter or the operation of natural laws aside from the agency of Deity. Revelation declares that "By Him all things consist," and that "In him we live, and move, and have our being." There is a futile attempt at an analogical argument running somewhat thus: Man can construct machines so adjusted as to work without his presence or superintendence; why, therefore, may not the universe have been thus constructed by God? The analogy fails in every important particular. Man never constructs machinery which furnishes its own motive-power or with self-acting forces. He only adjusts his work to forces already existing—forces he did not make and which he cannot destroy. The watch is made to operate by the power in the *mainspring*—but the artist did not make the power. The engine is moved by the force of steam, and is merely fitted to the reception and application of that force; but the latter is not the result of the manufacturer's skill. The stately ship may move upon the ocean as well without as with its builder; but, without the powers of nature (which are the power of God) in the winds and the waters, all the skill of the builder would be in vain. In the vast and complicated machinery of the universe there could be no adaptation to preëxisting forces. The builder must also supply the motive power. When the long endeavor after "perpetual motion" proves successful, we shall have an approximation to a perfect analogy—this will do some-

thing to convince us that the universe can get along without God. It will be infidelity going by machinery, atheism on wheels!

But if God is thus present in every event, always doing first what needs to be done, what need of any uniform system of natural law? Is such a system necessary to such a God? We have no doubt that God could work just as well by some other system (so far as power is concerned), as by the one he has adopted, or perhaps without any uniform system at all. But whatever may have been his chief design in choosing the plan he has, it is evidently adapted to the well-being of man, and thus becomes in our estimation one of the strongest indications of the infinite goodness of the Creator. On this point we quote the remarks of a profound and eloquent writer:

"It is not difficult to discover the utility of this method of action. It is the regularity of the laws of nature which leads us to put confidence in them, and enables us to use them. Without such order and uniformity man would have no motive to industry or incentive to activity. Disposed to action, he would ever find action to be useless, for he could not find out the tendency, and much less the exact effect of any step which he might take, or course of action adopted. Suppose that instead of rising regularly at a known time, the sun were to appear and disappear like a meteor, no one being able to say where, when or how, all human exertion would cease in a feeling of utter hopelessness. If, instead of returning in a regular manner, the seasons were to follow each other capriciously, so that spring might be immediately succeeded by winter, and summer preceded by autumn, then the labor of the husbandman would be at an end, and the human race would perish from the earth. In such a state of things mankind would not have sufficient motive to do such common acts as to partake of food, for they could not anticipate that food might support them. If such a system, or rather want of system, pervaded the world, suspicion and alarm would reign in every breast, man would sink into indolence with all the accompanying evils of reckless audacity and vice; 'fears would be in the way;' and man would fear the approach of danger from every quarter, and feel himself confused as in a dream, or lost in darkness; or rather, after leading a brief and troubled existence, he would vanish altogether from the earth."\*

All the pleasure we are constituted to receive from the inves-

\* M' Cosh, *Divine Government*, 1st Amer. Ed. p. 153.



tigations and discoveries in science would be impossible, were there no such system of uniform natural law. The powers of the intellect would lie dormant, and instead of receiving, as now, unnumbered and incalculable enjoyments from the excitements of judgment and reason, we should be a race of stupid idiots. As it is, the systems of science "are but the translations of the Creator's thoughts into human language." Yet this very regularity and uniformity is made by some the ground of denying an active Providence and of excluding God from all present participation in the works of nature. They forget that what we see to be uniform is only a diminutive fraction of the whole system. The operative standing by the power-loom, knows how to handle the bobbins according to the respective colors of the pattern, and how to mend the broken threads; but she knows almost nothing of the structure or the operation of the marvelous machinery working with apparently human intelligence. So man may learn certain of the methods of God in nature, so far as these methods pertain to his own action; but of the complicated and intricate arrangements within and outside of these, he knows nothing, and if made patent to his physical vision, he would not be able, even in the faintest degree, to comprehend their working. How little competent, then, are we to set forth a system of nature, and assign the relations of God thereto! If known at all, as Cicero says on another subject, "some god must tell us." The philosophy that comes thus in conflict with the theory of God's active connection with all his works, is not only superficial, but, as is natural, it is also infidel. Lord Bacon says, "A little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion." This is evident. For it is certain that some of the most powerful intellectual characters in the world, have been at the same time deeply religious men; and these, whether Christians, Jews or Pagans, have earnestly maintained the doctrine of God's presence in his works. Even Plato reckons as one of his three divisions of Atheism, "The believing that God *is*, but not that he has anything to do with human affairs."

But while philosophy can do nothing to determine this question, "we have a more sure word" of testimony, to which even

science is now beginning to grant its tardy assent. The great professor and universal student of nature, of whose accession to our "thinking and laboring constituency," our country has a right to be proud, in the noble work \* he has just given to the world, rejects, most indignantly, "the desolate theory which refers us to the laws of matter as accounting for all the wonders of the universe, and leaves us with no God but the monotonous, unvarying action of physical forces, binding all things to their inevitable destiny."

By Scripture example we are authorized to speak of all natural events *as done by God*. He carries the rapid flame of the lightning, and utters the notes of its thunder; he brings from its aerial heights the snow-flake and marks out its path, and appoints its place on the earth; he leads up from their hot beds the streams of molten rock, and sends forth the fiery flood from the volcano's mouth. His hand takes the sear leaves of autumn from their branches and strews them on the ground; and he lays hold of the huge pillars of the earth so that they tremble. The Divine energy is everywhere at work, whether in fashioning the beautiful petal of the tender violet and the sparkling dew-drop on it, or in carrying worlds and systems of worlds around their appointed centre, and diffusing through his universe the mysterious influence by which he governs their places, and times, and seasons.

We had intended to say something on the relations sustained to each other by the terms *general providence*, *special providence*, and *miracles*. But we will only remark at present, that by *general providence* we mean those natural operations which we see to be regular and uniform; to most minds these appear to be all with which they have any concern. By *special providence* we understand certain events which are brought about by Divine Wisdom, not in the regular operations of uniform laws, and yet not by the least contravention or disturbance of them—for the discipline and instruction of individuals, as answers to prayer, for the advancement of Christianity, or for the shaping of history. There is ample opportunity for God to work, if we

\* Agazzis' Contributions to Nat. History of United States.

may be allowed the expression, between the general and uniform laws. A *miracle* is a suspension of ordinary laws by the supervention of an extraordinary one. It is a kind of "higher law" which necessarily presents itself to our view infrequently, on occasions when God would reveal and prosecute some of his sublime purposes of good toward his creatures. Still the law of Divine Providence is one, and therefore always works harmoniously in all its parts; only the operation of but one part is recognized by us.

We have thus far considered the operation of Providence only in the material world, not taking human agency into the account at all. It is more difficult to apprehend the agency of God in this relation than in the former. These two facts seem to stand out prominently everywhere in the Bible, viz.: (1.) That *there is in man a volition perfectly free from any extraneous coercion whatsoever*: (2.) That *God is present, not only in all natural events, but also in all human actions*. The freedom of man about which so much is said, consists simply in liberty of choice. His outward conduct is by no means free; he is not free in his relations to his fellow men; nor as to his body, nor his intellect nor his sensibilities—*nothing* but his will. It is comparatively a very diminutive sphere, this realm of his temporary absolute monarchy—but quite large enough so that within it his whole moral character is formed, and his eternal destiny irrevocably settled. Within this sphere there is perfect freedom, but the moment the volition emerges into action, that moment it is in God's hands, and he uses it in working out his own purposes. It is thus that "man proposes, but God disposes." "A man's heart deviseth his way, but God directeth his steps." History abounds in illustrations of this principle. We select two or three from Scripture, because we may there have authority for the most important fact (Divine agency); whereas in profane history we should be left to mere conjecture. In that intensely interesting history of Joseph, over which childhood loves so well to linger, the events are all simple and natural—there is no violation of the common laws of cause and effect, or the freedom of human volition; there is not a miracle in the whole (except in the interpretation of the dream). Human agency in all its

variety of manifestation appears throughout the narrative perfectly free, undisturbed and unmodified. Yet we are informed that it was not the brethren of Joseph, (whatever they may have intended,) but God that sent him down to Egypt. \* "Ye thought evil against me," said Joseph, "but God meant it for good," † &c. Here God is declared to have done what to all human appearance, wicked men had been doing, without any modifying or coöperating influence whatever. It by no means diminished their sin; for this is always complete before it finds expression in action. How clearly, too, is this doctrine exemplified in the prophet's description of the employment of the wicked king of Assyria to accomplish the purposes of Deity. ‡ "Oh, Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. I will send him against a hypocritical nation and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge to take the spoil and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets." Here we see God using this man's action for his own purposes, directing it as if there were no dissenting element and no self-determining power. On the other hand, the individual thus used, has no idea of any superior controlling power. He feels no restraint or compulsion in his choice; his freedom is intact. Without let or hinderance he forms his volitions, though as soon as they are formed and pass into acts, they are in God's hands. "Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so; but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few." Here we see his unholy disposition, his wicked intention; and he goes to the execution of this intention as though God's interference were impossible. In his estimation, it is *his own hand* which has destroyed other kingdoms, and it is his power which will overthrow Jerusalem and glorify himself, defying all power that can be brought against him. But his plans and intentions will be successful only so far as the Invisible Power can make them subservient to his own purposes: then they will be frustrated. "Wherefore it shall come to pass that when the Lord hath performed his whole

\* Gen. 45 : 7, 8. † Gen. 50 : 20. ‡ Isaiah 10 : 5, &c.

work upon Mount Zion and on Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria and the glory of his high looks." "Shall the axe boast itself against him that heweth therewith? Or the saw magnify itself against him that shaketh it? As if the rod should shake itself against them that lift it up, or as if the staff should lift up itself as if it were no wood." Thus God may with perfect consistency employ a man in executing judgment on a nation, and yet punish him for sins committed in that transaction.

Take another familiar example. Nebuchadnezzar, with a proud heart and selfish ambition, grasps at extended empire. Impelled by the lust of power, he makes war on the neighboring nations; he is guilty of outrage and cruelty, and carries forward his wicked projects with a violent, high hand. Just at this time the cup of Judah's iniquity has become full; the day of recompense, long foretold, has arrived. The wicked ambition of this proud monarch renders him a fit instrument for this work, and thus the wrath of man is made to praise God. Nothing was further from Nebuchadnezzar's mind than the intention of doing work for God. But the thought of Jerusalem, noted for its strength and its opulence, together with the widely extended reputation of the glory and riches of its temple, came into his mind. *How* that thought came there, we do not know; but we see no impropriety in supposing it to have been suggested directly by God—not as a temptation to sin—God never tempts any man; the king's purposes were already based on sin, and established in iniquity. Of course, then, there would be here no infringement in the least, of his moral freedom. Even men are continually influencing each other's intellectual states and each other's sensibilities, without at all becoming responsible for each other's volitions. The king's wickedness was already determined—he was only devising a plan of accomplishment. God had the means to modify that plan. He proposed to strike a blow for self-aggrandizement; God took care that the blow should fall in a particular place, and produce a particular effect. Tytler tells us that after all his preparations for invasion were completed, Nebuchadnezzar had not yet decided whether to attack Jerusalem or Tyre; and that he order-

ed lots to be cast—the lot fell against Jerusalem. We do not rely upon this tradition. We can conceive of a score of ways in which the Divine power could work among and modify the plans of this royal fillibuster without in any way interfering with his volitions or placing before him any motive to wrong doing. A thousand *apparent* accidents occur in every day's experience of every man, any one of which may be influential of changing the tendency of any enterprise, or even of the character of life itself. It is by these seeming *accidents* that God controls the actions of even bad men. Such, doubtless, was the case with Nebuchadnezzar. At all events, the prophet long beforehand declared that God would bring Nebuchadnezzar against Jerusalem;\* it is also affirmed afterwards that God had *caused* all this evil,† and that *he had brought‡* the king of Babylon against the nation for the punishment of their crimes. Yet by the same authority the wickedness of the king in this very transaction is denounced, and he and his people are threatened with condign punishment for these iniquities—the threatening also is recorded as fulfilled. It was thus, too, that the ignominious death of Christ was brought about, as the natural result of the most unholy volitions on the part of wicked men; yet it was what God's "hand and counsel had before determined to be done"—and this without diminishing aught of their sin.

Virtually God says to men, "Choose freely for yourselves good or evil. I will put no restraint upon your will. But though you choose evil, yet your wickedness must flow in the channels which I mark out for it, and nowhere else. The streams flowing from your hearts may be filthy and turbid with sin; but they shall be compelled to turn the wheels of human progress, and so minister in all their results to my glory." We do not mean by this that God makes all results just the same as though man's will did not operate at all, or as though it operated in exact harmony with the will of God. But God takes human actions and so changes their direction that the result is frequently a wonder to the human agent; and that result is, upon the whole, for the glory of God and for the good

\* Jere. 25 : 9. † Jere. 32 : 23. ‡ 2 Chron. 36 : 17.

of all those affected by it, if they are in harmony with God. Wicked men sometimes persecute God's children. He makes the persecution a blessing to those who suffer it; their reward in heaven is made greater, their spiritual joy on the earth is also increased. The persecution, too, is made the means of spreading and strengthening God's kingdom in the world; and this fact has become so well understood as to have passed into the familiar proverb, "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church." Some of these persecutions have been crises in the world's history, and have resulted in the advancement of civilization, and such changes in the conditions and relations of nations as have been wonderfully beneficial to the world.

It is evident, then, that virtue and vice, sin and righteousness, are exclusively *voluntary*; that is, are confined to the volitions. It is therefore perfectly proper to speak of the presence of God in every event, not only of nature, but of human action; and to regard all events as modified by providential influence. There is a class of writers, who, while endeavoring to inculcate a practical philosophy of life, at the same time teach a scarcely concealed materialism, and take great pains to keep an active providence out of sight. With them holiness is synonymous with virtue; and virtue is merely obedience to natural laws; and natural laws are a close, compact frame-work, occupying all the possible area of active forces, so that even God can find no opportunity for action or place of influence among all his works. That this is a shallow philosophy we have already shown. Yet there is sometimes a plausibility in its practical illustrations which beguiles the unwary. We recollect a sneering article by one of these writers, when, on the occasion of a murder, God's providence had been alluded to in connection with the death of the individual. It was said, that "God had nothing to do with it; it was simply the work of an assassin." The opportunity was used in a deistical style, to ridicule the notion of a providence in the affairs of men. Does God, then, give the assassin unrestrained license to perform the horrible devices of his heart? Is the creature possessed of greater freedom than the Creator? Are we all of us at the mercy of every malignant spirit which may chance to cross our path? We prefer to

think otherwise, even if for no other reason than the sense of security which comes with the thought that God takes care of us, and that no good and no evil can ever affect us but such as tends to our personal profit and to God's glory. But let us examine this a little more closely. A man decides to commit a murder. At the moment of that decision he is guilty of the crime, whether he ever accomplishes it or not; his guilt is just as great as though the irrevocable deed had been done, save that if there be much time or many steps between the determination and the consummation, there will be repetition of the volition, and thus, if persisted in, his crime will be enhanced. But a thousand things may intervene between the decision and the act. Probably but an inconsiderable portion of the murders devised are ever committed. Sometimes the terror of the law may occasion an abandonment of the intention—sometimes conscience is aroused to unwonted activity, and by its alarming clamors deters from the bloody deed—sometimes there are insuperable obstacles in the way of the murderer; his victim may be on the guard and repel the attack; the weapon, by some obvious or unaccountable influence, may be turned aside or rendered inefficient. There is ample room for God to work without interrupting natural laws or interfering with the freedom of the sinner. No outward act of murder takes place without God's sufferance; and while he punishes the murderer for his crime, he makes use of the results of that crime—that is, of the outward action—in bringing about certain purposes of his own towards the unfortunate victim, or towards his friends or the community; or it may be, in producing results of a totally different character from all of these. What is true of murder is true of all other physical and temporal results of man's wickedness.

The consequences of human misdoing are very many and very sad. A superficial and semi-infidel philosophy clamors lustily for the exclusion of providence *here*, at least. In contemptuous tones it tells us of a young lady going to a ball inappropriately and unhealthily clad. "She exercises violently in a warm room and impure atmosphere; and as she retires in a state of physical exhaustion, very naturally takes cold. The



reaction consequent on the previous excitement, together with the physical irregularity thus induced, brings on a fever, which terminates in consumption and death. The minister comes to perform the last offices of religion, and to offer consolation to the stricken friends, and in so doing talks of it as 'a mysterious providence;' whereas it is nothing but *the natural and necessary result* of the girl's own folly and imprudence." But we ask, is it *known* to be "nothing but the natural and necessary result of folly and imprudence?" These exist, we freely admit; and we do not deny that they are violations of natural law, and therefore expose the subject to the appropriate penalty. Still, as all natural laws are uniform in their operation and in the penalties of their violation, we are compelled to ask whether all young ladies who imprudently attend balls catch cold? whether all such colds result in fever? and whether all fevers result in consumption or death? If it could be shown that at the same ball there were twenty other young ladies who committed precisely the same folly and imprudence, and the same violations of physical law, so far as they or anybody else could know anything about it, and yet, that in their cases the result was *totally* different, it would then appear that this particular instance, instead of being a "natural and necessary result," was really an exception to the general rule, and depended upon some unknown and incalculable cause. If it be said that under precisely the same conditions precisely the same effects would follow; we answer this is just what can never be known; as it would be impossible to find two persons under precisely the same conditions. It is a point that human philosophy can never settle. We prefer, at any rate, to adhere to the old Christian phraseology, and regard all such events as "providential;" believing that while every transgression meets with its due recompense of reward, they are severally under the control of God, and the results are varied so as precisely to meet the wants of those affected by them. Even at the funeral of a suicide we can see no inconsistency in maintaining the influence of providence. No man becomes a suicide without some previous great errors or fearful sins. Nor does he become so all at once. There are many steps to be taken, and each of these may be modified by

various extraneous influences. Suicide is only one of the results to which these steps may lead. There are innumerable methods by which God can work so as to vary the results, while, at the same time, full play is given to the operation of natural laws and to freedom of volition. Apparent accidents often modify or determine the action of the individual; but what we call *accidents* are most definite and important elements in the economy of providence.

It may seem strange, if man's moral character pertains only to the *will*, that God ever permits sin to get an outward expression. There may be various reasons in the Divine mind, which it would be presumption in us to try to apprehend. Still, it is possible that one of these reasons is, that by an exhibition of the *fruits* of sin, men may get such a conception of its character as would be impossible by any other means. We are thus made to see how terrible a thing it is; while in the economy of the Divine government one sin is frequently made to counteract another, or to punish the doer of sin; and all the natural results of sin are compelled to do some service in accomplishing the purposes of God.

Men sometimes have singularly narrow and inadequate notions of the *causes* of things. "Every effect must have its cause," is the old axiom; from which it is the erroneous inference that such particular event is produced by some one particular fact or force. That every effect may be itself a cause, and that each cause in an indefinite series is, in its turn, an effect seems to be lost sight of. The real or principal cause of an event is seldom or never known. As we ordinarily use the terms, there is scarcely any event which can properly be said to be the effect of a single cause. Many things are to be adjusted in a particular relation before the particular effect is produced. We have good bread on our table to-day. What is the cause of this goodness? or rather, what are the causes? To go back only a little way, we shall find some of these in the ingredients, some in the proportions in which they are combined, something depends on the knowledge and skill of the cook, something on the oven, something on the fuel, its quality and quantity—and each of these again are dependent on several

other things. Without any difficulty, we might specify a hundred "causes" for the particular fact; and they are causes so far as this—any one of them having been different, the result would have been otherwise. We stood the other day beside a cotton loom. The shuttle flew back and forth with its proverbial swiftness; the beam and reed beat in the filling; the harnesses moved up and down, bringing each of the ten thousand threads to its proper place every moment; the web was drawn along and wound up as fast as woven; and every part of the wondrous machine worked harmoniously as if instinct with life and intelligence. Suddenly the loom stopped, from no apparent cause. "Why does it stop?" we asked. "Because the thread broke," said the attendant. And so it was. For the thread, as it pays out from the shuttle, is carried across the "thread-fork," a little delicately hung lever with a hasp at the opposite extremity. The striking of this thread on the fork keeps the hasp from another lever which connects with the shaft of one of the wheels, so that it may play freely back and forth. But when the thread breaks, the hasp holds the "goose-neck" firmly; this causes a movement against the "shipping-iron;" this strikes against the "shipping-handle," and causes it to fly back; this turns another long, crooked lever; this is furnished with a fork at the end and causes the band to fly off the wheel; this causes the wheel to stop; this stops the shaft, and prevents the action of the lever which, acting through two or three other media stops the shuttle, and the whole loom. Now here are some ten "causes" of the stopping of the loom—there are many others which we have not mentioned—each of these depends on several others. Yet strictly speaking, none of these is the real cause of the stopping of the loom. It operates because of a certain connection, through many elements of machinery, with the water power, and it stops from the very properties of matter, because there is nothing to keep it in motion. The *real cause* is not a matter of perception. Still the loom always stops when the thread breaks or runs out. What we mean to illustrate is this fact: that what we commonly call the cause of an event, may be only a partial cause—perhaps only an *occasion*; or it may be, only one of innumerable

conditions on which the event depends. On this point we introduce some instructive remarks from Mr. Mill. "It is seldom between a consequent and one single antecedent, that this invariable sequence exists. It is usually between a consequent and the sum of several antecedents; the concurrence of them all being requisite to produce, that is to be certain of being followed by, the consequent. In such cases it is very common to single out only one of the antecedents under the denomination of Cause, calling the others merely Conditions. Thus if a man eats of a particular dish and dies in consequence, that is, would not have died if he had not eaten of it, people would be apt to say that eating of that dish was the cause of his death. There needs not however be any invariable connection between eating of the dish and death; but there certainly is, among the circumstances which took place, some combination or other upon which death is invariably consequent; as for instance the act of eating the dish, combined with a particular bodily constitution, a particular state of present health, and perhaps even a certain state of the atmosphere; the whole of which circumstances perhaps constituted in this particular case the *conditions* of the phenomenon, or in other words, the set of antecedents which determined it, and but for which it would not have happened. The real cause is the whole of these antecedents."\* What is more likely than that, in innumerable instances, many of these antecedents are entirely beyond the sphere of our possible knowledge? There are certain events to be sure, the relations of which to other events we are so well acquainted with, that when one takes place we are certain that the others will also occur. But in this respect our knowledge is very limited. We know but comparatively few of the causes and conditions of the phenomena taking place around us; very many of those which occur in every hour's experience can be known only to God. To us they appear like accidents; we cannot foresee them nor modify our action by them. "God has constituted a large class of events as contingent in view of man, but instead of being independent of God, it is especially by these that he fulfils his

\* Mill's Logic, p. 197.

own purposes and governs the world."\* These seeming fortuities are not such in the view of God—they are parts of laws which we know nothing about, but by which God works among and modifies the operation of such laws as we do understand. Nor do we suppose that God is confined to any set of conditions in bringing about a given effect. He may not only prevent an effect by removing some of the unseen conditions, but when some of the conditions are removed by human agency he may substitute others. Death may be caused by a knife, or a rope, or a fever. Often when some calamity seems to have been averted, a slight "accident" has rolled it back upon its victim. "It is not true that each phenomenon can be produced in only one way. There are often several independent modes in which the same phenomenon could have originated. One fact may be the consequent in several invariable sequences; it may follow, with equal uniformity, any one of several antecedents, or collections of antecedents. Many causes may produce motion; many causes may produce some kinds of sensation; many causes may produce death. A given effect may really be produced by a certain cause and yet be perfectly capable of being produced without it."† It is through such means (among others probably) that God has the control of every event in the universe, so that nothing is left to be determined in its *outward result* solely by any will of man.

Most uncomfortable and dreary must be the reflection of a mother, whose infant, loved more than her own life, lies in the next room shrouded for the grave, and who is conscious that she has done all she knew how to do and taken all possible precautions to prevent the terrible result; if she must regard it as the effect of unbending natural laws, among which no modifying power can move, and which no direct influence of a loving God can control. "Truly it is little consolation to the man disabled for life by an accident which he could never have foreseen nor prevented, to tell him, in answer to the groans which his pain is wringing from him, that his calamity occurred through a very beautiful law; that it is a good thing that stones fall

\* M'Cosh. † Mill's Logic, p 250.

and fire burns, and thus brought down that building in the ruins of which he was found. The widow's tears which flow as she weeps over a husband whose ship has perished in the waters, will not be dried up by the mere observer of mechanical laws coming to her and explaining that winds blow and waves rage, and that it is for the advantage of mankind that they should. To those who could bring no other consolation, the heart would respond, 'Miserable comforters are ye all, ye are physicians of no value.'\*\* If it is to such an entertainment that the teachers of the material philosophy invite us, we choose not to go. We prefer the simple faith which exclaims, "We know that all things work together for good to them that love God."

To us it seems clear that there are innumerable agencies by which God works in conjunction with natural causes and in harmony with the freedom of human volitions, yet by means of which he modifies every incident in the material world, and every element of human experience to meet some special end in their relation to his own purposes. The arrangements of the Divine Government are like an instrument of ten thousand keys, some of which we can see, and of a few of which we understand the use—but there are many more which we do not understand, or have never seen. Every event in the physical and in the moral world is a note, which, with others, is combined into a grand symphony of wondrous and transcendent harmonies.

By such means as we have described, God works also in history. Human agency has had full play on this broad stage. Terrible have been the crimes committed and the evils consequent. Yet man has not been left alone in the midst of these, nor have the consequences of his conduct been controlled by the operation of mere material laws. Amid the apparent chaos of events, the Almighty hand has ever been present restraining, suggesting, inspiring, controlling, fitting each event to its place, vindicating the principles of his government, making the wrath of man to praise him, and shaping the materials of the world's

\* M'Cosh, *Divine Government*, p. 181.

story into a grand unity, steadily progressing to one predetermined end. God has been actively at work, using great men and little men; individuals and associations; single nations and confederacies; wars, revolutions and insurrections; reformations and apostacies; assassinations, massacres and conflagrations; despotism and slavery; polytheism and atheism; all the efforts of the human intellect and the grand inventions of human ingenuity; every scheme of desperate wickedness, and every earnest and honest effort to coöperate with him in the sublime purposes of his government; all the acts of man and all the disturbances of the elements have been assigned their respective places in the great drama, and made to contribute to the result. What to the disciple of the material philosophy is the most wonderful of all is the fact that some of the most stupendous movements in history have resulted from the most apparently trivial accidents; while to the believer in God's providence, these are only indications of the simplicity of the Divine operations.

We conclude, then, that there is no such thing as *chance*; that *accidents* in reality never occur; that God is actually present in *every event* of both the physical and the moral world; and that in all the calamities of life, however closely connected with human misdoing, as well as in all life's prosperities, however occasioned, it is right to acknowledge God.

## ART. III.—THE REVIVAL OF 1858.

The year just closed will be memorable on many accounts; but the religious experiences of our land will stamp it with one of its most peculiar and impressive features. It is quite too early even now to attempt a statement of the results of the Revival, and especially too early to estimate its influence and value. Indeed, the work is still going forward; new facts if not new features are being constantly developed; the forces it has set free, or consecrated, or made practically operative, are not yet fully organized and systematically working. Its history will be much more easily written a century hence, and that period will be soon enough to estimate its real influence upon our higher life; still it may be already offering us some practical lessons which will repay our study.

Such seasons of marked and general religious interest are no novelty in the history of the church; nor do they necessarily involve any unnatural or unhealthy experience. Every great principle and good cause has its visible triumphs and its apparent disasters and perils. The jubilant journey of Jesus over the palm-strewed thoroughfare to Jerusalem, and the passionate clamor for his crucifixion, only illustrate the process by which all high enterprises reach their goal. We may wish it were otherwise; but the fact remains. We may glorify regularity and order, and prepare a programme according to which the gospel is to go steadily on to royalty in the world; but convulsions come crowding in upon experience, and the world goes onward largely by revolutionary steps. Not all the work, by which the results we see are brought to pass, is performed at the marked era; the forces which so suddenly and wondrously come out into view, or surprise us by their activity, may have been long accumulating under the patient labor of years. And it is not to be supposed that religious influences have forsaken the world when Pentecostal seasons are longed and waited and prayed for apparently in vain. The services in the "upper room" at Jerusalem were doing the needful work for the world not less really than Peter's sermon; and the fervent prayers



that ascended there were as really tokens of the Divine presence as the cloven tongues of flame that descended upon the worshippers. There is Divine might in the patient, trustful toil which keeps on through unilluminated years, as well as in the flashes of glory that seem, at special seasons, to accompany the commonest efforts of the commonest men. The revival is often but the sudden and glorious blossoming of the spiritual plant which wearisome watching and care have brought at length to beauty. Such seasons of revival have the way prepared for them by many a John the Baptist, whether the multitude recognize or misinterpret their mission. If our spiritual discernment were keen enough, we should doubtless see no unusual marvels in these seasons of refreshing, but only the orderly developments of spiritual law and life.

Special effort at special seasons, followed by equally special results, need excite no surprise, and will not warrant the charge of fickleness upon the laborers. Such effort is proper in the sphere of religion, as in every other. There is more working vigor for us to carry into every sphere at some times than at others. The soul feels impulses at certain periods which are not felt at others. Circumstances combine to give us stimulus and encouragement to-day, which we could not find yesterday. Difficulties disappear at length, which we had sought vainly to surmount. Men's hearts are accessible at certain periods, which we cannot seem to approach at others. It is natural and proper to make special efforts in behalf of some one person at specific times. A favorable opportunity, a strong solicitude springing up in the heart, a manifest frankness and moral tenderness which invite our attempt—these things will induce a special effort at a special time, in behalf of some personal friend or acquaintance, without at all proving that we are fickle or impulsive. Others may join us in that special effort,—drawn and impelled by similar influences. We may feel this special interest, and make this special effort in behalf of a dozen persons at the same time—in behalf of a church, a community, a whole people. Others may join us—a dozen others, a score, a hundred, a whole church, a whole Christian community,—and all is still perfectly natural and proper. Our friend may yield himself to God and become a

Christian—others may yield, a dozen, a score, a hundred, many hundreds. This state of things may operate to awaken those to new interest and effort, who have long been sluggish in the church,—it may greatly rejoice and encourage and increase the faith and labor of God's people generally; this blessed labor, and these blessed fruits may serve to bind the laborers together in new sympathy and affection;—this awakened state of religious feeling may arrest general attention and give prominence to religious thought in the general mind, and many who were little affected before, may be effectually reached and brought to submission and a new life. All this is perfectly natural; all this may take place in the most healthy and wholesome operation of the laws of mind, and in the most normal way of living. And yet this is a Revival—it is a simple description of the state of things pertaining to the Revival of 1858.

There may be excesses in such seasons. There doubtless are; they are sometimes numerous and great; though with differences of intent, they are often exaggerated by outside critics and observers. But excesses are no rare exceptions in human life. Men are guilty of them every day. They are not wise enough, or lack the self-control, to avoid them. Whenever they act energetically, they act more or less injudiciously. Is it to be expected that they will part with all their frailties the moment they take a step in a religious direction? Must they never attempt any thing till they are offered a guaranty that they shall be saved from offending against any body's sense of propriety, or even against the highest prudence? Must they risk nothing, even of etiquette, in an attempt to secure the highest interests that attach to human existence? And it should not be forgotten that there is an excess in stupidity, in carelessness, in self-justification, in postponement of sacred duties, as well as in earnestness. While men pursue, with the public approval, their various worldly ends with an Olympian racer's impetuosity, their perpetual and noisy demand for prudence and moderation in all moral and religious matters savors more of selfishness than of saintship.

In such seasons of revival, judging both from philosophy and from facts, many natures are stirred by religious thought and

influence that are generally stupid; and it is far better for any man to look the grand and solemn facts of life in the face for one hour even, than for him never to do it at all. The vision itself may soon pass away, but the effects of it will linger and impress. The hearts of Christians receive a quickening that is often permanent—hearts that greatly need it and greatly rejoice over it. And many are really won to Christ who seemed not likely to be won by the ordinary influences which act upon them. However such seasons may be decried by consecrated or unconsecrated lips, there are many who look back upon them, through the whole subsequent life, with eyes moist through gratitude, and with hearts that throb with the hopes whose birth-hour they are contemplating. A real revival is what every true prayer is reaching after;—no man can intelligently and sincerely say, “Thy kingdom come,” but he is beckoning a mightier and more stirring revival than was inaugurated on the day of Pentecost, or denoted by the throngs that crowded the spacious theatre of New York, a few months since, when it was thrown open for midday prayer.

The various features of this Revival of 1858 deserve to be noted, and especially those features which make it, in any sense, a peculiar experience. The practical lessons they suggest may be left for the reader to draw out.

It cannot be ascribed to skilful planning, and the shrewd use of ingenious and flexible spiritual machinery, on the part of the religious community. Mere human appliances were hardly seen. Christians felt that they were only called on to coöperate heartily and faithfully with those influences which all were feeling and perceiving, and which appeared to them so manifestly of God. Very many of those who sympathized with, and labored in the Revival, were those who have been suspicious of all general and strong awakenings that had passed under their own notice, and protested against what they called revival machinery. And not a few of those who had been inclined to regard almost all strong religious excitements as indications of spiritual progress and vigor, had learned wisdom by what they had previously seen and suffered, and now could only give their approval to those forms of effort which were at once rational

and Christian. In fact, there seemed much less of the human planning than of the Divine quickening in all this wide-spread awakening. The ordinary public and social services were still kept up, and almost no others adopted; though the influences which seemed working in the sanctuary and prayer circle were such as to make them seem more than the ordinary places. Religious services were more frequent than usual, and more largely attended, but chiefly because the throbbing and sympathetic hearts of the people plead so powerfully for the solemn convocation—some to pour out the yearning or the joy which could not be kept a secret, others to find some effectual guidance and impulse to the cross, and others still because they felt a strange awe stealing upon and through them, and dared not wholly throw off the pressing hand of Heaven. The usual themes were discussed in the pulpit, with perhaps the added fervor and faith which the ministry were experiencing, and the words thrilled the hearer's spirits through and through. The same hymns were sung, and by the same voices as before, but they went up freighted with unspeakable emotion. Petitions, many times heard, were repeated, and many hearts found the way to heaven by sending their desires along the track of the prayer. The revival came and moved along with means appointed centuries ago for bringing men to salvation.

The revival followed on the heels of the wide-spread and severe commercial disasters that fell upon the country; and men, never accused of superstition and credulity, saw something more than a chronological connection between the two. Men who pleaded they had not time to give thought to the question, "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul"? were forced into opportunities now. There were no shrewd bargains to be driven, no speculations to carry on, no stocks to gamble in. There was ample time to think seriously, and serious thought was earnestly invited. Rich men, proud *in*, if not *of*, their riches, saw their property melting away under successive bankruptcies, and became worse than penniless. No capitalist felt sure where he would stand tomorrow. Want stared multitudes in the face who had never dreamed of such necessities. The foundations on which so

many had built their highest hopes, were seen to be only sand. The objects of such earnest and general pursuit were discovered to be phantoms. Outward good fell away from men, and for the first time revealed to them the nakedness and poverty of the spirit.

Besides, these disasters were felt to be a lawful and just retribution, overtaking the reckless and defiant worldliness and sensuality that had resolved to get on without God, and practically ignored all the lessons of history and the cautions of inspiration. Men whispered to each other and to themselves as they surveyed the wrecks that covered the land, saying, "*There is a God, after all*; and they who condemn him venture a terrible and uneven conflict." The reaction partially came. Postponed duties came crowding up and demanded recognition. Bygone convictions, cast out into forgetfulness, reappeared and told their fearful stories. Bible lessons, learned when the heart was simple and the spirit tender, but long ago dismissed as impracticable in real life, flamed out into clearness and read like a revelation. The long-abused conscience began its long deferred work of discipline. The opening future, pushed out of sight for its unwelcomeness, stretched across every path, and met every earnest look. In conscious guilt, in shame, in fear, in sorrow, in the sense of weakness, in the desire for a nobler life—some with one feeling uppermost, and some with another, multitudes began in earnest to inquire after and enter upon the real work of life. Prosperity had taught them presumption instead of gratitude; beneath the blows of adversity they learned their weakness and cried for a Helper. O, if we could only learn at length to tremble rather than bow down in reverence at the presence of material success!

The simple, earnest effort of private Christians was very prominently brought out in and by the Revival, and a higher estimate set upon it than has been the case at any previous period in our history. There has been for a long time too much relative dependence placed on the ministry. The pulpit has been expected and required to do almost everything in the way of directly promoting religion. Great preachers and popular have been sought, as the only conditions of church prosperity,

and the only hope of rendering religion a saving power. The laity built the sanctuary, filled the pews, paid the bills, and then insisted that, if godliness did not increase, it was no fault of theirs. The lecture had largely taken the place of the prayer meeting; and only the merest fraction of the membership assumed any active responsibility in the maintenance of the social meeting. The pressure of business had crowded devotion out of many so-called religious families; and the Christian merchant who openly betrayed an interest in his customers' souls as well as in their securities, was a rare phenomenon—more frequently smiled at for his simplicity than copied for his faithfulness.

The Revival brought us a most remarkable and grateful change in these respects. It was the prayer meeting that was demanded, and it was personal effort that was so manifestly exalted to prominence and power. And the prayer meeting must be divested of stiffness and formality; men of all classes must be alike welcome and at home there; the unschooled daily laborer, speaking out of his full heart, or sending up his heavily-freighted prayer, was often listened to by the millionaire and the scholar, with more interest and profit than the eminent divine or the scholarly critic. The preaching grew simple and practical, both through impulse and demand; and men and women who had scarcely dreamed that they were called to anything beyond church membership and a routine of life that occasioned no positive reproach, sat down and pressed the gospel upon their acquaintances with a power that surprised them. Prayer meetings multiplied, but still they overflowed; and, instead of being obliged to summon parties by special pains-taking, to see the time fairly occupied, it became necessary to restrict participants to a single exercise, and confine them to the three minutes' rule;—so great was the number who longed to say a word to God or for him. Men at length felt that religion was a personal matter; and that Christian duty had prescriptions as sacred for pews as for pulpits,—for active life on week-days as for sanctuaries on a Sunday. Heaven grant that this lesson, so long in being learned, may not soon be forgotten!

There was comparatively very little of mere animal or nervous or sympathetic excitement attending the Revival. Men felt much and deeply; but the emotion was born of intelligent and deep-seated and rational conviction. The most crowded meetings were solemn by their deep and strange stillness; the most thorough conviction and terrible anxiety showed themselves in concentrated meditation and half-suppressed and deep-drawn sighs; while the joy of hope and forgiveness told of its presence by tears, which made the eyes they moistened more radiant than ever. The wrong and the guilt of sin; the baseness of an ungrateful and worldly life; the soul's one great need, that God should grant it fellowship with him; the obligation to devote all power, resource, attainment and influence to his glory and to human welfare;—these were the chief elements of that penitence which so many were exercising. Men sat down deliberately, with Bible in hand, to learn their condition and duty, and then deliberately, in the presence of their friends, pledged their whole selves and future to God; and when business interfered with the execution of their purpose, they shut up their counting-rooms, and went to the closet till the great transaction was completed.

The large proportion of mature minds reached and won to Christ in connection with this Revival, is another feature peculiar enough to be noted. Heretofore, at least for some years past, conversions have chiefly occurred among the young. But while that class of persons was by no means passed over by the saving influences that were operating, a large fraction of the whole number of cases of conversion occurred among men and women in the maturity of life—heads of families, absentees from the sanctuary,—those who had lived through many seasons of awakening, and still remained destitute of religion. Especially men of business talent, influence and activity, were generally affected, and great numbers of them were among the most marked cases of apparent conversion. The "Business Men's Prayer Meeting" became an institution in most of our cities, and it was among the most interesting and efficient means, humanly considered, of spreading and deepening the work.

The Christian sympathy and unity, which prevailed and were promoted, presented one of the most pleasing and impressive aspects of the revival. Sectarian prejudices largely gave way under the pressure and warmth of Christian feeling; and mere zeal for denominational progress was swallowed up in the higher zeal for Christian progress. A great increase of spiritual strength grew out of this unity; and it did not a little to silence the cavilling which waited on the lips of skeptical and worldly men. Not all that could have been desired in this direction was witnessed or felt; but there was a great and manifest growth of that spirit whose triumph faith predicts, and Jesus plead for. The possibility of maintaining the unity of the spirit and diversity of sentiment and mode, was proved beyond all reasonable question.

The whole Revival, in its entire character and history, is a precious testimony to the divine and saving efficacy of the gospel, and a great and welcome help to the faith which waits and looks for its rapid conquests in the earth. More, by far, than a philosophical and slowly working educational force, is the religion of Christ; and this Revival has impressively set that fact forth before men. It takes ignorant men, hardened men, prejudiced men,—men wholly averse to the life it prescribes through inclination, interest and habit,—men who have hedged themselves around carefully, year after year, with prejudices and objections against it,—men who boast themselves as above the credulity and the necessities which afford a sphere for it,—it takes all these under its influence, and, so far as aim, motive, spirit, and purpose are concerned, it effects in them almost at once a moral transformation. It works not according to the formulas of any earth-born and earthly scheme of philosophy, but according to the laws of its own Divine nature. It promises what mere earthly educational philosophy pronounces absurd, and accomplishes at once what had been declared impossible. Divine forces throb in its heart, and work in its hands; and so its ministry is not to be estimated by any merely human arithmetic. What man can do by the aid of his imperfect and often empirical science, is no measure of the work which God can accomplish by his infinite and perfect scheme of grace. A



conversion may be at war with our systems of logic, and ignore all the postulates of our philosophy ; it is not thereby proved a pretence, a sham, a self-deception, nor a miracle ; it may unfold a feature in the established methods of God's grace. This Revival tells men—tells us all—to accept the facts devoutly, and then adjust our philosophy and our faith to them as we can.

And when revolving the problem of this world's future,—as every thoughtful man must, and as every truly prayerful man does,—what an inspiration is it to our hope, that the powers lodged in the gospel may work so mightily where we saw no room for their exercise, and that they may without bustle and commotion, change nearly the whole currents of a great nation's life, almost in a day ! So fast and so mightily may work that gospel which all pure hearts wait to see leaven the world. A larger and grander programme than our philosophy has drawn out for the centuries, may be gone through speedily, when God sets his spiritual instruments to make haste. Faith will feast many days on the fruits of this Revival, and like the old prophet, “go in the strength of that meat” a long time through fastings and griefs.

To the questions,—What have we gained by this Revival ? and, How are the church and the world to be affected by it in the future ?—it is quite too early to give any complete replies. And yet, since the permanent gains will depend very much upon our practical idea of what gains are, and upon the use we make of the experiences through which we have been passing, we will venture a few brief hints on this part of the subject.

Many real conversions have doubtless taken place. Conversions from every circle in life—conversions of children, long prayed for ; of parents, long leaving the chief parental work undone ; of companions, who were such only in person and natural relation, not in heart ; of wayward and prodigal ones, long given up as hopeless ; of strong men, whose neglect of religion was much leaned on and widely copied ; of amiable and generous men and women, whose lovable qualities made the necessity of something else seem less absolute to themselves and to others ; of skeptics, who had spurned the gospel as false, and of aristocrats who had spurned it as vulgar ;—conversions of more or less from all these classes, have occurred in this Revival. If there

be joy in heaven over *one* sinner that repenteth, there is reason for the deepest and devoutest gratitude that so many bowed as penitents before God, and in the presence of men.

The membership in our churches is greatly increased—increased by many thousands. Weak churches, faint in long-continued and apparently almost fruitless labor, have become girded with strength and filled with joy. Deserted sanctuaries have been crowded again. Pastors have addressed themselves to their work with new faith and zeal; and the list of candidates for the ministry is steadily lengthening. The sphere of Christian work grows broader, and the work itself more simple, direct and intense. Christian activity attaches to a larger fraction of church members; and many who have long had only a name to live, greatly rejoice in the consciousness of awakening life within. In the battle which ever goes on between the fleshly and the spiritual hosts, a large company have openly gone over from the worldly to the heavenly standard. How many of these will prove good soldiers of the Cross, remains to be seen; but the indications are hopeful.

The amount of true church power which is to be gathered up and made available for high ends, will depend not a little on the practical answers given to the few questions below.

*Shall the Revival teach us to make our preaching direct, simple, practical, appropriate, rational, faithful?* We are not pleading for pulpit common-place. There is too much of that, by far, and there has always been. The retailing of theological platitudes, or hortatory insipidities, is a business far too extensively carried on in pulpits and conference-rooms. Living thoughts, that start responses in every mind they strike, are demanded there. Men want their own dimly seen and uncomprehended experiences made luminous by portraiture, and plain by interpretation. The sermon needs to be a self-revelation, and a revelation of God to the hearer; and the temptations and perplexities which hedge many minds around, holding them prisoners, need to be divided as with the sword of the Spirit, and the soul pressed to the way of escape. Men preached thus, more or less, during the Revival; the dogmatism and the cant of technical theology being wisely left at home on the library

shelves. Many eminently practical men have come into the churches, and many more stand eagerly looking and listening at the door; their efficiency as Christians depends largely upon their being made to see that religion is the greatest and most comprehensive of all practical concerns. It is not in their nature to sit and dream.

*Shall we learn to use our regular, systematic, religious services and work, as expecting them to be, with God's blessing, really and immediately efficacious? Shall we work as though we knew we had implements of power, and perform each set task as though expecting to see fruit? Shall we cease to talk about God's time and way, and practically believe that now is the day of salvation? Shall we cease to manufacture magnets of our own to attract men to us; and give up the making of galvanic batteries to bring out the semblance of life from what we know are corpses? Shall we learn to use the truth, prayer, holy living, social relations and influence, as the means by which to bring men directly and at once to salvation? These are God's chosen methods; and the Revival should help to teach us their power, when the blessing that always waits, attends their faithful use.*

*Shall it induce us to labor for such experiences to be permanent; or shall we rest, rejoicing as though the harvest was reaped, and was not to be repeated till the distant autumn of another spiritual year? According to our faith and purpose, so, in a great measure, will be our experience—at least our experience is not likely to be higher and better than our faith and purpose. Permanent progress—both by the nurture of a growing life within the fold, and the bringing home of such as stray outside of it—this is the law of Christ's kingdom.*

*Shall the Christian unity already developed, survive and increase? Union Prayer Meetings grew out of, or rather grew up with, this Revival. They were interesting from their spontaneity, as well as from the fraternal spirit they nurtured and disclosed. We cannot well afford to be bigoted, and exclusive, and jealous, after this; it is hard enough to indulge ourselves thus when there is a necessity for it; and its necessity is thoroughly disproved. And we hope nobody will take offence if we*

say that close communion is coming to be widely and deeply felt as a needless barrier between hearts. We hope few hands will lend themselves to repair the breaches which Christian love has made in the walls of this ecclesiastical Sevastopol.

One more question remains, of deeper import to us than almost any other we have suggested, viz.: *How will this Revival affect our public character, policy, and life?* How much honor will it put into our commercial transactions? How much principle into our politics? How much justice, and humanity, and faithfulness into the Boards of our great Ecclesiastical and Benevolent associations? We sat one day in the Business Men's Prayer Meeting, and heard an active young merchant, just rejoicing in hope, tell, in his own straight-forward and energetic way, of the experiences through which he had just passed in consecrating himself to Christ. Every word had tone betokened his sincerity; and there was nothing which, even to the ear of prejudice, savored of cant. The assembly, made up largely of those who knew him, and had dealt with him in business transactions, listened in attentive silence, as if resolved to lose no word of the simple but thrilling story. At the close of the meeting an intelligent and high-minded business man, not by profession a Christian, said to us while speaking of this incident:—"Yes, I know —, as a business man; I liked his talk; he meant all he said; to him the change he speaks of is the greatest reality; I do not understand it; I have been through nothing of that sort, though that *may be* my fault. But," he added, "if Mr. — will go back to his counting room, and do business two years on the basis of the Sermon on the Mount, and then come back and tell us his experience and repeat his exhortation, I shall feel as though I, and the rest of us in my position, are bound to regard his religion as something really from heaven; and he will have a claim upon our special attention far higher than his honest and manly words gave him to-day. There, in his business, is where the qualities of his religion are to be tested and brought out." There was little to be said against that view of the case, however severe the criticism—to which the critic was liable, on account of his own false attitude.

And if trade is to be as overreaching as ever; speculation

as rife and as vicious; if bankruptcies are to be as frequent, flow from the same causes and wear the same character; if political caucusing is to be as unprincipled and tricky, and partizanship as base and bitter and full of falsification; if expediency is still to be allowed to outwit justice; if availability is to be set above character; if righteousness is to be bartered away for success; if the higher law is still to be a target at which demagogism is to let off its sarcasms; if slavery is still to be defended, apologized for, or tolerated for the sake of a guilty quietude and the spoils of office; if religious bodies are to mutilate the gospel for the sake of getting money and opportunity to preach the remaining fragment which offends and alarms no sinner;—if all these things are to go on as before, without abatement or increased remonstrance, then the moral influence of the Revival on the great affairs and interests of this world is of questionable value. These crimes are not less reprehensible because a larger number of converted men aid in giving them currency and reputation. If the number and influence of church votes to endorse these iniquities have been increased by the Revival, its ripened fruits will change much of the joy, begotten by its blossoming, into sadness—the sweet-voiced spring airs will tone off into the wail of autumn dirges. If the Revival should do nothing to help honesty, justice, truth and freedom, in the fearful contests amid which they are struggling in this land, how can it be set down as a power for God, or from him?

But we are hoping for better things. We look to see our public life and our great national forces purified and consecrated by this religious spirit. We look for true lives as well as for corrected faith; for integrity as well as humility; for a manly temper as well as for melting tears; for pious work as well as for penitent prayer. It was to us a most sad conjunction of circumstances, time, and place, when, at the very height of the Revival in New York, the American Tract Society openly, indecorously, shamelessly, boastingly, did that most sad and pitiable of all its many sad and pitiable deeds! And yet we trust there was no necessary or natural connection between the thronged and solemn prayer meetings—and the thronged and turbulent Anniversary. We shall see if the Revival, in its maturer results, shall aid in

undoing the grievous wrong which was perpetrated while its early breath was wooing us to righteousness.

May the lessons of the Revival of 1858 be faithfully studied and truly learned, and God's quickening spirit come so freely that all our life shall be a season of Pentecost.

---

#### ART. IV.—GOD NOT SEPARATED FROM HIS WORKS, BUT A HEARER OF PRAYER.

One of the most striking peculiarities of the Hindoo philosophy is the dogma, that the Creator of all things has no direct and immediate control over the universe which he created. At the creation the Great Supreme broke the silence of eternity, and spoke this and the numberless worlds around us into being. He then returned again into his own original state of infinite quietude and absolute unconsciousness, having resigned the actual control and government of the universe into the hands of inferior deities, previously created for this purpose. We can now understand the principle on which an intelligent Hindoo would justify his idolatry. With Christians he acknowledges the being and perfections of one only living and true God. This infinite and eternal being, however, he affirms, is not to us a proper object of religious homage or worship, inasmuch as, in his state of infinite quietude and unconsciousness, he is alike indifferent to our actions, whether right or wrong. The reins of universal empire being committed to other hands, God himself will not reward or punish us for our character or conduct, whatever they may be. We have no occasion, therefore, to propitiate his favor, or deprecate his wrath. From the Author of our being we have nothing to hope or to fear. To him the darkest impiety and the devoutest homage and worship, the purest virtues and the foulest crimes, are objects of the same infinite indifference. The inferior deities, with whom the disor-

dered imagination of the Hindoo has peopled the universe, he devoutly worships, because from these, as actually holding the reins of universal empire, all the good or ill which can be to him an object of hope or fear, is to be derived. What he supposes them to command or prohibit, he performs or avoids, because upon their frowns or favor his destiny is suspended.

Modern philosophy, guided by the same depravity and impurity which gave form and shape to the Hindoo philosophy, has not copied that philosophy in one important particular. It has not taken the reins of empire out of the hands of the Supreme, and committed them to inferior deities. On the other hand, it has peopled the universe, not with finite gods, but with what are called laws, laws of nature. These, according to its teachings, are the present reigning, inexorable deities of the universe. In both systems alike, the infinite and eternal God is wholly separated from any direct concern in and control over his own works. Nature, like the steam engine, has left the workshop of him who made it, and is governed by other agencies—governed by millions of finite gods, says the devout Hindoo—by a corresponding number of laws, says a cold and Godless modern philosopher. In the two systems alike God is, we repeat, completely separated from his own works, and in the one system as completely as in the other. While the Hindoo system completely separates God from his works, it places him, we know just where, and in what state, a state of infinite and absolutely uninfluential quietude and unconsciousness. Modern unbelief produces the same divorcement in all its completeness and perfection, but places the infinite and eternal one, we know not and cannot know where, nor in what state. The Hindoo philosophy, while it separates from our hearts and homage, "the Father of our spirits," furnishes us with objects of worship and prayer, and thus, though in a perverted and degrading form, leaves us, as we were made to be, *religious beings*. Modern philosophy, while it perpetrates upon our hearts the same deed of violence and moral death, leaves us in a state of Godless orphanage, without any objects of worship whatever, and thus renders us what we were made not to be, *irreligious*, and consequently *impious*, beings. Which would be the most pernicious

cious and desolating in its moral tendencies, a system which gives us a false religion, or one which leaves us no religion at all, it would, at first thought, be difficult to determine. The latter, however, will, we think, be found to be, in its ultimate tendencies, the worst, for in no state, actual or conceivable, can man become so cold and heartless in his depravity as when, with nothing to command his supreme regard but blind, unconscious, and inexorable law, he goes forth "without God in the world."

To us it should be a matter of devout adoration and gratitude if inspiration and a higher and more perfect philosophy of nature, have imparted to us better views of the character of God, of the operations of Providence, and of the actual relations of the Creator of all things to the works of his hands. If we have been thus taught, "the darkness which covers the earth, and the gross darkness which covers the people," do not cloud our moral and intellectual vision. In our regard God is not separated from "the things that are made." He is not asleep, nor on a journey somewhere at an infinite remove from us, in the immensity of space. On the other hand, he is ever nigh to us, within and around us, holding "in his hands the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind." The universe around is not a machine gone out from under the immediate inspection and control of its Maker. It is neither under the guidance of inferior deities, nor of blind and soulless laws which are now out of and beyond the control of Him who established and upholds them. The heavens and the earth, in all their movements and revolutions, speak to our hearts in one and the same language, the presence, power, glory, and all presiding agency of God. We hear his voice alike in the music of the spheres, the roar of the thunder and the tempest, in the great harmony of nature when all is calm and still around us, and in the deep bass notes of old ocean as he repeats his everlasting song. We feel his presence alike in the sunshine and in the storm, in the stillness of midnight quietude and amid the shaking of the earthquake. His hand is ever equally visible to us in the motion of the planets, the revolution of empires, and the fall of the sparrow. In every variety of circumstances



we are awed by his presence, attracted by his love, moved by his fear, and impressed with his omnipresent infinitude and perfection. Even when a superabundance encircles us, we rise from our beds in the morning with the devout sentiment upon our hearts, and prayer upon our lips, "Give us this day our daily bread," and when we lie down at night, we pillow our heads upon the omnipresent thought, that God has been our protector, guardian and preserver during the day, and that the angel of his presence alone can keep us safe from the pestilence that walketh in darkness, during our slumbering hours. In the period of sorrow, pain, sickness, suffering and adversity, "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble." Every object and every event present to our minds all impressive motives for adoration, gratitude, submission, love, praise and prayer. Thus taught by the light of inspiration and a true philosophy of nature, we stand at an equal remove from Hindooism on the one hand, and a godless philosophy on the other. We are religious without superstition, and study nature as philosophers, without forgetting or denying the God of nature. We do not forget that nature has her laws, and we do not disregard those laws. We never put those laws, however, in the place of God, or say, in view of them, "It is vain to serve God; and what profit is it that we have kept his ordinances."

Let us now contemplate this doctrine of an overruling providence as contrasted with the dogma of a universe governed by fixed, changeless and inexorable law, a dogma which nullifies prayer, and renders religious worship and ordinances folly and superstition. If law, blind, unconscious and inexorable law is the only agency really working in the universe, and determining the entire current of events within and around us, then undeniably there is no proper place for prayer, confession of sin to God, or for religious ordinances or worship. God is no longer to us an object of fear or of hope. We may think of him as we remember Washington, as one who formerly did very worthy deeds. As objects of *present* hope or fear, as sources of present good or ill, however, we have really and truly no more to do with the one than with the other. This is the philosophy of nature by which it is now sought to displace relig-

ion from the hearts of men. Religion does not stand opposed to this system, it should be borne in mind, as denying the existence of laws in nature. While it admits and affirms their presence, it asserts the doctrine that these laws are in the hands and under the immediate control of God, who continues, changes and modifies them at pleasure, and is so in, around, and over his works, that he is to the mind the great all overshadowing object of hope and fear, and that the orderings of his providence and government of the universe, material and mental, are such that prayer has all the efficacy affirmed of it in the Scriptures. Now in regard to the cold, heartless, godless system of government by naked law, the system which practically dethrones God, and makes religion an absurdity, we have five very concise statements to make, to wit:

1. This dogma is based upon sheer ignorance, and has not a shadow of evidence on which to rest, and is, consequently, contrary to all the real teachings of sound reason and philosophy. One of the first dictates of true wisdom and philosophy is a deep sense and honest acknowledgment of our ignorance and want of knowledge of many of the deep things of God and nature too. When we hear an individual professing a full knowledge of things "within the veil," that is, of the invisible principles and causes which determine the visible facts of nature, when we hear him proudly legislating God himself from the throne of the universe which he has created, and talking of universal laws, as if these were the gods which are now to be to us the sole objects of worship, we mark him at once as a self-inflated fool, "a cloud without water," a proud and arrogant boaster, "who speaks evil of that which he understands not," and professes a perfect knowledge of that of which he knows nothing. Let us ask the advocate of the theory under consideration, on what authority he separates the infinite God from the works of his hands? How does he know that the Father of our spirits is not a hearer of prayer, and does not govern nature, and control her laws in conformity to the wants and prayers of his rational offspring? Has he so completely developed the secret springs of life and existence, that he can safely affirm, that "the soul of every living thing, and the breath

of all mankind," are not now in the hand of God, but under the direction of blind and inexorable laws which God even does not control and never modifies? Has he found out the secret place of the lightning and the thunder, and held converse with these dread agents in their dwelling, till he knows all the secret agencies that control the movements of universal providence? Has he gone off into the depths of infinite space, and found the eternal God asleep or on a journey there, in a state of separation from all direct care of and superintendence over the interests of his own offspring? Does he know that God is not *now* in and over his works, exercising everywhere a particular and special, as well as general, providence, and ever present to the pure in heart, not only as an object of worship, but a hearer of prayer? The dogma under consideration is the offspring of a bastard philosophy, the child of ignorance, arrogance, and impiety, a child begotten in these monstrosities of human pride and depravity by the father of lies.

2. Our second statement is this, that this dogma is an infinite absurdity in itself. Nothing can be more absurd than a philosophy which separates the finite from the infinite, and affirms that the former is able to walk alone without the upholding agency and control of the latter. God, and God alone, wrapped nature originally in her swaddling clothes. He taught her to go, taking her by the arms, as a father teaches his child to walk, and nature has not yet attained to age or strength to stand, much less to walk alone. She must yet lean upon the Infinite when she attempts to move. Was ever a darker absurdity thrown upon the surface of society by the seethings of human depravity, than the idea that God has surrendered the control of his own works to other agencies than his own will, and above all, to that of blind, cold, heartless and inexorable laws, or that he controls those works himself by any laws which are incompatible with his being to his rational offspring as a hearer of prayer, or being known among them "by the judgments which he executeth?"

3. Our third remark is, that this dogma is contradicted by the highest law of nature itself, the immutable demands of uni-

versal mind. External nature exists only for mind. All her laws were established only for this one end. Now the all-overshadowing want and demand of universal mind is, that God should be what this Godless dogma affirms, that he is not a hearer of prayer. If this highest of all nature's laws is not itself a lie, then is the dogma under consideration false, and its opposite, this fundamental doctrine of all religion, and the immutable demand of universal mind, true.

4. Our fourth remark is, that He who has an absolute knowledge of nature, and of the relations of the Author of creation to his own works, has affirmed the dogma under consideration to be false, and its opposite, the great central doctrine of all religion, the doctrine of a general, and particular and special providence, which orders the movements of nature in accordance with the wants of creatures and the prayers of the pure in heart, to be true. He has pronounced a blighting curse upon all who say in their hearts, that "God will not do good, neither will he do evil." He has affirmed absolutely, that the "effectual, fervent prayer of the righteous man availeth much," "that He is *nigh* unto all that call upon him, that call upon him in sincerity and in truth." That is enough for us. — It is a mad and crazy philosophy that would contradict or doubt such testimony.

5. Our fifth and last statement on the subject is this. The dogma under consideration is contradicted, and the opposite doctrine affirmed, by the united experience of the really pure in heart, and fervently prayerful in all ages. They who have observed providence, have ever had providences to observe. They who have truly tested the power of prayer, have never had occasion to doubt its efficacy to the full extent of all that is affirmed of it in the Bible. So it is now. So it ever will be to the end of time; when prayer will be lost in praise, and faith in victory. With a few suggestions of a general character, we close this article.

1. The bearing of the great truth which we have endeavored to elucidate, upon our condition as a people and as a nation at the present time, should not be overlooked in this connection. For many years past, the providences of God have visibly hung

over this nation; filled with vials of mercy and vials of wrath, and the contents of first one and then the other have been poured down in forms and circumstances adapted preëminently to arrest public and individual attention, and impress all with the solemn conviction, that God has not forgotten human affairs, nor ceased, as of old, to interfere in disturbing, directing, and overruling them. The church, long led astray by a false and Godless philosophy of nature, has begun to inquire after "the old paths" in which our fathers "walked with God," and to recognize his presence and control in the movements of providence. As a hearer of prayer, he is appearing in her heart. The results, too, are beginning to be "known and read of all men." The masses, however, have not considered God, but have gone into deeper and deeper forgetfulness of him. Of the nation at large, he may say as He did of ancient Israel:

- 6 "And I also have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities,  
And want of bread in all your places:  
Yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the LORD.
- 7 And also I have withholden the rain from you,  
When *there were* yet three months to the harvest:  
And I caused it to rain upon one city,  
And caused it not to rain upon another city:  
One piece was rained upon,  
And the piece whereupon it rained not withered.
- 8 So two or three cities wandered unto one city, to drink water;  
But they were not satisfied:  
Yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the LORD.
- 9 I have smitten you with blasting and mildew;  
When your gardens and your vineyards  
And your fig trees and your olive trees increased,  
The palmerworm devoured *them*:  
Yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the LORD.
- 10 I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt:  
Your young men have I slain with the sword,  
And have taken away your horses;  
And I have made the stink of your camps to come up unto your  
nostrils:  
Yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the LORD.
- 11 I have overthrown *some* of you,  
As God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah,

And ye were as a firebrand plucked out of the burning ;  
 Yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the LORD.

12 Therefore thus will I do unto thee, O Israel !

And because I will do this unto thee,  
 Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel !

13 For, lo ! He that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind,  
 And declareth unto man what is his thought,  
 That maketh the morning darkness,  
 And treadeth upon the high places of the earth,  
 The LORD, the God of hosts is his name."

Nor has God yet ceased to rebuke individual, social, and national sins in our midst, nor will he cease to shake individuals, communities, and the nation at large, till, as a church and people, "the living shall know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men." While the honor which belongs to God alone is given to his laws he will continue to render his laws so terrible in their results, that the human mind will seek for deliverance from a power above nature.

2. We will next contemplate our duty when subject to special judgments. Our inquiry should be put with the deepest interest, to wit, how far these judgments have been brought upon us by a violation of God's laws physical and moral? A special providence does not exclude government also by general laws. These laws were made to be studied, known, recognized and obeyed. We know what they are. Those of health are temperance, and a proper exercise of the physical and mental powers. Those of competency are industry, frugality and economy. Those of spiritual health and prosperity, are the careful practice of justice, and mercy, and a humble walk with God. The fruitful causes of the opposite states are the various vices opposed to the virtues named. Another question which we should put under these circumstances is this: How far should these providences be regarded as special judgments for sin? When God, by his providences, rebukes men for their sins, they receive no benefits from such visitations, till the facts of the case, as they are, are distinctly recognized and confessed. The transgressor must confess to himself, to the world, as far as the wrong is known, and to God, that he "has walked con-

trary to God," and that "God has walked contrary to him." The judgments must not be attributed to wrong causes, nor must the agency or design of God in them be overlooked. A protective tariff, for example, may or may not be conducive to national prosperity. The existence, or the non-being of such an institution, however, never precipitated "the crisis" upon this nation. The real causes are to be sought wholly in other directions, to wit, individual greediness of gain and extravagance, social vices, and national corruption, injustice, and oppression. We have "walked contrary to God," and he, in righteous retribution, has arrayed his providences in judgment against us. The conviction of these facts must enter the individual and national mind, and God must be sought unto, or he will continue his judgments till they reach a remediless termination.

So when, as individuals, we find ourselves "in heaviness through manifold temptations," when special judgments descend upon us, we should, first of all, seek to know whether these providences are, in fact, chastisements for sin, or needful "trials of faith." This question being resolved, God should be sought unto accordingly. If these "vials" have come by violations of law physical or moral, let us return unto obedience, but always with deep confession, that we "have walked contrary to God," and he has "walked contrary to us."

3. We notice but one other thought, one main cause, as we suppose, of the present moral and spiritual weakness of our churches. It is the alarming prevalence in them of the influence of the crazy, Godless philosophy of which we have been speaking. How seldom are "the elders of the church" now called in to "pray over them," when "any are sick among us?" How seldom is God now sought unto in times of drought or flood, or in times of prevailing sickness or of public calamity? May the period soon return when "the old paths" in which our fathers, in the exercise of unwavering faith in the efficiency of prayer to the full extent of the Divine promises, sought and obtained corresponding deliverances, be inquired after and walked in, by the entire church of God. Then will her peace be as a river, and her righteousness as the waves of the sea.

“Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing psalms. Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him. Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much. Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are, and he prayed earnestly that it might not rain; and it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six months. And he prayed again, and the heavens gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit.”

---

#### ART. V.—GRACE AS A NATURE.

In contemplating human redemption through Christ,—the gracious promises through him to rebels, as well as the specific blessings promised to them in a state of acceptance—the mind not unfrequently experiences a difficulty when it attempts to classify the facts and promises (future facts) so as to give them a category expressive of their relations to nature and miracle. It is asked, for instance, is conversion a miracle? Is it natural or supernatural? This second question may or may not differ from the first, as we shall hereafter see. Again, How can God answer prayer; nature being, as it is assumed, fixed and uniform? With nature under her unchanging laws, how is Providence, general or special, possible? These specifications may serve to indicate the class of difficulties we desire to contemplate.

The experienced Christian *feels* intuitively that there is a fallacy here. He knows, though there are facts that give great plausibility to the assumption that nature is under fixed and uniform laws, there is a fallacy, though to his own mind and others he



fails to give a philosophical answer for the reason of the hope in him. Nor is he always as happy in his answer as was the little girl when offered an orange by the atheist, if she would tell where God is. "I will give you two," said she, "if you will tell me where he is not." Satan, through his numerous agents, loves to take such an occasion by science, falsely so-called, "To lead to bewilder, and dazzle to blind." These difficulties are made to assume the appearance of absolute contradictions. Faith is thus overtaxed.

"But why reason on the subject at all?" some devout persons are wont to say when any attempt is made to assist faith by considerations that appeal to the intellect. "Faith and sight walk not together; if we could perfectly comprehend the whole system of grace and nature, and their relations one to the other, there would be no room left for faith; we should needs walk by sight." It is assumed by some persons of this class, that faith laughs at impossibilities in a sense more than the case will bear. They seem to assume that credulity is the same as faith; that all that is requisite when doubts arise is to believe by sheer force of will; to believe without evidence.

These persons needlessly alarm themselves in regard to the extent of any explanations ever to be made by the human intellect. After that has done its best, the sphere of faith will be wide enough. Besides, we might insist that they do not accurately apprehend the nature and ground of faith. They do not, in words, at least, sufficiently distinguish between faith and credulity. It is, for instance, impossible for the human mind to believe that there can ever be an event without a cause; that duration will cease, and that space will be annihilated. Now it is the work of the adversary to confound things which differ characteristically from such impossibilities with them, and thus overthrow faith. Faith is never required without evidence and faith is never required to believe in contradictions. It must often trust where it cannot explain; it must often trust where it is difficult, if not impossible, to conceive *the mode* in which promises are to come to pass. It is never required, however, to believe a thing which the reason intuitively apprehends as an

absurdity which must always be distinguished from a mystery, or a thing which we apprehend as a fact, though we cannot explain its mode of existence, or its relation to secondary causes.

When an object of faith is made to *appear* for the time a contradiction, an absurdity, an impossibility, it is good for the mind to detect in what that *appearance* (for it can never be more) is to be distinguished from a valid ground of faith. That which is assumed to be an absurdity may be shown to be a mystery only. In this way intellect may help faith. That profound work, Butler's *Analogy*, proceeds upon the ground that faith may be in this sense assisted. If nature, an admitted fact though unexplained, presents characteristics analagous to the objects of faith, then has faith made a gain in all candid minds. The cure for bad books is good ones; the cure for a false philosophy is a true one. Admit that science and philosophy are opposed to revelation, and we give the victory to God's enemies.

To encourage us to the proper exercise of intellect in the sphere of faith, is this fact: Anything that for the time being helps one to a view that makes absurdity give place to mere mystery, is good for an important end, though there may be a thousand better ways, in themselves considered, to relieve the difficulty. Such a view is, nevertheless, we say, a genuine good to the mind that obtains it, and it may to certain other minds prove a like benefit, upon presentation.

With these preliminaries, we may proceed to give a view of the kingdom of *grace*, which once lifted for us the cloud from some points which we have already named. In giving this view, we are not obliged to contend that it is absolutely valid as the *real* explanation. If it is only a possible way, we are content. We are far from supposing even that it is a way serviceable to all minds. What we say is, it is a bridge that once carried us over a gulf in safety, and hope it may be beneficial to those whose wants are similar to what ours were when it served us.

There was a time when nature began. There was a point of time before which no creative act was put forth in the organiza-

tion and arrangement of that system which we term nature. We speak not now of the origin of matter and finite mind, but of their present organization and relations. Of the beginning and progress, as well as completion of nature, in this sense, we have an account in Genesis. The creative fiat was put forth in this sense at a given point of time; the creation of nature was by direct acts; it at length reached completion, and then rested the creative fiat. God rested in this sense from his work. The creative fiat formed no new order of plants or animals after that rest began. Nature, as to its elementary forces, was complete. We speak now more particularly of nature as presented in this earth, for we do not wish to say that God is not now in some part of space creating as of old.

Let us not be understood that God has departed from nature; that he works not in it in any sense, because our view is that creative volitions have ceased. He is yet in nature working; he sustains, superintends, directs, controls and develops those forces which resulted from past creative fiats. In this sense we contemplate what are termed the laws of nature as indicative of past creative volitions which, though not now beginning, are still executive. They may also be contemplated as modes by which the power once creative now works, though not here in nature now creating. The same God is as much present with the same wisdom and power as he was in creating, but still now exercising those attributes in another mode. In nature completed, and not in creating nature. Nature was finished in the sense of creation, but not in the sense of ceasing to be an implement in the hand of the Maker, an implement with which and in which he works to-day. It is as incompetent to the performance of what we call the operations of nature as it was to create itself, that is, if the hand of the Maker be withdrawn from it.

While the above view is true, yet we may say that we know, by observation, *about* how God works now with this implement, and *about* how he will work in time to come. Nor is this a fact only, but as a fact designed of God and pleasing to him. He no doubt loves, so to say, to have us learn his general modes of operating in nature. He would not perhaps, have us expect

creative acts in nature to-day. He would regard it in us a presumptuous sin to expect, for instance, that the wheat in our granary will increase thirty or forty-fold, if we leave it there and commit it not to the bosom of the faithful earth. All that we learn as to the laws of agriculture, science, commerce or society and government may be properly termed as so much knowledge as to the way God acts in these respects. This knowledge cannot exist without the assumption of general uniformity of these modes of the operation of Divine power.

It is this general uniformity upon which must rest our knowledge of nature, and which is the ground of progress in civilization; it is this uniformity of nature, we say, which is made the basis of the objections to prayer and providence. It comes up in this form: Nature is uniform; we can trust the operations of nature; prayer cannot change nature's laws; providence cannot modify them. Prayer and Providence are therefore a contradiction of God's work in nature; they are absurd; they are impossible! May as well believe in events without a cause as to believe God will contradict himself. The real ground of this objection is not unfrequently this: God completed nature and has left it to itself. He does not act in it any longer. But we put the difficulties on the best grounds—those more likely to try our faith. But our view, we trust, will meet the objections founded on both these false premises, on these assumptions.

Take, now, afresh into the mind, the view of nature in the beginning of creation, its progress, and completion. Let us then strive to transfer that view to another sphere, to that of redemption, the kingdom of grace as exhibited in this world from man's first transgression to the present time. We may contemplate it as a work which, in this world's development of it, had a beginning, had its progress, and had its completion in the sense in which we speak of the completion of nature. It is a completion in the sense that the elementary forces are brought into being and placed in organic relations to each other. In this sense, contemplating grace as an objective system of moral forces, we call it a new nature, a nature that began, progressed, and reached its completion. In regard to the new nature, we

may say the creative fiat have ceased. In this, God has rested from his works. Here he is present as in the old; here he sustains, develops, controls and directs, by his real presence, as in nature: but in neither now by direct, creative acts.

The out-stepping of God in Nature, in direct originating fiat, we call an act of creation. The similar out-stepping of God in the kingdom of Grace, we call a miracle. When God said, "Let there be light and there was light," he created, in the sense we speak of creating, in this article: When he said "Let water become wine, and it was so," he wrought a miracle. When "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," he wrought a work of creation. When he said "Lazarus come forth, and he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot, with grave clothes," God wrought a miracle in the kingdom of grace.

Let us next contemplate this act of God in the direct out-stepping of his power, which we term a miracle, long enough to mark one or two of its characteristics and important relations. It is a direct act of the Divine will as distinguished from the act of any created will, be it that of man, angel or satan; of finite spirit in body or out of body; of created beings, good or bad. A miracle, specifically so called, is a direct act of the Divine will as distinguished from the act of any other being. Here, too, distinguish cause from mode and instrumentalities, or the thought may be missed.

A miracle must also be, as before intimated, distinguished by the direct, present action of the Divine will. For instance, God wills through nature to make wine every year in many countries. It may even be said that in this way he wills to change water to wine every time a grape comes to maturity. But this act of the Divine will, is readily seen to differ from the miracle of Cana. This, perhaps, is too obvious to need further remark.

A miracle is to be distinguished by the relation that the human intellect as by necessity, gives it with reference to nature, or if you please, God's acts in nature. A miracle must have such characteristics as to compel every candid human intellect to refer it to a cause above nature; to a cause en-

tirely independent of nature. As much as this has before been said, but we deem it well to state it again in this form. Every human intellect is compelled to refer every event to an adequate cause. In that sense every human intellect that admits the resurrection of Lazarus, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, as those events are described in the Bible, is in like manner compelled to refer these phenomena to a cause above nature. To refer these and other miracles to a cause above nature is not incidental; it is essential; without it there is no miracle in the full sense. It would not be a miracle in the full sense, that is, when you contemplate the end to be subserved by a miracle, if some human intellect is not as a matter of fact placed in such relations to it as actually to refer it to God as a power above nature. The direct act of the Divine will in producing an event, is not a miracle unless some human intellect, sooner or later, does as a matter of fact, so refer it. It is not possible for a miracle in the full sense to be ambiguous as to its cause. Perhaps we dwell too long on this point, but let it not be forgotten.

It is essential, furthermore, to every miracle, that in one way or another, either directly or indirectly, it point to Jesus as the Christ and the only Saviour of sinners. In the origin of nature, there were six days or stages of the creative energy. They all belong to the kingdom of nature. In the establishment of the kingdom of grace, however various and widely separated in time and character miracles may be, they are one in the sense of belonging to that kingdom, and pledging to Jesus Christ all the resources of God as the cause above nature, to accomplish the ends of redemption. If God changed the face of nature in the time of Adam, to rebuke his sin, the same power is pledged to bring to pass the promise of the One born of woman, by whom satan is to be deprived of power and man restored to a second paradise. If God revealed by miracle to Noah the destruction of the earth by the flood, and by miracle conducted Noah safely over the waters, it was to pledge the wisdom and power thus indicated as above nature, to be efficient evermore for the salvation and blessing of redeemed sinners, in the kingdom of his dear son. If God, by miracle, called Abraham to

leave the Ur of the Chaldees; if by miracle he gave him a son of promise; and if by miracle he preserved that son from the knife of sacrifice on Moriah; if by miracle God revealed that the posterity of Isaac, the one snatched by the Divine hand from death, should a thousand years thereafter drive out the Jebusite, and build thereon the temple, whose model was revealed by God to Moses in a mount quaking by miraculous power—it was all to condense into one “Jehovah-jireh” for our salvation, the pledge of the mind that thus foresaw, and the hand that ordered the wonderful events by which, in after centuries, we behold the Lamb of God on Calvary. If Adam be driven out of paradise; if Enoch and Elijah ascend to heaven without seeing death, and Christ after death, that each great dispensation may have one representative in heaven; if Noah sail over the waters of the flood in an ark; if Abraham have a great horror of darkness come upon him amidst whose shades he sees “a smoking furnace and a burning lamp”—emblem of the Divine presence—pass between the pieces of the animals slain to confirm a covenant; if Lot escape from the doomed city by the help of angels; if Joseph interpret Pharaoh’s dream by the interposition of God; if Moses behold the burning bush that is not consumed; if the miracles wrought for the deliverance of Israel’s children cause the Egyptian magicians to cry out, “This is the finger of God;” if the waters of the Jordan open to let the redeemed pass through on dry land; if the sun and the moon pause in their course to aid the armies of Israel in routing the Jebusites; if to encourage the temple builders it be Divinely revealed, “The Lord shall suddenly come to his temple;” if Moses, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Paul, and John unroll for us the scroll of the future, that we may read centuries before hand the fate of empires and churches; if Daniel pray unharmed in a den of untamed lions; if the three worthies walk through the flame, without the smell of fire on their garments; if Christ command the winds and the waves and they obey him; if he direct the fishes in the sea, and the wild beasts crouch harmless at his feet, as he fasts in the desert, he command food from heaven for the starving Israelite in the desert, and break miraculous bread to the perishing multitude on the shore of Genessareth; if with a word he dry up

the fountains of vegetable life; if demons, disease, and death depart at his bidding; if by prayer in his name illiterate fishermen are able to speak more than a dozen languages with vernacular accuracy, all without a moment's study—the greatest of all conceivable miracles; if in his name, Peter and Paul raise the dead;—if all these, and thousands of others of the miraculous out-steppings of the Divine power and wisdom have taken place, to show us a power and wisdom above nature, it is all for the purpose still further of pledging that power and that wisdom, by a cloud of witnesses, overwhelming to contemplate, that Christ is the Redeemer of those who believe in him; that for them he can provide, despite “nature's fixed laws,” and his hand reaches forth the blessings his friends ask, despite all the decrees of fate. Truly, “*If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater; for this is the witness of God which He hath testified of his Son.*”

Thus, what the creative fiat is to nature, the miracle is to grace. The same Power that originated nature still operates in it, though in a new mode; the same Being whose wisdom and power are indicated by miracle, is still operating with those attributes in grace, though miracles have ceased. If for a moment we regard nature the product of one Deity who is still in it with all the efficiency required to create it, and the author of miracle as another Deity, who is still operating in grace, with all the power and wisdom indicated by miracle, it then follows that the latter Deity is greater and wiser than the former. This follows from the fact that miracle indicates a cause above nature. Then as we have the promises of this stronger and wiser Deity in relation to prayer and providence, we have a good ground for faith.

This ground of faith remains unshaken, though we do not now behold miracles, for on the part of nature we do not see any creative fiat. We see no new order introduced into animate or inanimate things in nature. If nature goes forward with uniformity, so does grace, and the latter being the product of the stronger and wiser Deity will in the end as a nature, conquer the old nature. The moment the old nature conflicts with the interests of the new, we have good reason to believe the latter,



as it were insensibly, modifies the former. If at any time this modification be not sufficient for the interests and ends of grace, the Deity in grace, we have reason to believe, will again step forth in miracle. Prayer and providence are therefore not merely desirable, but objects of faith. They are not contradictions, absurdities. They are founded in a nature whose operations are as uniform as the other, and proven to be by its origin superior and independent. If there is any war between grace and nature, the latter in the end *must* succumb, whatever the *appearances* to the contrary. The Lord of miracle, "He is our God." If the sun rise and set uniformly, if the seasons come and go in regular succession; if the rain fall upon the just and unjust by the "fixed laws of nature," we have consolation in a uniformity quite as "fixed." Men, the best of men, continue to pray and receive answer to prayer; souls still pass from nature's darkness to God's marvellous light; the nations, influenced by the miracles of the Bible, are the only ones that in any good degree subject nature to their good, and other nations to their will. "Little by little" it is said to those who trust the Deity of miracle, "ye shall drive them out." No fact in nature is more fixed than is the destiny of all who trust in nature-religion, to yield to those who trust to miracle. Our argument here we can only hint for want of space.

Come, now, to the fact that nature and grace are from the same God. By miracle, God has shown he is still above nature and can at pleasure wield or suspend all its forces. By miracle he has shown that the ends of grace must always be promoted by the operations of nature, or he will at once suspend those operations. If God does not come out to view in miracle now, neither does he in creative fiat. Whenever there has been an out-stepping of God's power since man came upon the earth, it has been for the sake of the kingdom of grace. Not till nature was finished did grace begin. Did He begin grace without knowing nature? Did He make promises that his own works by a headlong career will defeat? Has God in nature called up a spirit that will not down at his bidding?

Creative fiats are the foundations of nature; miracles, which are above nature, are the foundations of grace. The Creator's power and wisdom are in nature; the God of miracle, which is

above nature, is in grace. Creative fiat ceased in one; so, at length, miracles in the other. When the earth was complete for man's abode, God, in nature, made man, and ceased from his works. When the second Adam was introduced to the heavenly paradise, miracles culminated and soon ceased. If creative power now acts as a nature, the miraculous power, the power above nature, has not dropped into annihilation, but goes on in grace, as a new and higher nature.

Is conversion a miracle? No. Is conversion of nature? No. What then? It is a change wrought in the soul by the power of God, as that power was manifested in miracle, God's power as manifested above nature; but it is the effect of that power, not in the *form* of miracle, but in the form of a nature, if we use nature to indicate antecedent and consequent, and their relation in the system of redemption. How was Elijah translated to heaven? By God, as working in nature? No. By God as a cause above nature? Yes. Was it a miracle? In every sense a miracle. But is conversion of God as a cause, above nature, as truly as was the translation of Elijah? Certainly. Yet one a miracle, and the other not? Yes, one a miracle and the other not. What! both supernatural, the one as purely so as the other, and yet one a miracle, and the other not? Just so. Is not this a distinction without a difference? By no means.

To make this distinction clear, suppose that from the time of Elijah to the present, every saint, at the precise age of Elijah at his translation, instead of dying like the impenitent, had been taken up visibly to heaven, as Elijah was. The miracle-working power would then have put on the form of a nature. It would not then impress us as a miracle does, though it would still remain as supernatural as ever. We would, then, about as soon ask the question, Is translation natural? as we do now, Is conversion natural? Suppose, during the whole progress of human history, there had been only three men, of what we now call distinguished piety, and they separated in time from one another, like Enoch, Elijah, and Christ; piety would then impress a heathen world very much as translation now does us. This holds good and illustrates our meaning, though physical changes more impress us than mental changes.

Now grant, on the supposition above, that every one, where the system of revelation is known, could imitate, or rather acquire the character of Elijah, it follows that every such one would know how to become the subject of God's translating power. He would know how to become the subject of God's power in miracle as *above* nature, as the experienced farmer now knows how to apply God's power *in* nature to the raising of grain. So conversion is of God as a cause above nature, and yet by his revelation we know how to become the subjects of that supernatural power, with a certainty far transcending that with which the experienced farmer approaches God in nature for grain. The latter knowledge comes by experience and observation of God's power in nature; the former God has condescended to reveal to us. The conditions in the case of nature are innumerable and always changing with season and clime, but not so of God as above nature, for human redemption. "He that hath the Son hath life; he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life." "This life is in his Son," of whom he has given such testimony by miracles. "The witness of God is greater."

Thus, in conversion we become the subjects of God's power, as it comes out in miracle. All the miracles of the past are pledged for the salvation, guidance, and blessing of the saints by the same God, in the exercise of his wisdom and power as a God above nature. All the promises of the future are as certain to come to the saint, as it is certain that he who wrought miracles has given the pledge. As nature is no limit to the God of miracles, so there is no limit to the saint's prayer unless it be the weakness of his own faith, or the limits which God in his own word hath set. When he has the word of the God of miracle for a blessing to be asked, if need be, the sun and moon must pause in their course, to crown his prayer with victory. And yet now we expect no miracles, because, according to our view, grace is a finished nature, entirely superior to the old,—a nature whose vital power is God in the exercise of his attributes as a *manifested cause* above nature, for the redemption of man.

The Christian's hope is not to be kept waiting for the prom-

ised blessing till God has time to conquer nature as an adverse power, as some would represent. The God in nature is the God in grace, and grace is the high end which nature must serve even now. It is the best blessing which infinite Wisdom can now bestow when the highest eternal well-being of the saint is contemplated. Though the saint has other things in his inheritance, yet is not nature excluded therefrom. Even that with all its ills must serve him from the moment he becomes the subject of the kingdom of grace which as a nature modifies and controls the former to its own ends. Are you indeed Christians? Then by the most rigid logic, we say to you that in the most literal sense, so far as your highest good is concerned, "All things are yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ God's."

The stand-point we have now gained gives peculiar significance to the following inspired language as expressive of conversion, prayer and providence: "Unto them which are called both Jews and Greeks, Christ the *power* of God and the *wisdom* of God; because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men. For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world, to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world, to confound the things that are mighty; and the base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and the things which are not, to bring to nought the things that are; that no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." In Christ thus is God pledged as above nature and in nature subject to grace, to meet all the wants of the saint from conversion to the resurrection.

Another illustration from the Bible,—the very one which gave us the view which it is the chief object of this article to present. We refer to the case of the miracle of the Savior de-

nominated the "Withered fig-tree." As the Savior with the apostles was on his way early the Monday morning before his crucifixion, from Bethany to Jerusalem, he came to the fig-tree bearing leaves only. The Savior then said to it, "No man eat fruit of thee forever." The company returned too late to Bethany that evening for the apostles to notice the fate of the tree. On Tuesday morning, the next morning, however, as they were going in the same direction, they came to the tree and, behold, it was dried up from the roots. The apostles, though familiar with the sight of miracles, were amazed that the Savior had thus at length wrought one indicative of severity and judgment. Peter called the Savior's attention expressly to the withered tree. "Behold the fig-tree which thou cursedst is withered away." It was an important occasion. The mind of the hearers was then very impressible. He was about to speak whose word had withered the tree upon which they were looking with amazement. His lips move and pronounce words, and what words! "Have faith in God, for verily *I say* (and my word has power) unto you that whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed and be thou cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have whatsoever he saith. Therefore, I say unto you, What things soever ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive and ye shall have them."

In the presence of a miracle as before characterized, the sentence, "Have faith in God," has great significance. Here is the effect of a power above nature. The faith is to expect the exercise of that very power. This power is not to be called forth by the Savior and the apostles alone, for it is said "whosoever shall say unto this mountain," &c., shall call it forth, provided he have the faith to which he is here exhorted.

To the apostles this power in its miraculous form was actually confided. By it they were enabled to remove every obstacle in the way of their success. Annanias, Simon Magus, and Elymas were witnesses of this power. But there is no need of specification here. By the help of this power the cause of Christ made great progress in their hands.

Next, this principle is generalized in this way. Not only is it of great power in defeating opposition, but also in securing positive blessings. Anything asked in prayer as promised by the Being who thus displayed his authority and power over nature can be had. Our point is that the same power is pledged to every Christian as much as it was to the apostles, so far as its efficiency is requisite to the answer of genuine prayer; and yet, that power, though thus efficient for the end, operates now in the form of a nature instead of coming out in the form of miracle, and as a nature it moves in its own orbit, old nature nothing hindering but in a subordinated capacity cooperating with it.

The way is now open to notice for a little the relation of the Holy Spirit to the subject under consideration. In Christ dwelt all the fulness of God. Miracles for him were as ordinary acts to us, as John hints by the very word by which he indicates miracles. So to express the thought, it was natural to the Savior to work miracles. He said in reference to his anticipated departure from this world, he would send the Holy Spirit as his vicar; that Spirit should be to this world and his redeemed ones as he himself in person. The Spirit's mission as to time should, however, be entirely different from the Savior's. His mission was only for an hour, but the Spirit's for all time. The Spirit is to take the things of Christ and show them unto us.

The Spirit in all the miracles of Christ (and it was so of others) was distinctly recognized as the efficient power. This power "abides" here. It does not go away to come again like Christ. He, the Spirit, remains as the power as well as the instructor. He comes to beget prayer and he has the power to answer it. He is the power above nature in miracle, prayer and providence; but his very characteristic is that he remains though miracles cease. It is thus that Christ says at one time all things shall be granted in answer to prayer, and, at another, he says the Spirit shall be given, as much as to say the gift of the Spirit is potentially the gift of all good things, to be employed in just the way and time they will accomplish the highest good for those who "Have faith in God."

In closing the general part of this article we have only to observe, that we are not tenacious of our words, "Grace as a Nature;" no doubt better terms could be chosen; still we trust we have so presented our view as to mislead none by that ambiguous term, nature. We trust, furthermore, that the view presented may relieve some of doubts and perplexities, and that it may strengthen the faith of those whose doubts it does not come within the scope of this article to consider.

If the view here presented be substantially true, prayer is talent committed to us for which we may well hesitate to give up our account. We have received much more than the single talent, if our relations to Divine power are as we have suggested. Yet of this gift, more than of any other, perhaps, it may be said, we have hid it in a napkin in the soil of doubt and infidelity. Judas had the power in its miraculous form; the form in which it is granted to us is not less efficient for "the furtherance of the gospel." If we betray such a trust, it had been good for us if we had never been born.

In answer to prayer, and in providence, we have just as much right to expect supernatural effects as if we lived in the days of miracles. But we have no right to be expecting miracles, we have no right to be straining after very striking effects as in answer to prayer, any more than the farmer who sows in the morning has a right to expect to reap from that sowing, the same day. If grace is now in the form of a nature, we need not blame ourselves for not producing miracles. Nature advances not *per saltem*. But let us not forget that it advances.

A right view of faith leads us to expect our labors are just as surely to be blessed by the Holy Spirit as were the labors of the apostles. God is as surely to protect us as he did Peter, when an angel came and opened the prison doors and city gates for him; we can just as certainly wither fig-trees and remove mountains as they; "all things" are as possible to us as to apostles, and will be to all Christians to the end of the dispensation; answer to prayer is not less real, nor less certain, nor less supernatural than in the days of the apostles; Providence is not less certain, nor less supernatural, than when Paul had

the safety of those in the ship revealed to him by the literal presence of an angel. As to them, so to us, it is according to our faith. Rain from heaven and health to the sick in just as large a share in answer to prayer are given us now as then. Not every leper was cleansed in the days of miracles; but every one within the promise. So, now, faith precedes prayer, faith is founded upon a word to us and for us from the God of miracle.

Where is that word to be found? In the true interpretation of the Bible. Everything there really intended by the Spirit is yea and amen in Christ Jesus. There is no failure within the range of the promises to the man of genuine faith and prayer. We are just as much to look for conversions as were miracle working apostles; we are just as certainly under general and special providence as Paul or Peter, or we have ourselves to blame for either impenitence or backsliding. If we belong to the kingdom of grace and are walking obediently, there can no more an evil come upon us in relation to our ultimate welfare than God can be dethroned. The Lord is a strong tower. The way of the just is in absolute safety. "Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and *all things shall* be added unto you."

Lord, we believe, but help our unbelief. Lord increase our faith. Lord, we pray, but teach thou us to pray. We talk about providence, but let us walk in the way thou hast provided—the highway cast up for the ransomed of the Lord. Thou hast here taught us why there were giants in days of old, even men great before God prevailing with thee and with men. Shall we with lips talk about God as power above nature, and then consign ourselves to the fatalism of "Fixed Nature!"



**ART. VI.—THE RELATIONS OF THE HUMAN INTELLECT AND THE INSPIRED WORD.**

When Paul affirms of the Gentiles that these having not the law are a law unto themselves, he recognizes two distinct principles or rules of action. One is the law of revelation as contained in the Scriptures; the other is the law of reason as found in the conscience and intellect of man. One is what holy men, speaking and writing as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, have recorded for our instruction and sanctification in the Old and New Testaments. The other is what the human mind, unenlightened by special Divine teaching, and unaided by the Scriptures, is capable of discovering upon moral and religious subjects.

Here are two sources of knowledge, in a good degree distinct, and independent; and if they are not the only, they are the chief, media by which truth is conveyed to the soul.

Although the two laws, that of natural reason (for we find no better term to designate it) and that of special, written revelation, are in some measure distinct, they are not contradictory. One is the counterpart of the other. They are two powerful reflectors, having a common focus, and that focus is one of intense light and heat. True, their two faces may be turned in opposite directions; then wild and unconcentrated light will be irradiated; but this is their unnatural position. They were made to stand face to face; each to strengthen and intensify the other.

As to how far, precisely, the knowledge of mankind has been derived, respectively, from these two laws or sources of information, it is perhaps impossible to decide; for the light from both has been so interblended, that we cannot thoroughly separate and analyze it. We are certain that man, without the aid of the Bible, from the light of his own moral and intellectual nature, is capable of knowing much concerning his Creator, himself, his duty, and his destiny. How far he might have progressed in this knowledge but for the fall and subsequent sinfulness of the race, we do not know. And should he still use

his best endeavors, it is impossible to decide how far, without the Scriptures, he might yet advance in the apprehension of moral and religious truth. On this point there exists the widest range of opinion; some maintaining that nearly every truth of the Bible lies within the reach of natural reason, and were not our faculties blinded by selfishness, and misdirected, would be unerringly discovered; others, holding that the human soul must necessarily remain, on moral subjects, in blank darkness, except as the rays of the Bible are shed upon it. They even suppose that the very limited and imperfect knowledge of God and duty which exists in the heathen world has been handed down by tradition from those who once enjoyed direct teachings from heaven.

This difference of opinion, unimportant though at first view it may appear, has laid the foundations of two powerful, and, in many respects, opposing systems of theology. For convenience, they may be styled the Rationalistic and the Biblical.

The first, or rationalistic school, whose source is in Germany, but whose streams flow throughout Christendom, delights to worship at the shrine of Reason. It practically deifies the human intellect, and expatiates eloquently upon the God-like faculties and boundless resources of the soul. In obtaining religious knowledge, man's exalted nature, his intuitive perceptions, his innate sense of fitness, his experience of the past, his observation and reflection, and his purely scientific discoveries constitute his main dependence. Having by this *a priori* process determined what system of doctrines and duties ought to be adopted, he then turns to the Bible, not so much to learn what it teaches as to obtain evidence in support of its own preformed conclusions. Those passages which seem naturally to harmonize are seized upon with avidity, and held up in triumph. Others that are less tractable, or perhaps, in stern conflict, are put to the metaphysical and philological rack and tortured until from very agony they renounce their natural meaning and endorse the favorite doctrine. Thus, to change the comparison, the Bible is turned into a musical instrument, and made to play any tune which fancy or theory may demand.

Nor is this all. The spirit of self-sufficiency and pride that such a system generates and fosters, will not long be satisfied with giving the Bible a secondary position; in the end it will cast it out altogether. Those doctrines which at first were professedly based on the Bible, will soon be advocated independently of it, and those forced interpretations which were once resorted to will be abandoned, and the Scriptures themselves, in part, at least, be repudiated. The giant intellect of the nineteenth century, will have outgrown the antiquated and puerile teachings of Moses and Paul, and even of Jesus Christ! Thus the soul's sheet-anchor is thrown away, and she is left to drift at the mercy of storms, rocks, and sand-bars, on the shoreless sea of fortuitous speculation. This is no fancy sketch, as the history of modern transcendentalism in Europe and America too painfully testify.

The second, or Biblical school in theology, as it claims to be, is the converse of the rationalistic, and is scarcely nearer the truth. Its peculiarity is, that it ignores reason that it may exalt revelation. It would utterly extinguish the light of nature in order to convince men how much they need that of the scriptures. It would put out the eyes of one of our guides that we may become the more sensible of our dependence on the other. According to this school, reason, in the sphere of morals and religion, is comparatively worthless. It reveals nothing reliable in respect to the existence, character and government of God; nothing concerning the duty and destiny of man. Reason is not to be trusted; and men are warned against following its counsels as if, like satan, it were an enemy, and had no mission but to deceive. We must not only go to the Bible alone for an understanding of truth and duty, but we must go to it with no fixed principles, with no standard of judgment, with no established faith whatever. The mind, a mere *tabula vasa*, must receive from the Bible whatever impression its words are adapted to produce. Says one of the greatest lights of the present century, and strongest advocates of this theory,—Dr. Chalmers,—“In studying your Bible it is a question of pure criticism, your grammar and your dictionary is all you need. You are to interpret the Bible just as if you

knew nothing before." Thus all reliance upon the light of nature, upon the intuitions of reason, and upon the teachings of great and good men of our own and other ages, is to be rejected; and we must come to the Bible with our grammar and dictionary as if, up to that moment, we knew absolutely nothing. Men of this school are fond of writing works on the Divine authority of the Scriptures, and they usually employ at least half their space in attempting to remove the rubbish, *i. e.*, in disproving the validity of human reason, in crying down the light of nature, and showing that mankind must necessarily have remained in total darkness on all religious subjects to the end of time, had not a direct revelation from God come to their relief. They think in this way to exalt the Bible.

Now while this theory contains much of truth, it is truth, mingled with vitiating error. It mistakes fundamentally the general plan upon which the Bible was written, and seemingly the object for which it was written. It assumes what the Bible denies, namely, that man, without the Scriptures, is utterly and necessarily ignorant of God and duty. The whole structure of the Bible is a practical rejection of this dogma; for it everywhere takes for granted the general existence of such knowledge among men. Those who have not the written law are a law unto themselves. In respect to most of the fundamental principles of natural and revealed religion, the Scriptures seldom if ever attempt by argument to prove, or even by statement to assert, their truth; they assume that these are understood and admitted, and then proceed to reason from them as from a common standard.

The theory in question, then, while it was intended to honor revelation, is a reproach to it. Not only does it assume to be wiser than God, but it strikes down the only agency by which the Bible can be interpreted, and a consistent system of theological science evolved from it. All science pre-supposes the knowledge and admission of certain fundamental principles; and consists in bringing the facts, and deductions from those principles, into their just and harmonious relations. Unless the principles themselves are understood, science is impossible.

Now the fundamental principles of theological science are precisely those which the Bible does not assert, but assumes as already known and admitted; such, for example, as the existence of God, the distinction between right and wrong, and human accountability. If, then, we must come to the Bible assuming that we know nothing, that we have no common standard of judgment and appeal, how is it possible to understand the Scriptures, and much more, to reduce theology to a science? It cannot be done; and is never, by a person who knows what science is, attempted. Every theologian who merits the name, whatever his theory may be, has in his own mind certain fundamental principles which he does not attempt to prove, but which he never calls in question; and these principles constitute the substratum of his system. And the system itself will approach perfection in proportion as its author, if he be competent to reason logically, assumes the very principles which are assumed rather than asserted in the Word of God. He may not come to the Bible professing that he knows nothing, and yet hope to become a reliable theologian. Such a person is much more likely to plunge into the wildest fanaticism, or contract into the narrowest bigotry, than to obtain the truth. Should the history of fanaticism and bigotry ever be written, we should find much of it to have had its origin in the theory that the light of nature and of reason is not to be trusted; and that the Scriptures are to be expounded, not in the light of those great principles which underlie the Scriptures themselves, but in view, simply, of their grammatical construction.

Thus we see that the two laws referred to in the text, the Rationalistic and the Biblical, are liable to perversion; and it shall be the further endeavor of this article to separate the truth that is in them from the errors with which they have been encumbered. This can best be accomplished by prosecuting the inquiry, what, respectively, is the province of each of these laws with reference to the other.

And, first, what is the province of the *human intellect* with reference to the *sacred Scriptures*? It is, as we shall see, a province of vast extent and responsibility.

Beginning at the foundation, it is the province of reason to

decide as to whether or not the Bible is, indeed, a revelation from God. The world is full of religions, and every religion has its sacred books which claim to have come directly from heaven, and to contain the only true system of faith and practice. These books, *e. g.*, the Hindoo Shaster, the Mahometan Koran, and the Christian Bible, in their essential doctrines are opposed one to the other. Now by what authority do we admit the claim of one and reject that of the others. We answer, if our admission be anything other than blind credulity and superstition, it is solely on the authority of reason. We find these books all printed with the same type, all using the same words. There is no audible voice from heaven, or any other outward sign to convince us that one is inspired any more than the other. What then must we do to decide? Plainly we must cast them all into the alembic of reason and thus test their merits. We must try their doctrines whether they be conformable to natural justice; we must examine their miracles whether they be not spurious; we must study their prophecies whether they be not forgeries. We must acquaint ourselves with their histories, in short with the whole circle of internal and external evidence on which they rest for support. In this regard, supposing we are equally ignorant of each, we must treat the Koran and the Bible alike. Doubtless the result will be that we shall reject the Koran, and embrace the Bible as an inspired book; but in each case it is reason that decides. The Bible bears the test which it is the province of the intellect to impose upon it, therefore it is accepted; but if it could not (thanks be to God it can) bear the investigation, it ought to be and would be rejected.

But not only does reason, as we have seen, decide upon the authority and Divine inspiration of the Scriptures, but it goes further, and erects its own standards of judgment. There can be no *judgment* where there is not *comparison*; and there can be no *comparison* where there is no *standard*, or test with which to compare. What is the standard by which reason is to judge of the Bible? Can revelation itself prescribe the tests by which the question of its own truth should be settled? Grant this, and any book can prove itself Divine, any criminal can

prove himself innocent. The Bible, until proved true, has no authority, and nothing to say or do but submit patiently to the investigation. It is the prerogative of reason to prescribe her own standards, and to apply her own tests. And the standards it is to set up, are those moral convictions written by the finger of God on the heart, and which make man a law to himself. We refer to such convictions as those of right, and justice, and honor, which are deep laid in the foundations of our moral nature. A religion that subverts these we must reject, be its evidences what they may. A religion, for example, which commands us to hate and injure society, reason must instantly discard, without even waiting to examine its proof. Mr. Locke, in his essay on the understanding, has well remarked that, "no proposition can be received for Divine revelation, or obtain the assent due to all such, if it be contrary to our clear intuitive knowledge. Because this would be to subvert the principles and foundation of all knowledge, evidence and assent whatever, and deliver the soul into the domain of fanaticism." Such a proposition or professed revelation may, indeed, conflict with our opinions and theories; it may contain doctrines which lie above and beyond our limited comprehensions, and yet be Divinely inspired. All this we should expect to find in a revelation from heaven; for we find it everywhere in the works and providences of God. But a system of religion that offers itself to our faith must not contradict our reason; for this is man's ultimate and final test of truth. If he cannot trust here he can believe nothing.

But the province of reason does not stop here. Having accepted the Scriptures as a revelation from God, it is still her mission to become their expounder. The Bible, like all other books, must be interpreted; and it has some difficulties of exposition peculiar to itself. These arise from its great antiquity and the consequent obscurity of its allusions; from its strong, bold, and figurative style; from its fragmentary and miscellaneous rather than connected and scientific arrangement; and from the deeply spiritual and infinitely profound nature of the themes which it treats. Now such a book of all others must be interpreted; and reason must give us the rules of ex-

position. Reason must compare Scripture with Scripture, and doctrine with doctrine, or in many cases the truth will not be found. Many truths, and the most essential ones in the Bible, are indeed so plain that a child can understand them; but it must be a child that is capable of thinking and reasoning that can do it. Other of its teachings are hard to comprehend, and the most vigorous thinkers and earnest believers cannot agree as to the meaning. Now suppose we discard all rules or laws of interpretation, and all reasoning upon the meaning of the Scriptures, and set down with only our grammar and dictionary to find out the signification of the words, and to give to every passage its exact and literal rendering, what will be the result? There are no depths of extravagance into which such a reader will not be plunged. The Bible, to him, will be a source of as much darkness as light. This does not imply that the Bible is an obscure book, or that none but priests and popes can understand it; but it does imply that he who reads it to profit must use his reason, his common sense, that faculty with which every rational being is endowed, and endowed that it may be exercised, and as much in religion and in the study of the Scriptures, as in anything else. God's revelation was not intended to supersede the necessity of thought, but to arouse and invigorate it. His language to man is, "Come, now let us reason together," "search the Scriptures," "prove all things, hold fast that which is good," "Buy the truth and sell it not." To obey these injunctions we must employ our reason in the exposition of particular texts, and in the development of given doctrines.

But the province of reason is yet broader. It is the part of reason not only to explain particular passages and develop isolated doctrines, but to unfold from the Scriptures a complete system of theological science. The Bible is not a scientific treatise, yet it involves the elements of perfect science. It is not technically a book of philosophy; yet it assumes and is founded upon a perfect system of psychology and ethics. But the science and philosophy of the Scriptures must be elaborated by reason. It is its province to take the materials there provided and construct them into a system, into a science; discovering the great central truth of the Bible, and arranging



every subordinate doctrine around that centre in its harmonious and natural relations. This is a task requiring intense study and great power of logical analysis. It is reason's noblest work.

And in performing this work, the human intellect must be on its guard at two points. It must avoid the frequent and fatal mistake of deriving its materials, not from the Bible, but from its own independent reasonings. And, secondly, it must see to it that the system it constructs, is not in conflict with well established facts and principles in what is termed nature. Progress in the physical sciences, *e. g.*, in geology and astronomy, must lead to certain modifications in Biblical interpretation. Let those modifications be made, and fear not that religion will suffer. We can scarcely do the Bible a greater injury or dishonor than when, to protect certain commonly received interpretations, we deny and reject the facts of natural science. Such a course arms the enemy, and weakens our own fortress. Religion and science, rightly understood, are one and harmonious. They are not opposing citadels, frowning defiance upon each other, and their troops brandishing their armor in hostile attitude. They have too many common foes, in ignorance and prejudice, in passion and vice, to admit of their lawfully wasting their strength in a useless warfare upon each other. Science has a foundation, and so has religion. Let them unite their foundations, and the basis will be broader; and they will be two compartments of one great fabric reared to the glory of God. Let the one be the outer, and the other the inner, court. In the one let us look, and admire, and adore; in the other let those who have faith kneel and praise and pray. Let the one be the sanctuary where human learning may present its richest incense as an offering to God; and the other the holiest of all, separated from it by a veil now rent in twain, and in which, on a blood-sprinkled mercy-seat, we pour out the love of a reconciled heart, and hear the oracles of the living God. To secure this harmony and union is the province of reason.

And the human intellect, with respect to the Bible, must do one thing more. It must take the principles which the Scriptures contain, and faithfully apply them to such practical and

reformatory questions as were not recognized when the inspired record was formed, but which the providence of God has developed in these latter days; (such, *e. g.*, as total abstinence from the use of intoxicating liquors, and the iniquity of human slavery). Grant that the Bible says nothing directly upon certain modern aspects of these, and many like topics, yet does it contain no principles that by fair implication and application, relate to them? The Bible is a book of principles, and there is no moral question to which they may not, and should not, be applied. If reason refuses honestly and faithfully to make this application, and to give it prominence as the case demands, she is false to herself, to God, to the world, and to the Bible. We grant the task may sometimes be difficult, and may demand in us much prayer, and thought, and firmness; still it is the province and duty of reason to perform it, even at the cost of opposition and obloquy. The Bible must be made to speak out, not in opposition to the dead sins of the Jewish nation merely, but in denunciation of the living crimes of our own day.

Such is the province of reason with respect to revelation. *What, now, is the province of revelation with respect to reason?* If the thought has occurred to any one, that reason has been too much exalted, we shall now see that revelation is exalted yet more. Reason is the footstool, revelation is the firmament.

First of all, then, it is the province of the Bible, having once been accepted as of Divine authority, to become, on all questions where her voice is clear and definite, the end of controversy, the arbiter of dispute. There may be topics on which the Bible has nothing definite to utter; of these we do not now speak. But those questions, whether of faith or practice, upon which the Scripture teaching is pointed and positive, and they are as numerous as they are weighty, are, by that authority alone, at once, and forever settled. When reason has accepted the Bible as God's word, it may not obtrude its own theories or opinions in contradiction or modification of that word. Indeed, it is heresy, it is treason for her to have any opinions contrary to a plain "Thus saith the Lord." In the presence of God's confessedly revealed truth, reason is to embrace and confide; but it may not speculate or doubt, lest she make God a

liar, or claim to be his superior in knowledge. We press this point because of its infinite importance, and especially because we see everywhere a disposition, after admitting the Bible to be an inspired book, immediately to commence theorizing and opinionating upon its plainest and most important doctrines, until their vital power is destroyed. All this is a perversion of reason, and an encroachment upon the sacred province of Scripture. Reason may speculate where written revelation is silent or obscure, but where its voice is heard and understood, reason must bow reverently and obey. This view imparts to the Bible immense value, and crowns it with infinite honor. No other view can render it worthy to have emanated from God, or to be accepted by man; yet, had it been universally received and practically acted upon, how had the church been saved from cold speculation and bitter strife. Instead of being like a house divided against itself, she had stood a united host, "fair as the moon, and terrible" to the wicked "as an army with banners."

It is the further province of the Bible to assist reason where before she had some glimmerings of light from nature; but especially to reveal new truths, and truths of the highest magnitude, which uninspired reason could not have apprehended. There are some stars that never could have been discovered but by the telescope; so there are some truths that never could have been discovered but by the telescope of revelation. As the old astronomers guessed at the existence of unrevealed stars, so the old philosophers guessed at the existence of unrevealed truths; but those truths were never apprehended, and felt to be truths, till they were brought to light in the oracles of God. For the whole redemptive scheme through Jesus Christ, who brought life and immortality to light, we are wholly indebted to the Bible. Left to nature, man felt that he was a sinner, but as to how he should become just with God, was to him the mystery of mysteries. What a province does the Bible reign over, and how precious does it appear in our eyes, when we find this question of questions in which our eternal interests are involved, laid open and explained on its sacred pages! In comparison, and in practical value, the light of reason is a

rush-fire blazing in the mid-day sun. He who would be saved, must turn from the fires of his own kindling, to God's word; he must confess his sins, and offer his devotions, not on the altar of nature, but at the foot of the cross; he must plead for mercy, not justice; and he must accept of salvation as a gift through Jesus Christ our Lord. Such revelations it is the province of the Bible, not reason, to make.

But there are other truths which the human intellect does apprehend, on which it is the province of the Scriptures to shed increased light. The distance of the stars is measured by taking observations from different points. So the same truth which may be seen to exist from one position, may be measured and more accurately defined when examined from two—from reason, and from the Bible's stand point. This is, emphatically, the case with almost every truth (except mathematical and moral axioms) which the light of nature reveals. We may instance the mind's apprehension of God, of its own accountability, and of its immortality. If it can know these truths without the Bible, it can know them more perfectly with it. The influence of the two is reciprocal; one increasing the light of the other. A brace leaning against a building, if it have a separate foundation, while it in part supports that building, is itself in part supported by it. So reason and revelation are mutual helpers. Each furnishes the other with data. Walking side by side, each carries its own light and bears its own weapons of defence and attack, so that one aiding the other, they are both kept from stumbling, protected against enemies, and led on to victory.

But after all, it is the grand province of the Bible, made powerful by the Holy Ghost, to act directly upon reason itself, to humble, to exalt, and to sanctify it. Man, with all his knowledge and powers of knowing, is alienated from God, he is under the dominion of pride and self-confidence, and in the way to eternal death. The Bible comes to redeem him, and to do this by shedding light into his intellect, that his errors may be corrected, and love into his heart, that his sins may be removed. It does this by revealing to him the love of God in Christ, and seeking to persuade him that his Maker is worthy of his confidence, and to induce him to submit his own judgment and will

to the judgment and will of his Creator. This is the Bible's great mission, its peculiar province; and whoever overlooks this cardinal fact will under estimate its worth, and pervert its design. Nor will the mission of the Bible be accomplished, or its value diminished, till the last sinner is redeemed, or the drama of earth has come to an end.

Such are the relations of the human intellect and the sacred Scriptures. And, now, did our limits admit, we should, in conclusion, dwell upon the importance of keeping these relations distinctly in mind, and giving them their proper influence in shaping our sentiments and in regulating our lives. Could this be accomplished, we should see how the views which we have expressed are adapted to harmonize philosophy and faith; to vitalize one, and to intellectualize the other. The two have often been treated as if in conflict. Reason has been regarded as the enemy of faith, and faith has too often ignored reason. Thus have men put asunder what God had joined together. Were the mutual relations of both rightly understood, the bans of matrimony would be proclaimed, and a marriage ceremony performed which should unite the two in indissoluble and loving union. Each should bless and help on the other. Reason should teach Faith to think, and Faith should teach Reason to believe.

Another result would be that the cavils and objections of infidelity would be put to silence. Its charge, constantly reiterated against the Christian religion is, that it is irrational, and cannot bear the test of investigation. As held and taught by Popery and some Protestants, the charge is too true. But against the views which have now been expounded, the accusation is, and at a glance is seen to be, false.

Still another advantage of keeping these relations in mind is, that it enables us to enforce the truth upon the hearts of sinners with a double power. The conscience will be stormed from a double battery. It has no hiding place. If it flies to the Bible or to nature it is pursued and pierced with the arrows of truth. It cannot escape responsibility, and is likely in the end to make God its refuge.

Still another advantage would be the increase of knowledge and growth in grace on the part of Christians. The heart and

the intellect would mutually stimulate and strengthen each other. Reason would have a firmer grasp, faith a stronger basis, and the whole man would grow up unto the fulness of the stature of Christ.

But these advantages must all be dismissed with only this passing notice, while we add, in conclusion, that much as we should bless God for the gift of reason and the light of nature, yet our main dependence for eternal life is upon the teachings of the Bible. Let us approach it with reverence and affection and faith; for

“ Within this ample volume lies  
 The mystery of mysteries !  
 Happiest they of human race,  
 To whom their God has given grace,  
 To read, to fear, to hope, to pray,  
 To lift the latch, to force the way ;  
 And better had they ne'er been born  
 Than read to doubt or read to scorn.”

---

## ART. VII.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

**NATURE AND THE SUPERNATURAL, as together constituting the one System of God.**  
 By Horace Bushnell. Second edition. New York: 1859. Charles Scribner.

The author in this work comes up manfully to the question of our times as to the matter of Christianity. The question is certainly to be met on new grounds: Is Christianity natural or supernatural? Is it some form of unfolding nature, or is it something which, however intimately associated with nature, is not of it, but superior to it? Is it true, according to the title of this book, that nature and the supernatural together constitute the one system of God; that they are parts of one consistent whole; that nature sustains in this one whole, a place subordinate to Christianity as belonging to the supernatural?

Mr. Bushnell, (who, though he may not excel others in the power of thought, usually does excel others in modes of conception and expression on this difficult subject,) sets out with the fact that all men instinctively believe in the supernatural. That this fact lies at the foundation of the ancient mythologies of all lands, is a point which he makes in common with others. The

intellect in progress of ages comes to the task of finding the evidence upon which these mythologies rest as descriptive of the supernatural. It ends either with pronouncing them false or simply descriptive of nature. In either case it banishes them as the basis of religion. They resolve the whole doctrine concerning the gods into a history of nature. So did the sophists among the Greeks; and so, their successors among the Romans; so attempted the Sadducees among the Jews, and had they not attacked that which is in verity the supernatural, their success would have been like that of their fellows among the heathen.

The last example shows that a supernatural religion will be as certainly put to the test of philosophic criticism as one from man; that so the Christian religion is now passing through that ordeal. It of course has before been tried, but the present test has its peculiarities. What is to be the fate of Christianity? Can it maintain itself against the forces that would destroy it as altogether unfounded? Still more as pertaining to the test of our times, can it maintain itself as falling under the genus supernatural as contradistinguished from nature in all its possible forms and developments? This is the question to be settled: "*What I propose*," says the author, "*is simply this: to find a legitimate place for the supernatural in the system of God and show it as a necessary part of the divine system itself.*" And of course that the supernatural includes Christianity.

What are the forms in which the opposite doctrine must be met? "The relics of the old school of denial and atheism," represented by Hume and the French philosophers; then come the Pantheists, who confound God and nature, and thus render the supernatural impossible; then Utilitarians, many of whom have unconsciously confounded Christianity and nature by representing the former as a self-culture, instead of regeneration; "Again, the myriad schools of Associationists," who propose the salvation of the race, not by Divine help, but by development of nature; then spiritualists, phrenologists, and politicians, who see no relation of Government to God as above human will. Indeed, worse than all, the evangelical ministers themselves, in their very preaching, not unfrequently assume, unconsciously, premises that imply that Christianity is a part of nature. Physicians and scientific investigators of all kinds, who concern themselves mainly with matter, and mechanics, who deal principally in their thoughts as well as with their hands with physical forces, are all, or nearly all, gliding unconsciously, it may be, into the error in question.

The author limits the term nature to express that part of the universe bound in the relation of cause and effect. Thus, as a starting point to illustrate the supernatural, he makes man, so far as his will is concerned, supernatural: for the will is not bound in the relation of cause and effect; it is a free acting power. It can act from itself upon the chain of cause and effect, and through that chain produce effects; thus the will is creative. This is strikingly seen in sin, the action of free powers in a wrong direction, and through the chain of cause and effect changing all nature to a state of unnature.

There are degrees in the supernatural; above man in power are demons and angels; above all created wills is the uncreated. All these free-acting

powers have, as a theatre of action, nature. This is the common term to all powers as a standing-place. The great system of God consists, therefore, mainly of the kingdoms of powers—the empire of the supernatural; and that nature, instead of limiting the freedom of powers, only affords to them conditions of freedom.

If man, demon and angel, created wills, can act upon the chain of cause and effect not being included in the chain—if they can act supernaturally, it is simply absurd to suppose that God has ceased to be a cause. It is absurd to suppose that he has so fettered himself, that though man and demon come down upon nature supernaturally, with a sort of miracle, to change nature to unature, he has no freedom to change unature back to nature. God, therefore, is free to answer prayer, to direct in providence, to come out in miracle.

Christianity is supernatural. The author of it, Christ, cannot, by any possibility, be classed simply with men. His life was right from beginning to close; he had not to begin by repentance and confession, like all men who know anything of genuine piety; he had no mistakes to rectify; no wrongs to take back. Christ as the incarnation is the great central supernatural fact in the supernatural system, as it comes for redemption. This fact being granted, all other facts of Christianity must in reason be easily conceded. Inspiration, conversion, miracles, prayer, providence, are all only so many forms of the supernatural, and as to the difficulty of conception, not to be thought of after admitting the incarnation.

The supernatural, in all its forms, in every department, including miracles and providence, is systematic. Conversion is no chance affair. The supernatural power in its highest form to change man from a state of unature to nature is revealed. Its conditions of effective out-going are revealed. Those conditions the supernatural human will may freely accept. That converting power acts by no freak or caprice. The supernatural is not disorderly only in sin.

Miracles may be now as well as ever. Conversion is now, miracles may be. The author concludes they have never ceased, and that they occur now at least in the form of gifts of healing, and the speaking with tongues. It is not so much his point to insist they are, as to insist that it is naturalistic as opposed to Christian, to maintain, as some do, that miracles are not to be received now as well as in the past on testimony. That our Christianity is strongly tinctured with the doctrine of the Sadducees, he stoutly maintains.

In the main, we can most heartily endorse the doctrines of this volume. The terms employed may not always be in their legitimate sphere, but with that there is no good reason to find fault when the difficulty of the themes is considered and the author defines his own usage. His view of satan as the totality of evil powers and not a person, we think he fails to make out; his limitations to the term miracle, we think, not complete, but they are good so far as they go; there are some points a little over-done, we presume as by reaction from the materialistic philosophy of the times, but on the whole, he is remarkably well-balanced, considering how much new ground he has gone over. With the spirit and aim and general views of the author we have the



most unlimited fellowship, and believe his work not only a valuable contribution toward a true philosophy, but a token of the near approach of the advance of the church to a new grade of power and glory.

At the same time we thus write, we have no doubt but that the book will greatly shock some good Christians, and still more, alarm others whose religion has been received at second hand. Perhaps it is for the latter effect the book is to be peculiarly prized. The author himself expresses the fear that materials may be drawn from his book to feed the fires of fanaticism. Perhaps that is true, but it will be only because persons fail to apprehend the scope and system of the author. Those who read the book with due care, will not only be greatly profited intellectually, but will feel that they have had a peculiar communion with Christ as the author of their redemption.

There is another hope we have had while studying this book, viz.: that the day is at hand when Christians of every name will better apprehend the meaning of each other. This book will certainly contribute to that end. It has not fallen to our lot to read a work which so exactly expresses the general views held by Freewill Baptists in relation to the sovereignty of God and the freedom of man, and the relation of that freedom to the kingdom of redemption. So we might say of the view which the fathers held as to the call to the ministry and the preaching of the Gospel. The preaching of the gospel was, in the main, with them in theory and practice, the announcement of supernatural facts, facts indicative of God's power out of nature, and declaring to men their privilege of becoming the subjects of God's saving power. With what wonderful results they bore their testimony before men, that God was at hand always with his word to do the work in every willing heart. Just in the proportion that preaching has been crowded out by moral essays and arguments addressed merely to the judgment, our ministry has lost its power over the hearts of men. Education has, in too many instances among us, as among others, educated men away from the Bible and its doctrines, and their power to a godless and powerless material philosophy. May the mighty force of education among us always be employed to draw men to God and not from him. We know not another work more adapted to our wants in this regard than the one with which we now unwillingly part.

ON THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, in connection with some recent proposals for its revision. By Richard Chenevix French, D. D., Dean of Westminster, &c., &c. Redfield: 34 Beekman St., New York. 1858. 1 Vol. 12mo. pp. 188.

Biblical Criticism has made many important achievements during the last 200 years; and the question of revising the version of King James is one which can no longer be kept down or postponed. Though many extravagant things are said, and still more are intimated, respecting the defects and faults of the authorized version, yet its most enthusiastic eulogists, who are competent to form an opinion, are forced to admit that it contains some manifest interpolations, some renderings really incorrect, and others far from being the happiest and best. And though some of the attempts at revision have shown weakness and presumption enough to provoke ridicule, and others have shown faults enough to make reverential readers sad, still the feeling is every

day gaining ground, that a serious attempt to revise the English Bible is proper and inevitable.

A treatise on Bible revision by such a man as Dean French, must arrest attention at the present time. His previous works have given him a high rank as a philologist; his ecclesiastical position renders his utterances influential; and his well known conservative tendencies give a guarantee that he will say nothing in favor of revision beyond what his convictions as a manly and scholarly critic require.

We have read the work with a very deep interest. It shows large learning, but is wholly free from pedantry. He appears constantly as the calm, modest, reverent student,—never playing off Sir Oracle. He faithfully and almost affectionately sets forth the ordinary and remarkable excellencies of the common version, and yet points out, with great clearness and simplicity, the grounds on which a revision is called for, and the principles which ought to govern the labors of those who undertake the work. Almost any intelligent reader, though knowing nothing of the original tongues, can readily appreciate his reasoning and understand his examples. He looks fully in the face the difficulties in the way of effecting a satisfactory revision, and seeks to point out the proper method of procedure, so that these difficulties may be, as far as possible, overcome. Only in one instance does his catholicity of spirit seem to suffer eclipse, and his episcopacy become exalted to prominence. Rather amusingly to us, he seems stooping, in a half conscientious and half patronizing way, to consent that others than churchmen may be allowed to participate in the work of revision. Thus he speaks:

“Nay, of such immense importance would it be to carry with us, in whatever might be done, the whole Christian people of England, that it would be desirable to invite all scholars—all who represented any important portion of the Biblical scholarship of the land,—to assist with their suggestions here, even though they might not belong to the church. *Of course they would be asked as scholars, not as Dissenters.*”

The Italics are ours. There is no recognition of any help that could possibly come from this side of the sea, outside of *the church*, and a doubt is expressed whether American Episcopacy would either cooperate or sympathize much. John Bull is still himself now and then.

The following paragraph, while it shows that bigotry and misrepresentation leave their traces behind them even till now, is nevertheless quite as acceptable to us as would be the labored condescension, suggested above, toward the dissenting Biblical critics who are already honored in two hemispheres.

“Setting aside, then, the so-called Baptists,—who of course could not be invited, seeing that they demand, not a translation of Scripture, but an interpretation, and that in their own sense,—there are no matters of doctrine, or even of discipline, likely to come into debate, which should render it impossible for such dissenters as accept our doctrinal articles to take a share in this work—as regarded not from its ecclesiastical, but its scholarly point of view.”

With all due respect for the Deanery of Westminster in particular, and the English church in general, we are somewhat grateful that the care of the

English Bible and the work of pressing its teachings home upon the hearts of men, are not committed by Providence solely to the hands of British Episcopalians.

Yet again we commend this calm, able and well-considered treatise to the candid attention and the earnest study of our readers. They will thus be enabled easily to understand the merits of this much debated question of Bible revision.

**THE NEW TESTAMENT**, translated from the original Greek, with chronological arrangement of the sacred books, and improved divisions of chapters. By Leicester Ambrose Sawyer. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co., &c. 1858. 1 Vol. 12mo. pp. 423.

This widely advertised work of Mr. Sawyer, waited for with much anxiety, has appeared, and is being pretty extensively circulated. We have looked over it, and given particular attention to some portions, with a view of forming a fair estimate of its character, both as a faithful translation, and as a version seeking to be substituted for the translation of King James. The volume has suggested the saying of many things, some of which must be omitted, and others put down in the briefest way.

And, first, the methods adopted to press the work into notice, and create a demand for large editions seem to us, many of them, unfortunately chosen, injudicious, and, to use the mildest terms, morally questionable. The paraded testimonials to Mr. Sawyer's philological ability; the story of his 20 years' labor; the recommendations solicited by personal application for personal use, and then printed in the advertising columns of the secular and religious papers; the extravagant eulogies,—while the manuscript is yet clean in the printer's hands,—prepared by those who either really know nothing of the character of the work or have no capacity to form an opinion of its merits—all these things may be parts of the policy by which men gather reputation and make money, but they are not thereby rendered really wise or honorable. And all these things have been truly unfortunate accompaniments of the advent of Mr. Sawyer's translation. They will operate to induce a pre-judgment of the book, both by the critics and the common reader, and delay the just and decisive verdict which assigns it its true and final position among the products of modern Biblical criticism. We hope the time may soon come when all such extravagant puffing will be treated in such a way as to induce an abandonment of it from considerations that bear on the pocket, if the considerations that address the conscience fail to reach their object.

It is equally unwise and dishonorable to the critic's profession, to deal with every marked production as though it were a thesaurus of excellences, or a depository of all literary puerilities and abominations. There are other degrees of comparison than the superlative, and books may contain both chaff and wheat. The selection of a list of passages, manifestly improved by the new translator, hardly justifies the statement that the book is "the greatest work of the age"; and no pretended critic need be an object of envy, who picks out a dozen verses, where the new rendering is sure to strike the hurried reader most unfavorably, and, intimating that these are fair specimens of the work, dismiss the whole subject with a flippant witticism, or seek to awaken indignation that such unclean hands have dared to meddle so profanely with

what is holy. It would be well for such critics to remember that a man's hard earned character and reputation may no more be trifled with than a Greek aspirate or a Hebrew vowel-point. But it is time we should say a few words of the book itself.

Mr. Sawyer has undertaken a great work in this translation, and we are free to say that we do not think him fully equal to it. The same thing, doubtless, might be said of most other Biblical scholars who have attempted or may attempt it alone. And yet we most heartily approve of such undertakings, by individual scholars in a private capacity, as well as by Committees and Councils under royal or ecclesiastical patronage. And in this translation of the New Testament we think Mr. Sawyer has made a real and valuable contribution to that Bible revision which is more and more loudly called for, and which is yet to be completed, approved and adopted. Some of his variations from the authorized version are decided improvements; his arrangement of the books seems judicious in the main, and his division of the matter into chapters and paragraphs aids the common reader very greatly in following and appreciating the course of thought, especially in the Pauline Epistles. He furnishes evidence of critical Greek scholarship, and there seems to be no conscious theological bias determining his usual renderings. Clearly enough there is here the fruit of much patient, earnest, conscientious, high-aimed labor; and it is fruit of which healthy natures may partake with profit.

We do not suppose Mr. S. deems this work incapable of improvement; but rather that he is disposed to welcome all timely suggestions that may aid him in revising it, so that its future editions may make a nearer approach to the required standard. Such suggestions should be freely made by those who venture an opinion, either to him or to the public. In several respects the work seems to us faulty.

1. The author has consulted etymology too much in his renderings, and the *usus loquendi* too little. His translation of *metaneo* by the phrase, *to change one's mind*, instead of *to repent*, is a good example. Usage is law in speech, and ought to be so recognized.

2. His variations from the authorized version are unnecessarily numerous. Some of these variations really suggest that *differences are sought*, as though the old phraseology was a thing to be got rid of. Opening the book at random, we find, instead of "One soweth and another reapeth," this somewhat singular change, "He that sows is one, and he that reaps is another." What is such a change made for! The old form is adequate, briefer, better, and thoroughly idiomatic. Why needlessly offend popular taste and awaken general prejudice!

3. Words of Greek and Latin origin, not in general use, are often used in translating, instead of well known and equally expressive Saxon words; or these are substituted for these. Why should the author change the language of the publican's prayer, and make him say, "God be *propitious* to me a sinner!" giving up the word *merciful*, which expresses the same thing to scholars, and much more to ordinary readers. This word *merciful* is of French origin, but it illustrates the idea in the criticism, and occurs to us readily from the regret awakened by the change.

4. Sometimes there is an apparent effort to be rhetorical in the renderings; and as if to atone for this, some other phrases suggest an attempt to *speak down* to the unlettered masses; and the result is a loss of vigor, and an approach to the style usually described as *flat*. Have the author's philologically studies incapacitated him for the use of the simple, vigorous Saxon, which is such a striking characteristic of King James's translation?

5. In the attempt to give *literal* renderings, there is now and then a sacrifice of the English idiom, and the Greek is given us instead. The true idea of a literal translation is to put the English reader into the same relation to the text as the Greek reader sustains to the original record.

Of course it was not to be expected that Mr. S. would attempt to translate *baptizo*; and we observe that his rendering of *eis* in connection with accounts of baptisms, is *to*, instead of *into*, which the authors of our version allowed, as, perhaps, a sort of sop thrown to Cerberus. However, we raise no quarrel over this point.

But we have said enough for the present. We thank Mr. Sawyer for this translation. It is a work full of difficulty and delicacy; and we do not know a great number of men who, under similar circumstances, would have been certain to succeed better. His labor will not be lost; and we suppose that, if his attempt shall hasten the appearance of just such a translation as is demanded, he will be grateful to see his own superseded. It is not presumption for him to hope for so much. And if he should undertake a thorough revision of this translation, with a view of improving future editions, we think the additional labor would yield a high reward.

We should perhaps add that the mechanical features of the volume are worthy of the enterprising house that issues it.

**DISCOURSES ON THE NATURE OF FAITH**, and kindred subjects. By the late William H. Starr: With a Memoir. Chicago: D. B. Cook & Co. 1857.

We have been deeply interested in reading this volume. The Memoir is a simply and pleasantly written story of a young, earnest, thoughtful, independent minister, struggling manfully with inward and outward difficulties, resolved to conquer by, or at least through, his Christian manliness.

The "Discourses on Faith" are distinguished for their clearness, their logical consistency, and their eminently practical bearings. His ultimate and simplest, though perhaps not his clearest, definition of Faith in the gospel, is thus expressed: "*Faith in a truth, is acting upon it as true.*" His examination of the usual definitions, as well as his discussion of the general subject, shows a clear intellect, a practical aim, and a fervent heart. The book offers a good measure of healthy spiritual stimulus.

**WELLS'S NATURAL PHILOSOPHY**; for the use of Common Schools and private students: introducing the latest results of scientific discovery and research, arranged with special reference to the practical application of physical science to the arts and the experiences of every-day life. With 375 engravings. By David A. Wells, A. M., author of "The Science of Common Things," Editor of the "Annual of Scientific Discovery," "Knowledge is Power," etc. Fifth edition. New York.

In this series of excellent works of Mr. Wells, the author's zeal and pains to render his works entertaining and useful, cannot be too much commended.

To these ends he has an eye in the cuts which so admirably illustrate the various topics which come under consideration. When we compare, or rather contrast, this series of school books with those which we were compelled to see some twenty years, we can hardly prevent the feeling of envy against the present learners. Rather, we heartily rejoice they are to be saved for valuable purposes so much useless labor as we were compelled to no good purpose, owing to the deficiency in text books.

**SELECT DISCOURSES**, by Adolphe Monod, Krummacker, Tholuck, and Julius Mäler: Translated from the French and German, with Biographical Notices, and Dr. Monod's Celebrated Lecture on the Delivery of Sermons. By Rev. H. C. Fish and D. W. Poor, D. D. With a fine steel Portrait of Dr. Monod. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. 1858.

Most of these sermons we have read with unusual care and interest. It is not easy to find as much thought in the same compass, especially of sermons. The subjects are of deep interest, and they are treated in a masterly manner. The sermons on the conflict of Christ with satan are profound, and, we think, for the most part, scriptural. They form quite a study by themselves.

We know not another volume of sermons, which, on the whole, we prize as highly as we do this. We feel greatly indebted to the translators for their service to the church in giving this volume to the pulpit of this country in an English dress.

**BLIND BARTIMEUS; or, the Story of a Sightless Sinner, and his Great Physician.** By Rev. William J. Hoge, Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, Prince Edward, Virginia. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. 1859.

This, too, is a volume of sermons in a new dress. They were doubtless good sermons to the people who heard them. The preacher was doubtless over-persuaded when he put them to press. There are several good points in the volume, but as a general thing, the comparisons are pursued to a wearying extent, and the common-place matter makes up the great portion of it.

Nothing is more surprising than that preachers cannot learn that, as a general thing, a sermon that is of a character to be useful upon delivery to an ordinary audience, is not good to be published. It may, however, be good to preach to another audience. So this book and its like may do good if read to an audience in cases where there can be no preacher.

**HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION IN ENGLAND.** By Thomas Buckle. Volume I. From the Second London Edition. To which is added an Alphabetical Index. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1858.

Here is one volume of a remarkable work, whether we ever see another volume of it or not. This, and that of Bushnell on "Nature and the Supernatural," are as completely antipodal as it is possible for any two works of the same century to be. One insists that all things created, together with the Creator, are bound fast in the adamantine chains of fate, bound in a fixed and unchangeable chain of cause and effect, out of which there is no power or thought; the other finds a sphere of freedom for angel, demon and man, as well as for the Creator. Bushnell takes his ground consciously; the other unconsciously, and that, too, while in words he fights against his own doctrine, and indignantly re-

puddies it. After his repudiation, he goes on to build his whole superstructure upon that which he repudiates.

Thus the soil, the climate, the food, and the general aspects of nature, determine any civilization, including religion and morals. Hence all things are fixed and unchangeable. In London there is just about so many suicides annually, and it must be so. In France there are just about so many persons accused of crime, annually, and it must be so. If food is cheap, marriages will be numerous, and the population too great for the work to be done; wages, therefore, will be low, and the mass of the people ignorant and degraded; hence the potato is the doom of Ireland, and rice that of India.

Notwithstanding the author thus unconsciously fetters himself by a false theory, his work is very valuable for the facts it contains, and the reflections are often original, just and striking. It reminds us of what a friend said of another work: "It is full of meat; it is like an oyster; the meat is good, but do not try your teeth upon the shell."

We shall most heartily welcome the succeeding volumes, and hope at another time to present our views of this in an extended article.

*THE ELECTRON; or, the Pranks of Modern Puck, a Telegraphic Epic for the times, by Wm. C. Richards*, from the same house, is an interesting poem, and would have been read with great interest by thousands who, now that the cable has fallen into "pranks," will never think of looking at it. Yet the poem is as good and as interesting as if it were not necessary to say in the name of electricity,

"I'll put a girdle about the earth."

The notes in the margin of this volume convey just as much and as important information as they would, if hundreds of communications were passing every day through the Atlantic telegraph.

"Keep the Almanac seven years and it will come in fashion again," says an old proverb. In seven years these books will be in fashion as most wonderful prophecies. What arithmetic can compute the difference between success and the want of it!

**UNIVERSITY ALGEBRA:** Embracing a Logical Development of the Science, with numerous graded examples. By Charles Davies, LL. D., Professor of Mathematics in Columbia College. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1858.

To those familiar with the previous editions of Prof. Davies' Algebra, the following extract from the preface of this edition will be serviceable in forming an opinion of the character and value of this book:

"The mathematical department of Columbia College has been confided to a Professor and an Adjunct Professor; and the duties of instruction have been divided between them. Under this arrangement, the college is entitled to their joint labors—not only in the lecture-room, but also in the preparation of suitable text-books. Mr. Peck, the Adjunct Professor of Mathematics, has been so kind as to place at my disposal [says Prof. Davies] all the methods of elementary instruction in Algebra, which he has wrought out, and employed with great success, for many years. Those used in the development of the Binomial formula are deemed worthy of special notice."

This last point we have examined with care, and find it a very great improvement upon anything we have before seen.

**MEMOIR OF REV. DAVID TAPPAN STODDARD, Missionary to the Nestorians.** By Joseph P. Thompson, D. D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle church. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. 1848.

Mr. Thompson is a pleasant writer generally. Here he has a subject just to his liking, an old classmate at College, a missionary, a lovely character by nature, culture, and grace, all in one. Besides, the Life of Stoddard leads the author back among names and times very familiar to his studies, and very dear to his heart. Mr. Thompson, though writing the life of another, shows, by his sympathy with the peculiar traits of the subject, the peculiarities of his own interior life.

We are pleased to notice that Mr. Thompson omits not to improve every opportunity to censure the notion that the starving process is *useful* to students. The present affords him an admirable opportunity properly to characterize the hurtful, not to say wicked, notion. Alluding to the time he met Stoddard at Yale College, he says :

“The most demoralizing institution then maintained within the college walls, was the Commons Hall, where the students took daily lessons in barbarism from the untamed instincts of hunger. Rap, rap, went the tutor’s fork; a prayer was mumbled; and four hundred young men, thrown promiscuously together from families of every grade of culture, pounced pell-mell upon the limited supply of food before them, each devouring eagerly whatever he could seize, since politeness might cost him a meal.”

This volume is not only interesting as making us acquainted with a lovely missionary character, but it is useful in the way of awakening a deep interest in the cause of missions and religion.

**THE LIVING EPISTLE; or the Moral Power of a Religious Life.** By Cornelius Tyree, of Powhattan County, Virginia. With an Introduction by Rev. R. Fuller, D. D. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. 1869.

This is a book directed at the right point—practical Christianity—“the living epistle.” The author states a mournful case. “Near two-thirds of the race are pagans; a fifth part are Mahometans; only a sixth part are nominally Christians. Of this sixth part, by far the greater proportion are buried under the darkness of the Greek and Romish churches; and even in Protestant countries, to how small a number is the true church reduced!” Besides lands once the glory of Immanuel have been lost; Romanism and infidelity have gained back lands from the Reformation.

Why this! Not from the inefficacy of the atonement, nor its limitation; not because the promised Spirit is not given; nor because the Gospel is not a power adapted to our wants; not because God’s sovereignty is in the way as a hinderance; not from any want of evidence of the truth of Christianity; not for want of time for the church to fulfil the commission of Christ; not from doctrinal errors; not because the race is more depraved than it was in the times of the Apostles; nor is it owing to the paucity of means; none of these, “but we write it down as our most solemn conviction, that the great obstacle in the way of the diffusion of the Gospel, is the low tone of practical religion among the professed friends of Christ.”



The writer is earnest in his application to his subject. He makes a number of good points. He scores professed Christians to the quick for their inconsistencies, such as want of personal holiness, fickleness, their making religion a secondary interest, want of affectionateness, their uncheerful spirit, want of humanity, their self-indulgence, inactivity and one-sidedness. These defects he illustrates in the various spheres of life, sacred and secular, political and religious.

He seeks for the cure. It is of course a higher standard of personal piety, and illustrates in regard to various particulars. The book any one may read with profit and so the introduction.

We regret the author has omitted several particulars that would have added interest to his book. For instance, among the things that injure the influence of the Gospel in our times, are the sad facts that there are Doctors of Divinity who preach with peculiar unction, are yet in practice slave-holders, and devote their talents, and pervert the Bible, to apologize for and sustain the accursed system; that Christians in some countries buy and sell each other, to make gain, and the pulpit is too cowardly to rebuke it, and the Tract Society has too much on hand in the way of putting down dancing to spend one cent in rebuking the practice of breaking up families; that to convert heathens in Africa, ministers and deacons sell Christians in America, and the Mission society is too busy in giving thanks for money, to notice the blood upon it. These, and a few other little items that occur to our mind, would have added to the completeness of the book. Still, we say again, it is very good, so far as it goes, but we should be personally gratified if the author would devote a page or two on these trivial matters when there is a call for a second edition.

**THE POWER OF PRAYER, Illustrated in the Wonderful Displays of Divine Grace at the Fulton street and other Meetings in New York and elsewhere, in 1857 and 1858. By Daniel Irenæus Prime, author of "Travels in the East," "Thoughts on the Death of Children," "History of the English Bible abridged," &c. &c. New York. Charles Scribner. 1859.**

This volume gives an account of the origin of the Fulton street daily prayer meeting. The man who was the chief instrumentality in opening the meeting it seems kept a journal of its progress, and it is from this the materials for the account here given are chiefly drawn. This account, as well as that other display of God's <sup>power</sup> in answer to prayer, is not only interesting in style and details, but <sup>it will</sup> have a powerful influence of quickening the faith of Christians <sup>who</sup> ~~from~~ <sup>front</sup> it is read.

The <sup>author</sup> ~~author~~ <sup>subject</sup> ~~subject~~ are too well known to require extended comment. ~~The~~ <sup>The</sup> meeting was first held on the 23d of September, 1857. The first day, six persons were present. The next was a week later; the third, two weeks. Then a meeting was appointed for the next day, the 8th of October. It continued daily, and increased daily. The first notice of it in the papers was just a month to a day from the time it commenced. The revival power had been displayed before. From this, it was not only fully attended, but similar ones were rapidly instituted in every part of the country.

**SPURGEON'S GEMS**, being Brilliant passages from the Discourses of the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. Richmond: T. J. Starke. 1858.

The publishers say in their introductory note to this volume that more than one hundred thousand volumes of the author have already been sold in this country, and that the demand for his writings still continues. They say there has been a special call for a volume like the present, which contains the more brilliant passages selected from his various volumes. In regard to extracts from his works, they say with great justness, that passages of considerable length need generally to be taken properly to represent Spurgeon, as he does not deal in laconic sentences.

These extracts have been made according to the principle of the last suggestion, and we judge from a slight examination, that in other respects they are judiciously selected.

**WELLS' PRINCIPLES AND APPLICATIONS OF CHEMISTRY**; for the use of Academies, High-Schools, and Colleges: introducing the latest results of scientific discovery and research, and arranged with special reference to the practical application of Chemistry to the Arts and Employments of Common Life. With 240 Illustrations. By David A. Wells, A. M., author of *Wells' Natural Philosophy*, "*Science of Common Things*," Editor of the "*Annual Scientific Discovery*," etc.

The science of Chemistry is daily gaining upon the attention of the world, and it is well. The study of it brings the mind into peculiar communion with God in his wonderful works. On the whole, perhaps there is no study better than Chemistry for this. If it lacks the majesty, as felt in the study of Astronomy, it compensates for this, by greater familiarity with God's wisdom as seen in the most minute portions of matter.

While this study thus ennobles the mind, there is no other which equals it for usefulness in its application to the affairs of every day life in almost every calling.

This text book is full of interest by its variety and freshness of illustration, and especially by its adaptation to interest and instruct the common reader. In looking it over, we have been struck with the numerous and happy illustrations a minister can readily gather from this work for the enforcement of spiritual truth.

**WORDS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD**; or, Martin Luther his own Biographer. being Pictures of the great Reformer, sketched mainly from his own sayings. By Charles Adams. New York: Published by Carlton & Porter, Sunday School Union, 200, Malbury street.

A very entertaining little volume is this, not only for children and youth, for whom it is mainly designed, but for adults also. We took it one evening, expecting to read on the occasion, only a few chapters, but before we were aware of the time passing, we were well on with the whole of it. The author says he has taken his mainly from the great work of D'Aubigne, and yet those who have read that work will be pleased to read this condensed view.

We have no doubt it will prove very popular with the boys in every Sabbath school, where it goes. It will plant in their young minds the right principles. The boys that read it will not be likely even in their dotage, to become converts to Rome. Yet there is no mere Protestant spirit in the sense of

bigotry ; but its aim and effect is to implant the principles of the Gospel as opposed to all corruptions of Christianity. We hope it will reach all our Sabbath schools.

**THE SCIENCE OF COMMON THINGS ; A Familiar Explanation of the First Principles of Physical Science. For Schools, Families, and Young Students. Illustrated with numerous engravings. By David A. Wells, A. M.**

It is well that there is a strong tendency among students to come down to the common affairs of life. If the church has had its days of hermitage and monkery, science has had its days of greater separation from the living, actual world. Science, so called, has indulged in as many useless day-dreams as that which has gone under the name of religion. The latter had its great reformation sooner than the former. Perhaps the latter had never had its reformation without that of the former.

The volume before us is one of the results of this application of scientific knowledge to the duties and comforts of every-day-life, and at the same time it shows there is still much more to be accomplished on this score than has been accomplished in the past. It is devoted to showing the applications of the principles of Natural Philosophy and Chemistry to the "common things" of life. The book will soon pay for itself many times over to any one who will take the pains to read it.

**THE NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPEDIA ; A popular Dictionary of General Knowledge, edited by George Ripley and Charles A. Dana. Volume IV. Brownson—Charters. New York : D. Appleton & Co. 1868.**

This new Cyclopædia continues to meet the expectations of the preceding volumes. It is astonishing what a variety and amount of information one of these volumes contains. This one, for instance, contains 766 double column pages, equivalent to six or seven ordinary volumes of books at \$1.00 or \$1.25 per volume. The care taken, on the part of those who have the charge of it, to bring the respective subjects up to the present time, adds great value to the work, as compared with a similar work issued a few years ago. For instance, what could those works say of California ! Perhaps they might inform us, this is a portion of Mexico, and that is about all. On the other hand, we find here an article occupying about fifteen pages. The boundaries of the new state are carefully given ; its number of acres, 99,520,000 ; its counties, names and number, though ten of them have been erected since the census of 1852 ; the names and population of its seven incorporated cities, with general descriptions ; accounts of its progress, soil, climate, mountains, mines, &c., &c.

It is an advantage to many purchasers, that they can get the volumes in succession as they are issued. Thousands may safely undertake to procure this work by instalments, who would find it very difficult to pay \$45. at once.

Of its general ability, fairness and appearance, as to paper and print, we have spoken with commendation before.

\* \* Several Book Notices prepared for this number are crowded out.

THE

FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

---

NO. XXVI.—APRIL, 1859.

---

ART. I.—THE BAPTISMAL QUESTION IN THE LIGHT  
OF THE SCRIPTURES AND CHURCH HISTORY.

That infant sprinkling exists in the church as a baptismal rite is undeniable. It is either a Divine institution or a human tradition. If the former, all churches should observe it; if the latter, none should; for all, we presume, will agree with us that the Bible should be "*our only rule of faith and practice.*" If infant sprinkling be a Divine institution, we may expect to find a Divine sanction for it in the Bible. Where is that sanction? Christian baptism being ordained by Christ, we should naturally inquire in the New Testament for this ordinance. If, therefore, infant sprinkling be Christian baptism, we shall of course find authority for it therein. Where in the New Testament is that authority? If Christ and the apostles taught and practiced it, where is the record? Where in the whole New Testament is there one sentence, one word, one syllable, about infant baptism? Or is the sanction derived from the Old Testament? If so, where? Unless Divinely sanctioned, it is not to be observed, how many soever the witnesses, and however ancient and venerable, that may be brought to testify in its favor. Nay, could it be traced even up to the days of Christ and his apostles without their sanction, we should never touch it. Errors equally as great as we deem it to be, existed then; and human traditions and human inventions, which Christ and the apostles never sanctioned, have nevertheless the commendation.

of the very same men who advocated infant baptism,—*baptism*, we say, or immersion of infants, for that preceded infant *rantism*, or sprinkling. If, on the contrary, Christ and the apostles did practice infant sprinkling or infant immersion, and did give their sanction to it, then, though all the world were opposed to it, we are bound to practice it,—then all Christians and all Christian churches or societies are solemnly bound to espouse it.

The great stronghold of Pedobaptists is, that baptism is a substitute in place of circumcision. But where in the Bible is this asserted? If this be so, why did not Christ and the apostles practice infant baptism—say something about it—hint in some way that it was their wish that when they were gone their successors should practice it? Why did none of the writers and teachers, either Orthodox or Heterodox, of the first and second centuries, say *one word* about *infant* baptism, but much about *believers'* baptism? Why was the practice of infant immersion reserved to be brought to light sometime after the church embraced the Heathen mysteries, and about the time when, in the third century, there was instituted by *man*, and not by God, the sign of the cross, the consecration of "holy water, material unction, penance, monks, monasteries," &c., &c., together with numberless other innovations, until soon after the beginning of the third century the church had become so corrupt, that the more pure minority, desirous of adhering to the principles of Christ and the apostles, came off from the church, rejected infant immersion, with all the other Catholic innovations, and, though hunted, persecuted, put to death, many of them, and that, too, by their brethren in the church they had left, yet, nevertheless, have existed in every age, from John the Baptist till now, and who, as Baptists, (though under various names, derived from persons or localities,) mostly have practiced immersion. Why was infant baptism reserved to bestow the honors of its origin upon this period? Who will answer these questions? And when they are answered, we have many more to propose. If baptism were Divinely substituted for circumcision, there was indeed a most favorable opportunity presented, and one which, under the circumstances, positively demanded that the apostles should have thus declared. We

allude to the occasion and circumstances recorded in Acts, 15th chapter. Certain men, it seems, who had been Jews, but who were now converts to Christianity, came down from Judea to Antioch, and taught the Gentile Christians there, that "unless they were circumcised after the manner of Moses they could not be saved." After Paul and Barnabas had for some time withstood them on this matter, they all at length agreed that Paul and Barnabas and certain others "shall go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question." They go up to Jerusalem. We see them assembled in council with the apostles and elders, and with the church at Jerusalem. The question to be discussed is stated in effect thus: "Is the Jewish rite of circumcision binding on Christian converts?" Or in a more general sense, "Are the ceremonial laws of Moses obligatory upon Christians?" Now in reference to circumcision, (the primary, if not the only object for which they are now convened,) if baptism had been its Divine substitute, the apostles and elders must have known it; hence it would have been the most natural thing in the world, and to be expected, that this council would answer, "No; *baptism* is the Divine substitute for circumcision." But no such answer is given. What, then, is the answer? The reader can find it in Acts 15: 22—30. Nor is it anywhere in Scripture declared that baptism has come in place of circumcision. Let this suffice for the present.

We will now give a few proofs to clinch the facts suggested in the preceding questions, and leave them for still stronger confirmation in subsequent stages of this discussion.

That Christ and his apostles did not teach nor practice infant baptism, is boldly affirmed by many eminent and learned men, as well as conceded by many Pedobaptists, as, for instance:

*Professor Lauge*, on Infant Baptism, p. 101, says,

"All attempts to make out infant baptism from the New Testament fail. It is (says he) totally opposed to the spirit of the apostolic age, and to the fundamental principles of the New Testament."

*Schleiermacher*, Christian Theology, page 383, says:

"All traces of infant baptism which one will find in the New Testament must first be put into it."

*Olshausen*, on Acts 16: 14, 15, says:

"There is altogether wanting any conclusive proof—passage for the baptism of children in the age of the apostles; nor can the necessity of it be deduced from the nature of baptism."

*Neander*, Vol. 1, p. 311, says:

"Baptism was at first administered only to adults, as men were accustomed to conceive baptism and faith as strictly connected. We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution; and the recognition of it which followed somewhat later as an apostolic tradition, serves to confirm this hypothesis."

*Hagenbach*, History of Doctrines, p. 193, says:

"The passages from Scripture which are thought to intimate that infant baptism had come into use in the primitive church are doubtful and prove nothing."

*Mr. F. Johnston*, of Edinburgh, in his work entitled, "Infant Baptism not Christian Baptism," p. 143, says:

"There is no evidence whatever in Scripture for infant baptism."

Again, on page 153, he says:

"The Bible says nothing from beginning to end on the subject of infant baptism. It prescribes a line of things which if always regarded, infant baptism had never arisen; and which if now returned to, infant baptism would immediately cease. The exclusion of infants from baptism, necessarily follows from the demands of faith in order to it. Infant baptism, therefore, has no foundation in the Word of God. On the other hand, the baptism of believers is positively enjoined, and from every believer to the end of the age it is demanded. No ordinance of man can ever set its obligation aside. Whether men choose to observe infant baptism or not, still the baptism of all believers, by the authority of the Son of God, must be observed" (and whether sprinkled in infancy or not.) "Again," he says, "Every believer neglecting to be buried with Christ in baptism after he believes, is living in disobedience to God."

*Martin Luther*:

"It cannot be proved by the sacred Scripture that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or begun by the first Christians after the apostles."—Vanity of Inf. Bap. Part 2, p. 8.

These are in substance the acknowledgments and concessions of very many Pedobaptist writers, as, for instance, Bishop Burnet, Dr. Wall, Mr. Fuller, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Obed Willis, Vitringer, Mr. Samuel Palmer, Limbarch, M. De La Roque, Erasmus, Mr. Leigh, Dr. Freeman, Mr. S. Boston, Mr. Cawdrey, Dr. Field, Bishop Sanderson, Dr. Towerson, Mr. Walker, Witsius, &c., &c.

Such concessions are Pedobaptists obliged to make in reference to this matter. With propriety we may here demand and remonstrate in the remarkable words of Mr. Baxter :

“What man dare go in a way which hath neither precept nor example to warrant from a way that hath a full current of both? Who knows what will please God but himself? And hath he not told us what he expecteth from us? Can that be obedience which hath no *command* for it? Is not this to supererogate and to be righteous overmuch? Is it not also to accuse God's ordinances of insufficiency, as well as his Word, as if they were not sufficient either to please him, or help our own graces? O! the pride of man's heart, that instead of being a law-obeyer, will be a law-maker; and instead of being true worshippers, they will be worship-makers! For my part, I will not fear that God will be angry with me for doing no more than he hath *commanded* me, and for *sticking close to the rule of his Word* in matter of worship, but I should tremble to add or diminish.”—Baxter's Plain Scripture Proof, p. 24, 303.

Is it not strange, indeed absolutely unaccountable, if our Lord intended infants should be baptized, and if they actually were baptized by the apostles, that it should not be so much as once expressly recorded in all the New Testament? Baptism itself is frequently mentioned—mentioned as an appointment of Christ, as a duty to be performed, as an ordinance often administered; yet, though all these occasions of expressly mentioning infants as entitled to baptism, or as partakers of it repeatedly occurred; the sacred writers have united in observing a profound silence in regard both to the one and the other. Admitting the baptism of infants to be a Divine appointment, the silence of the New Testament writers is the more wonderful, because of the express mention made of infants on other occasions of far less importance to the purity of Christian



worship and edification of Christ's disciples, or the comfort of believing parents.

Not only do the Scriptures not say a word as to infant baptism, but there is also not the least mention of infant baptism in any writer of the first and second centuries.

There are one or two passages quoted by some Pedobaptists from Justin Martyr and Irenæus, writers of the second century, which we will briefly notice. Justin Martyr wrote A. D. 140. The passage from him is the following:

"Several persons among us of sixty or seventy years old, and of both sexes, and who were disciples to Christ in their childhood, do continue uncorrupted."

Now the term "childhood" in the above passage from Justin does not refer to infants, but children old enough to be instructed in the faith of the gospel, or to catechumens, *i. e.*, children and youth prepared by previous instruction and Christian discipline for baptism. The following passage from Justin will show this. Justin Martyr (2d Apol. to Antoninus Pius, Emperor,) says:

"I will declare unto you how we offer up ourselves to God after that we are received through Christ. Those among us instructed in the faith, are *brought to the water*, then they are baptized therein, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Then we bring the person thus baptized or washed to the brethren, where the assemblies are, that we may pray both for ourselves and the newly illuminated person; that we may be found by doctrine and good works worthy observers and keepers of the commandments. Then bread and wine being brought to the *chief brother*, he taketh it and offereth praise and thanksgiving to the Father in the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost. After prayer and thanksgiving, the whole assembly saith *Amen*. When thanksgiving is ended by the *chief guide* and the consent of the whole people, the deacons (as we call them) give to every one present, part of the bread and wine, over which thanks are given;—this we call the *Eucharist*, to which no man is admitted but he that believeth the truth of the doctrine and lives as Christ has taught."

Observe, he says "they are brought to the water," and not the water to them. They are first "*instructed in the*

*faith.*" The baptized is called the "newly illuminated" person. The person is then placed at the Lord's table. This looks like an infant subject and a "sprinkling mode!"

On this and a similar passage from Justin, (Apol. 2, Sec. 79,) and one from Tertullian (de Cur. mil. c. 3,) Mr. Reeves, the learned translator of Justin, says :

"Tis evident from these passages, that PONDS and RIVERS were the only baptisteries, or fonts, the church had for the first two hundred years. The catechumen being brought to the baptistery, was thus interrogated, '*Dost thou renounce the devil? Dost thou renounce the world? &c, &c.*' Answer. *I do renounce* them. Next he made an open confession of the faith in answer to the questions: '*Dost thou believe in God? &c.,*' to which the person answered, '*I do believe;*' and this form of interrogation the apostle is thought to refer to when he styles baptism, '*the answer of a good conscience towards God.*'"

After this confession is made, the candidate (Mr. Reeves adds) was "thrice\* *plunged under water* at the naming of the three Persons in the blessed Trinity." (Apologies, Vol. I. p. 97, note.)

There is not one word in Justin Martyr's writings on infant sprinkling nor infant immersion. *Venema*, says Justin Martyr in his 2d Apology, when describing baptism, mentions only that of adults. So say others.

We pass now to consider the passage in Irenæus, which some Pedobaptists quote in proof of the existence of infant baptism (immersion) in the second century. Irenæus Contra Hæreses lib. 2. c. 22, § 4 :

"Omnes enim per semetipsum venit salvare; omnes, inquam, qui per eum *renascuntur in Deum* infantes et parvulos et pueros et juvenes et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem, et infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantis; in parvulis, parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes ætatum, simul et exemplum illis pietatis effectus, et justitiæ et subjectionis; in juvenibus, juvenis, exemplum juvenibus fens et sanctificans Domino."

Translation—"He (Christ) came to save all by himself; all, I say, who through him are *regenerated to God*; infants, little children, boys,

\* Trine immersion, or once at the mention of each of the Persons in the Trinity.

young people and old. Therefore He passed through every age and for the infants he became an infant sanctifying infants ; among little children he became a little child, sanctifying those that belong to this age, and at the same time presenting to them an example of piety, of well-doing and obedience among young men, He became a young man, presenting an example to the young men, sanctifying them to the Lord."

The phrase in this passage which is made to mean baptized by some Pedobaptists, is the words in italics, "*renascuntur in Deum,*" translated "*regenerated to God.*" Now, if the word "*regenerated*" had no other meaning than *baptized*, and Christ came to save only those who received baptism, and to save them only by baptism, then that passage would be the first "express mention of infant baptism." But as it is, it is *begging the question* to cite it at all on the subject. If infant baptism was practiced by Christ and his apostles, and in the first and second centuries, is it not passing strange that our Pedobaptist friends can find no proof thereof but this passage of Irenæus, which, after all, says not a word about baptism? But, say our Pedobaptist friends, "regenerate was sometimes used to mean baptize." This is no proof, however, that Irenæus thus used it here. Let us substitute *baptism* in place of *regeneration* in the passage from Irenæus, and then his testimony will read thus: "He (Christ) came to save all persons by himself; all, I say, who are baptized, infants, little children, young people and old." This makes baptism salvation with an emphasis. Are all saved who are baptized? None but such as hold to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, will pretend to this. Again, are none saved but such as are baptized? Witness the penitent thief.

That the ancients used the word *regenerate* for baptize, we admit; but this was far from being common or general. For Tertullian, Origen, and indeed all "the fathers" used the word baptize as we do. When it does signify baptize, in the idiom the circumstances appended make it evident; and to substitute the word *baptize* as we have done above, shows when it is not used for baptism, as in the words of Irenæus.

On this passage from Irenæus, *Le Clerc* says :

"We see nothing here concerning baptism; nor is there anything relating to it in the immediately preceding or following words."—*Hist. Eccles. Sæcul. 2.*

*Mr. Hebden :*

"This has been often cited against the Anti-Pedobaptists; baptism being, say these learned Pedobaptists, often called *regeneration* by the ancients," &c. "The *all*," says Hebden, "whom Christ came to save are said to be *regenerated to God*. Can this be meant of baptism? Are none saved but such as are baptized? Or, are all who are baptized saved by Christ? That must be the case, according to Irenæus, if regeneration was here put for baptism; for he evidently intimates that all whom Christ came to save are regenerated, and that all who are regenerated to God are saved."—*Baptismal Regeneration disproved, Appendix, p. 55.*

Mr. Booth, (*Pedobaptist Exam. Vol. 2, p. 85*), says:

"Incompetent, however, as the testimony of Irenæus is, in favor of Pedobaptism, Dr. Wall will have it speak directly in point, saying, 'This is the first express mention we have met with of infant baptism.' *Express* mention! Then the terms *baptized* and *regenerated* must be perfectly equivalent in the works of Irenæus and the ecclesiastical authors of those times. But this cannot be proved, as the learned and impartial Venema acknowledges. Yet while we insist that this is far from being an express testimony, or indeed any testimony at all, in favor of infant baptism; we may venture to conclude that it is the first passage in ecclesiastical antiquity which Dr. Wall considered as having any appearance of being directly to his purpose,—and the very best he could find to support his hypothesis. But if it had been a Divine appointment, and customary in the church from the apostolic age, is it not strange, is it not quite unaccountable, that such ambiguous words as those of Irenæus should be considered by our opponents as the most explicit of any on record, in proof that Pedobaptism was practiced so early as the year one hundred and eighty. What, is there nothing in those monuments of Christianity, which go under the name of BARNABAS, of CLEMENS ROMANUS, of HERMUS, of IGNATIUS, and of POLYCARP, as much to the purpose, as this passage of the celebrated Bishop of Lyons? Is there nothing in the writings of JUSTIN MARTYR, of ATHENAGORAS, or of THEOPHILUS ANTIOCHENUS (which are all considered by learned men as prior to those of Irenæus) that is equally plain and equally favorable to the antiquity of Pedobaptism! Strange, indeed, supposing infant baptism to have been derived from the apostles, and to have been generally practiced in the times of those authors; that none of them

should speak of it with as much clearness and precision as the venerable Irenæus in those equivocal words before us."

Thus saith the great and learned Abraham Booth.

The words of *Venema* (alluded to by Mr. Booth in the passage above quoted) are these :

"It (regenerate) is not always used in that sense (to baptize,) especially if no mention of baptism precede or follow, which is the case here; and here, to *be regenerated* by Christ may be explained by *sanctified*, that is, saved by Christ. The sense, therefore, (says he,) may be, that Christ passing through all the ages of man, intended to signify by his own example, that he came to save men of every age, and also to sanctify and save infants. I conclude, therefore, that Pedobaptism cannot be certainly proved to have been practiced before the times of Tertullian, and that there were persons in his age who desired their infants might be baptized, especially when they were afraid of their dying without baptism, which opinion Tertullian opposed, and by so doing he intimates that Pedobaptism (Pedobaptist sentiments) began to prevail."—*Hist. Eccles. Tom. 3, Secul. 2.*

We have dwelt much longer upon this passage from Irenæus than we otherwise should have done, because of the extreme unwillingness of some modern Pedobaptists to acknowledge that there is no mention of infant baptism by any writer of the first and second centuries. This unwillingness on their part arises from the fact that the silence on this subject of the writers of this period is utterly inconsistent with the supposition that infant baptism was all the while being practiced by Christ, the apostles, and their successors.

On this point we will add but a few words more and pass. Mr. Booth, in *Pard. Exam. Vol. 2, p. 76*, quotes Curcellæus (a learned divine of Geneva, and Professor of Divinity) :

"The baptism of infants in the two first centuries after Christ, was altogether unknown; but in the third and fourth was allowed by some few. The custom of baptizing infants did not begin before the third age after Christ was born. In the former ages, no trace of it appeared, and it was introduced without the command of Christ."

*Salmasius and Suicerus :*

"In the two first centuries no one was baptized, except being instructed in the faith, and acquainted with the doctrine of Christ, he

was able to profess himself a believer; because of those words, '*He that believeth and is baptized.*'"—*Pard. Exam. Vol. 2, p. 76.*

*Alexander Campbell* says:

"No man mentions infant baptism before Tertullian's time in the third century. Of forty-four writers called Orthodox, besides a great many called Heterodox, who lived, and taught, and wrote, from the Apostle John's time till the time of Tertullian, NOT ONE mentions infant baptism. But all that speak of baptism and the baptized, speak of it and them as the baptists now speak, viz.: that a disciple is the subject and immersion the action."

Again, he asks:

"Is it not a most daring and unparalleled effort, to attempt to prove that infant baptism is a Christian institute, when, for more than two hundred years from the Christian era, no man, Orthodox or Heterodox, even so much as mentioned the thing! Is it probable, nay, did ever the like happen, that any practice should be a common, a general, or even an occasional thing, and no man, friend or foe, of hundreds of writers and teachers and practicers, for more than two hundred years, drop one syllable about it!! We have searched (says he) all the large and voluminous histories now extant, and many, if not all the abbreviated ones, we have examined all the writings of those called the apostles' successors, and many of the writings of their successors, both Orthodox and Heterodox, and we fearlessly affirm, that there lives not the man who can produce one instance to disprove my affirmation."

We must now leave this part of our subject, barely remarking, in conclusion, that Tertullian, A. D. 204, is the first writer that mentions infant baptism at all, and then he speaks decidedly against it, which it is not likely he would have done, had it been handed down from Christ and the apostles. It was named next by Origen, in A. D. 230, though Rufinus so interpolated his writings as to render this doubtful. But the first writer that *defended* the practice was Cyprian, A. D. 253. At this time, too, arose the institution of "Sponsors, Godfathers and Godmothers," which office grew out of the unwillingness of the advocates of infant baptism to *dispense*, at once, with the profession of repentance and faith by the candidate for baptism, which were always required before baptism in the apostolic age,

Hence these sponsors professed to repent, to renounce the devil, exercise faith in Christ, &c., for the infant. Tertullian objects to sponsors also.

It is a fact which cannot be denied, that infant baptism sprung from the corruptions of the church and from the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; from the craving for an outward form which was taking the place of the power of godliness; and accordingly making people, as they professed, Christians by outward processes, rather than aiming at the conversion of souls; from a belief that there was no salvation without the outward ordinances; a creed fostered by misinterpreting and misunderstanding such passages as John 3 : 5, and Titus 3 : 5, and a fact furthered by priestly corruptions, as well as by the ignorance and worldliness of the churches, glad to rest in the birth of water as an apology for the birth of the spirit, eager to run themselves and eventually to carry their babes to the laver of regeneration, the mere bath of water, while neglecting regeneration itself, the renewing of the Holy Ghost.

It is worthy of notice, too, that the very first word we have of the rise and establishment of infant baptism is in Africa. Christian baptism began in Asia, and was ordained by Christ, the founder of Christianity. Infant baptism, *i. e.*, immersion, began in Africa, and was ordained and promoted by the ambitious prelates of the North African churches, such as Cyprian, Fidus and Augustine.

The first case of *pouring* or *sprinkling*, that Mr. Wall, (the great and learned Pedobaptist, who ransacked all the records of antiquity in the quest of infant baptism) could discover, was that of Novatian, about the middle of the third century, or A. D. 251. This man while unbaptized, as Eusebius records, (Eccles. Hist. Lib. 6, c. 43,) "fell into a dangerous disease, and because he was very like to die, was baptized in the bed where he lay (*εν κλινη περι χυθησα,*) *en kline peri chuthenta, i. e.*, (poured over in bed, or water poured all over him,) if that might be termed baptism." Novatian recovered, and the view which the Christian church generally took of his baptism is shown by the fact that when afterwards he became a candidate for the priesthood, "*all the clergy* (says Mr. Wall) *and a great many of*

*the laity, were against his being ordained presbyter (mark, reader, the reason) because it was not lawful (they said) for any one that had been baptized in his bed in time of sickness (Greek, poured, &c., as above) as he had been, to be admitted to any office of the clergy.*”—Wall’s Hist. Inf. Bap. part 2, c. 9. Novatian obtained the office in a schismatical way.

Here is the first recorded case of *affusion*, either pouring or sprinkling, for baptism; and here we have a serious objection taken against the person so baptized, in which “all the clergy” were united. This objection was two-fold; first, against his *situation*, as being sick in bed; and secondly, against the *mode* of the ordinance. The first expressed in the 12th canon of the Council of Nevearsarea, as follows: “He that is baptized when he is sick, ought not to be made a priest, for his coming to the faith is NOT VOLUNTARY, but from necessity. 2. The second part of this objection relates to the *mode*.” While Novatian was yet living, one Magnas submitted this question to Cyprian: “Whether they are to be ESTEEMED RIGHT CHRISTIANS, who are not washed in the water, but only sprinkled?” Cyprian answers that baptism was to be esteemed good “necessitate cogente,” “*necessity compelling to it, and God granting his indulgence.*” Reader, please reflect on the force of this evidence.

From this period, A. D. 250, onward, sprinkling was permitted, but only in case of necessity, and in prospect of death; originating in a false view of the necessity of the ordinance to salvation.

“France (says Mr. Wall) seems to have been the first country in the world, where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily to *persons in health*. This affusion, or *pouring*, in the church of Rome, was first *tolerated* in the eighth century, while *immersion* was still the established law of the church; and so things stood several hundred years. In the sixteenth century, *pouring* was generally adopted. The rituals of that church prove this to a demonstration.”—See Robinson’s Hist. of Bapt. p. 525.

*Bishop Bossuet* (in Strumt’s Ans. to Russen p. 176) says:

“We are able to make it appear by the acts of Councils and by ancient Rituals, that for THIRTEEN HUNDRED YEARS, baptism was



thus (by immersion) administered throughout the whole church, as far as possible."

*Stackhouse :*

"Several authors have shown and proved that this immersion continued, as much as possible, for THIRTEEN HUNDRED YEARS AFTER CHRIST."—Hist. of the Bible, Part 8, p. 1234.

*Mr. Whitby* (author of a Commentary on the New Testament, and more than forty other learned works) says :

"It being so expressly declared here, Rom. 6: 4, and Col. 2: 12, that we are BURIED with Christ in baptism, by being buried under water; and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death, by dying to sin being taken hence; and this immersion being religiously observed by ALL CHRISTIANS FOR THIRTEEN HUNDRED YEARS, and approved by our church, and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the author (Christ) of this institution, or any license from and council of the church, being that which the Romanist still urges to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity; it were to be wished that this custom (immersion) might be again of general use, and aspersion only permitted, as of old, in case of the clinici (sick persons) or in prospect of death."—*Note*, on Rom. 6: 4.

The Church of England retained the original practice of dipping longer than those of the continent. Erasmus, A. D. 1530, says: "*Perfunduntur apud nos, merguntur apud Anglos, i. e.,*" "With us (the Dutch) they have the water poured on them; in England they are dipped." The Rubric to this day instructs the clergyman, "he shall dip in the water discreetly and warily"—but it allows of an exception, "but if they shall certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to *pour* water upon it."

The catechism requires the youth to express the form of baptism only as by immersion. "Water *wherein* the person is baptized." In the early history of this church "the officers or liturgies (says Mr. Wall) did ALL ALONG enjoin dipping without any mention of sprinkling or pouring." In A. D. 1549 first appeared the exception for "weak children;" four years afterwards the word *thrice* after the order to *dip*, was omitted. Mr. Wall says :

“It being allowed to weak children in the reign of Queen Elizabeth (she reigned from A. D. 1558 to 1603) to be baptized by aspersion; many fond ladies and gentle women first, and then, by degrees, the common people would obtain the favor of the priest, to have their children pass for ‘weak children,’ too tender to endure dipping in the water.”

Here we see sprinkling beginning to prevail. In A. D. 1644 was issued the Directory of the Westminster Assembly which says, “*Baptism is to be administered, not in private places, or privately; but in the place of public worship, and in the face of the congregation.*” And thus says Mr. Wall: “They reformed the font into a basin.” The conclusion of the whole matter on this point is this: Sprinkling or pouring administered to persons in health was first tolerated in the Papal church in France in the eighth century. *Immersion* was still the common mode, and for a long time afterward. From France it extended itself to Germany, &c. About the middle of the sixteenth century, England begins to practice pouring and sprinkling in case of “weak children,” dipping them in the font still being practiced in case of well ones. Gradually pouring and sprinkling obtains, until, in A. D. 1644, the Westminster Assembly abolish dipping entirely.

The question occurs, “In what proportion of the Christian world has immersion been continued down to the present time?” Ans.—Mr. Wall:

“What has been said of this custom of pouring or sprinkling water in the ordinary use of baptism is to be understood only in reference to those WESTERN PARTS OF EUROPE, for it is used ordinarily nowhere else. The Greek church does still use immersion; and so do all other Christians in the world except the Latins. All those nations of Christians that do now, or formerly did, submit to the authority of the Bishop of Rome, do ordinarily baptize their infants by pouring or sprinkling; but all other Christians in the world who never owned the Pope’s usurped power, DO and EVER DID DIP their infants in the ordinary use. All the Christians in Asia, all in Africa, and about one-third part of Europe are of the last sort,” *i. e.*, practice immersion.—Wall’s Hist. Inf. Bap. Part 2, ch. 9, p. 376, Ed. 3.

Again says Mr. Wall:

“In this third part of Europe are comprehended the Christians of Græcia, Thracia, Servia, Bulgaria, Rascia, Wallachia, Moldavia, Russia, Nigra, and so on. In the Greek church is included Greece, the Grecian isles, Egypt, Abyssinia, Nubia, Lybia, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Cilicia, Palestine.”

The results of our investigations thus far, then, are these :

1. The practice of sprinkling and pouring as Christian baptism was unknown till the third century after Christ.
2. It was then allowed only to sick persons, in prospect of death; that it had no Divine sanction, but was the product of error, and owed its existence to that spirit of anti-Christ which had even then already begun to exhibit itself in human additions to Christ's ordinances and system of worship; such as the sign of the cross; the consecration of the baptismal water; the use of sponsors; the imposition of hands at baptism; the use of material unction at confirmation; offering prayers and oblations for the dead, &c.; we never read of any of these in any Christian writer before Tertullian. Hence learned Pedobaptists infer that they were *introduced about that time*. We come to the same conclusion for the very same reason, respecting the baptism of infants.
3. The Papal church in France, and in the eighth century, first *tolerated* pouring to persons in health; and in the sixteenth century, *pouring* was generally adopted. It spread into Germany, Switzerland, &c.
4. Sprinkling found its way into England in the sixteenth century, being introduced thither from the continent, and in A. D. 1644 became general, dipping in the font being abolished by the action of the Westminster Assembly.
5. Lastly, the inevitable conclusion is, that sprinkling and pouring, to persons in health, is of Papal origin, and those who practice either, practice a Papal rite.

Infant communion is as old as infant baptism, but of this we cannot now treat.

II. We pass now to make a few general observations on positive laws or institutions.

1. The nature of a positive law differs essentially from that of a moral law. A moral law is an expression of unchangeable

truth and right, and commends itself as holy, just and good, whether of the nature of a requirement or prohibition. It is therefore of perpetual obligation. But a positive law, whether requirement or prohibition, has nothing good or evil in itself, and is therefore binding only because enacted. Thus the moral law, in the ten commandments, written by Jehovah on two tables of stone, and comprised by our Savior in *love to God* and *love to man*, is in the very *matter* of it so reasonable and necessary, as that by virtue of its own merits, it commands universal respect and obedience. The fourth commandment, so far as relates to the particular day of the week, is of the nature of a positive institution, and liable to change. So far as relates to the keeping of some time holy, or the duty of worshipping God, it is of the nature of moral law, and is therefore unchangeable, and perpetually obligatory.

Positive laws are such as the prohibition from eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, or the command to sprinkle the blood of the Passover-lamb on the door-posts. It is plain that eating or not eating of that tree might be, in itself considered, as indifferent a matter, as eating or not, of any other tree in the garden. But God had forbidden Adam to eat thereof, and hence the eating of the fruit of that tree was a sin, the awful consequences of which are felt at this day. So the sprinkling of the blood of the lamb on the door-posts was a thing indifferent in itself, but was obligatory by virtue of being commanded, which had the Israelites neglected to do on that night, in which God had positively required it, their neglect would have been sinful, and would have exposed their "first-born" to the sword of the destroying angel. The same distinction exists between the moral law and the ceremonial law delivered to Moses on Sinai. The moral law is of perpetual obligation upon all rational beings. The duty to love God and man was binding upon men before as well as after the publication of that law on tables of stone. The essence or spirit of that law is binding upon all creatures in all worlds. This law comprises those eternal principles of truth and right, to which God himself conforms in his dealings with his creatures in whatever world. The ceremonial law, on the contrary, was binding on

the children of Israel exclusively, and that during a certain period only, for there was no *intrinsic* value in it. The statutes of this law had no virtue in themselves only as they were to answer a certain end, and when that end was accomplished, they were no longer binding any more than before their enactment. The command to Abraham to circumcise himself and his children, and also the command to sacrifice Isaac, were positive. These duties were not binding before enjoined, nor afterwards by virtue of any intrinsic good in themselves, but only because commanded. This brief statement, we think, will justify us in saying,

2. The obligation to obey a positive law arises *solely* from the authority of the law-giver.

Our obligation to obey positive laws arises not from the nature of the law, but from the *authority* and will of the legislator. If God commands a thing which before was indifferent, it is as much a law as if it were ever so good in its own nature, and is binding whether we see its necessity and utility or not. Take as an illustration the positive order to Abraham to sacrifice Isaac. We might quote numerous Pedobaptist writers in proof of what we have said above, and may say hereafter in this article on positive precepts. We refer the reader to Butler's Analogy of religion, Part 2, Chap. 1; Jonathan Edwards' Sermons on Imp. Sub. page 79; and to numerous other writers whose remarks on positive institutions are given by Mr. Abraham Booth in his Pard. Exam. Vol. 1, pages 1—43. The words of Dr. Sherlock carry in them such a strong reproof of Popish rites, that I cannot forbear quoting his remarks. He says, "What is matter of institution depends wholly upon the Divine will and pleasure; and though all men will grant that God and Christ have always great reason for their institutions, yet it is not the reason, but the authority which makes the institution. Though we do not understand the reason of the institution, if we see the command we must obey; and though we could fancy a great many reasons why there should be such an institution, if no such institution appears, we are free, *and ought not to believe there is such an institution, because we think there are reasons assigned why it should be.*"

3. The *law* of the institution is the *only rule* of obedience. Positive institutions in religion derive their whole being from the *sovereign pleasure* of God. His pleasure in this case can be known only by his *revealed will*. Therefore, we cannot know anything about the precise *nature, design, objects* of them, or proper *mode* of administration, farther than the Scriptures teach, either in plain positive precepts or by clear example.

Not so in doctrinal truths. The difference between these and institutions is that, as Dr. Goodwin observes, "One truth may by reason be better fetched out of another, and more safely and easily than institutions. For truth is infinite in the *consequences of it*, and one truth begets another, but so institutions are not." That we must love God with all our hearts and our neighbor as ourselves, are fundamental principles; and all the various duties which they urge respecting God or our fellow-men, are but so many inferences and deductions from them. But when positive duties are under consideration, and the question is as to the *manner* of performing them, or who are the proper *subjects* of them, the case is quite different. The inquiry then is, what is the *sovereign will* or pleasure of God in the matter. And for intelligence on this point, we are in such duties absolutely dependent upon *Divine precept* or *scriptural precedent*. Baptism, the Lord's supper; or in the Old Testament, circumcision, or the command to Moses to make all things pertaining to the Tabernacle "according to the pattern showed him in the Mount," will illustrate this. It is on this principle that Protestants, Pedobaptist as well as Baptist, reason, when contending with Catholics about their claims to prerogatives and their numerous rites, viz. † that nothing short of an explicit grant, a *positive* command, or a *plain* example in the New Testament can prove their Divine origin. So Nonconformists demand of Episcopalians, saying, "*Produce your warrant* for this, that, and the other, *from our only rule of faith and practice, a Divine precept, an apostolic example relating to the point in dispute.*" So Baptists ask of Pedobaptists, Where is your Divine command or apostolic example in support of Pedobaptism?

4. The law of a positive institution must be so *plain* and

explicit, as to stand in no need of any other assistance to understand it, but the mere letter of the law. The language used should be as the words of a father to his family. *Baron Montesquieu* observes (Spirit of Laws, B. 29, Chap. 16.)

“The style of laws should be *plain* and *simple*, a direct expression being always better understood than an indirect one—it is an essential article that the words of the laws should be adapted to excite in every body the same ideas. The laws ought not to be subtle; they are designed for people of common understanding, not as an art of Logic, but as the plain reason of a father to a family.”

So say Blackstone and other law writers.

Ernesti (translated by Prof. Stuart) lays down a principle of interpretation, which we wish to quote in this place. “The *literal* meaning of words must not be deserted without reason or necessity.” We wish the reader to remember this common sense principle of interpretation, for it has many important applications.

*Mr. Benjamin Bennet :*

“’Tis a *reproach* to the Law-giver, *blasphemy* against him, to suppose that any of his upright, sincere subjects, cannot find out the meaning of his laws, with all their care and diligence, even in the necessary, essential points of their faith and obedience.”

*Mr. Bradbury :*

“The words of our Lord, Matt. 28 : 19, ought to be taken in their plain and natural sense, because they are a lasting form to the end of time. For Christ to give us expressions which people cannot understand would be only to *abuse* them. ’Tis unworthy of Him who is the Light of the world, in whose mouth there was no guile, (Such) is the plain and natural sense of the words, and therefore to twine and torture them with conjectures and *maybes*, is making Christ, not a teacher, but a *barbarian*, by not uttering words that are easy to be understood.”  
—Duty and Doct. of Bap. pp. 150, 173.

5. None but a law-giver himself has a right to alter a positive institution.

Nothing is more common than for *Protestant* Pedobaptists to

urge the necessity of adhering strictly to the original institution in administering the Lord's Supper, and to urge also the *absurdity* and *iniquity* of departing from it, on account of any supposed inconvenience. The same may be said with respect to every positive institution in religion. Dr. Clarke says:

"In things of external appointment, and mere positive institutions, where we cannot, as in matters of natural and moral duty, argue concerning the ground and natural reason of the obligation, and the original necessity of the thing itself; we have nothing to do but to obey the positive command. God is infinitely better able than we, to judge of the propriety and usefulness of the things he institutes, and it becomes us to obey with humility and reverence."—Expos. Church Cat. p. 305.

6. Nothing must be added to or taken from a positive institution.

This remark is repeatedly made by our Pedobaptist brethren.

*Dr. Owen :*

"That principle, that the church hath power to institute or appoint any thing, or ceremony belonging to the worship of God, either as to matter or manner,—lies at the bottom of all the horrible superstition and wars that have for so long a season spread themselves over the face of the Christian world."

*Archbishop Hall :*

"God will bless nothing but his own institutions. The inventions of men in serving God are as unprofitable as they are wicked and presumptuous. See Deut. 12: 31, 32. We cannot think God will honor the inventions of men however they may be dignified with the specious names of *useful, decent, agreeable* or *prudent contrivances*; yet if they are an *addition* to his system, will he not say who has required these things at your hands."—View of gospel church, pp. 33, 82.

7. It is highly criminal to neglect or slight a positive institution.

The force and sacredness of the Lord's Supper and Christian Baptism have been frittered away very much by calling them "mere ceremonies," "non-essentials," "abstractions," "shadows," ceremony. Well, was not circumcision a cere-



mony? And yet it had almost cost Moses his life for neglecting to circumcise his son. Ex. 4: 24—26. So for their abuse of the Lord's Supper, ceremony though it be, some of the church at Corinth were sick and weak; others fell asleep, i. e., died; and if God did so severely punish the abuse, how think you to escape if you neglect the use thereof. Though ceremonies, they have the sanction of Divine authority.

But they are sometimes called, and that too by professed Christians, "abstractions," "non-essentials." Do those who call a *positive* institution of Christ thus, know the full import of what they say? What would a parent think of the respect paid by a child to the family government, who should call some principle thereof an abstraction, &c.? What would a teacher think if pupils call the rules of schools non-essentials, abstractions? Or a wise legislator, if the people call his laws thus? Or a king, of his subjects? What then must Christ think of those who call his positive precepts or institutions by such names? This is most daring impiety. It is positive *blasphemy*, if done with intent.

8. Nor will a wilful or voluntary ignorance in the least diminish the crime of neglecting a positive institution.

The criminal course in such cases is generally non-inquiry, laziness, prejudice, lust, pride, passion. We will merely add here that it is at every man's peril, how he comes not to know the will of God, as well as not to do it. As Dr. Grosvenor remarks, "We must look to it *how* we came not to see the appointment, and must answer that to God and our own conscience. It is not enough to say, Lord, I did not know it was appointed; when the answer may justly be, *you never inquired into the matter*. You never allowed yourself to think of it, or if you did, you resolved in your mind that *you would not be convinced*. You made the most of every cavil, but never minded the solution to any of your objections."

**ART. II.—CURSORY REFLECTIONS UPON THE EVIDENCES OF A GOD REVEALED IN HIS WORKS.**

Back amidst the scenes of its earliest years the heart often loves to wander, retracing on the swift wings of the mind the highway in the journey of life which it has already traversed, and which to the youthful vision seemed to extend immeasurably in the distance as the eye of imagination gazed upon its long, rugged ascent up the high hills of the future and saw it lose itself behind the western horizon of old age. At the still twilight hour, as the shadowy curtains of night are being drawn around, before the lamps of worldly care are lighted, many a bright picture of the past enchains the soul, till wholly absorbed in the revery we revisit the old, familiar haunts of childhood, and forgetting, for the time, it is not real, we again hear the loved tones of brothers and sisters, chase again the butterflies by the roadside, again join in the sports of our school-fellows, and again roam over the green fields and pastures, through the forests, beside the river and lake, happy with the chosen companions to whom we have given the preference of our young hearts. Every pleasure we then tasted, once more we enjoy, reviewing our course from year to year—now sad at parting with friends, now joyful in meeting them, and in the warm grasp of affection's hand, and now weeping at the grave of those we have long cherished, as we laid them in the cold ground to see them no more—thus living over each scene of the past, till we arrive at the present, when with tender and chastened feelings we turn away from our dreamy reflections to plunge once more into the active duties of life. The hour is gone, but it is not lost. As the gentle shower of summer revives the fields, parched by the sun in his meridian heat, so after the toilsome hours of a long day, this little twilight revery of the past refreshes the mind and invigorates it for future action. It brings vividly before us every error we have committed, and by the evil consequences attending, warns us to beware of the same fault in time to come. And thus we are stronger, better pre-

pared to meet the vicissitudes of fortune and resist every temptation which may be before us.

In like manner the Christian student may have his piety deepened, his faith strengthened, his hopes made clearer and brighter, and his whole heart encouraged by devoting a portion of his time, not only to reflecting upon God's dealings with himself and with the patriarchs, apostles and martyrs of whom the world was not worthy, but by often contemplating the wisdom, power and goodness displayed by the almighty Architect in the works of his creation. And the eye need not gaze far or search long for the evidences of a Divine Intelligence. They are all around us. The walk of a balmy morning in summer, when the gentle breezes fan the brow, and the melodious concert of birds make the groves vocal with their wild warbles, is peculiarly fitting for contemplating the works of God. The very grass that we tread upon has written upon its spires the name of its Creator. A flower blooms in our pathway; we examine it—number its leaves and petals, and observe the form of each. Now, wherever that flower grows, on mountain or plain, in the old or new world, it has just so many, and just such shaped leaves and petals, and its properties and qualities are the same in nearly every respect the world over. If there is no design in this, why is it so? Why is it, with hardly an exception, that we find just three leaves on clover, year after year? Why is it that the same species of trees in different countries have the same characteristics? That just so many leaves grow on one stem together, never varying in form? Why have similar species of birds, of animals, even on the distant islands of the ocean, with very slight variations, the same plumage, the same notes in their song, the same habits, subsisting upon the same food, and living the same number of years wherever and however distant found. Chance has no answer for such interrogations. The mouldering ruins of Central America tell us that mighty nations of intelligent men once dwelt there. Equally do these things tell us that some Being has given them their unvarying form and established the laws that they observe. They speak to us of a power above man— infinite and eternal.

“ In reason’s ear they all rejoice,  
And utter forth a glorious voice ;  
Forever singing as they shine,  
The hand that made us is Divine.”

And the more critically the natural world is examined, the more evidently revealed is its Author. Remove from the earth the weeds and trees, and only the seemingly useless plants, leaving just enough for the food of animals, and the atmosphere would soon become more deadly than the exhalations of the pestilence. All have seen vapors arising from the ground, especially in marshy places. These vapors are poisonous to the animal creation, but the life of the vegetable. The lungs of plants are their leaves, which absorb the gases generated in the soil or breathed into the atmosphere from the lungs of animals. See here the wise economy: plants inhale carbonic acid gas and exhale oxygen; animals inhale oxygen and exhale carbon. Neither could exist under the present arrangement without the other. Hence wherever we find plants we find animals. Now, who established this reciprocal relation between them? Is here not evidence of an intelligent Creator? And is not the pious Christian student’s heart made better, more fervent in its adorations of the great All-father, as he reflects upon these evidences of his wisdom—these hidden mysteries—mysteries hidden, at least, from the superficial eye?

But again, did we stay to examine minutely everything before us, we should find more wonders than the mind could contain, and eternity itself would hardly be sufficient for the examination of this single globe we inhabit. The Bible declares to us that the earth and all upon it were fashioned by the same Almighty Hand. And the truth is also written in the book of nature in characters too legible to be mistaken. The whole process of the earth’s formation from the time the huge, shapeless mass first began to assume symmetry of form, till its Maker pronounced it good, we may trace with all its changes, revolutions and advances. And as we contemplate that the matter which composes its entire body has existed in some form for an almost indefinite time, under the moulding hand of a directing Intelligence, and that probably not a particle has been lost,

does it not increase our faith in the protecting care of our Heavenly Father? And as we reflect upon these changes, do we not feel assured, perfectly assured, that it was our God, our Father, who, when the dark waters covered the surface of our world, caused its internal, volcanic action, by which continents were thrown up on which vegetation flourished with primitive luxuriance long before the most inferior animal had an existence?

The science of geology teaches us that such revolutions have taken place. Reason teaches us, as we see the evidence of law in all these movements, that there must have been a Governor. Geology teaches us also that the very lowest order of animals was created first, and afterwards the higher; and then those of monstrous size, which for ages roamed over the hills and valleys of the earth, the sole occupants of its islands and continents which were not yet prepared for man, the noblest work of Him who made all things. But in process of time the Spirit of God moved again upon the face of the earth, and a great change took place—a deluge swept over its surface. Mighty, resistless, it rushed on, swallowing up flower and tree, bird and beast, carrying in its waves the seeds of plants mingled with the fragments of vegetables and animals, and the tops of hills and mountains, and depositing this solution everywhere as the soil for the future world. Continents were raised and sunk. It scooped out valleys and elevated hills, changing and giving form to the earth till it should be a fit habitation for the superior intelligence about to be created. Such is the manner in which geology demonstrates the earth to have been formed. It has arrived at its present maturity by gradual developments, just as the oak is created—not at first with its towering height, its large and firm set trunk and loftily spreading branches, but a germ from an acorn, and then a twig, a sapling, and finally a tree. Yet notwithstanding this slow process of development, no one ever doubts that it is any the less the work of God. There is no chance about these things. They all take place in accordance with law. The reflecting mind sees regularity amidst all these seeming irregularities. The evidence of design which they bear upon their face is too plain to be mista-

ken. It is manifest to any critical observer that the soil of the earth is composed almost entirely of the wrecks of former animals mingled somewhat with vegetable ruins and the detritus of mountain rock. Can we not then see a design in the creation of those monsters that once possessed the earth, in that state of the earth so favorable to luxuriant vegetation, when ferns were of the size of our tallest pines, and in the creation of the high hills and mountains? All this was necessary to prepare a fit habitation for man. Let the pious Christian student see in this the infinite love of his God for his children.

Again we learn from our Bible that the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the world shall be on blaze. Every chemist knows how easily this could be done by changing the elementary proportion of the atmosphere. Every one knows who has made the experiment, that the two principal constituents of the air—oxygen and nitrogen—mingled in any other ratio from what we find them, would be a thousand times more inflammable than gun powder. What a proof too of his goodness, that his Fatherly care never fails to be exerted for our preservation, when by a slight variation in its composition, the air which we breathe, and which penetrates into the most hidden recesses, would be turned to flame, and the whole world be wrapped in one inextinguishable blaze in an instant! And then, too, the globular crust of the earth we tread upon, gather our harvests from, and upon which we build our cities with so much security, is undoubtedly filled with a liquid mass of fiery matter, which would render it as explosive as a bomb-shell, were it not for the volcanic outlets. What an evidence of a designing Mind! What a wise provision in making volcanoes the safety valves of the earth! Let them be closed for a moment, and the fragments of our world would be hurled in ten thousand directions. Whenever, then, doubts of a God enter the mind, or we begin to lose our love for him, and we begin to feel that we are our own keepers, and that there is not an overruling Providence, let us remember that the constant suspension, over our heads, of a drawn sword, by a single hair, would not be half as much to be dreaded as to inhale a single breath of air, or remain upon the earth for a moment, if the special

influence of God's power should be withdrawn in the least degree. For what but his power can it be, which prevents the slight change in the composition of the atmosphere, which in its terrible consequences would be the destruction of all animal life?

Thus the more we study the works of the Creator, and the better we become acquainted with the operations of the natural world, the more we see the evidence of such a being and our dependence upon One above ourselves to protect us from instant danger; and the greater is the gratitude that rises from our hearts to his adorable name whose merciful kindness never fails. And how conspicuous is his benevolent love to man in adapting to all his wants the means of their peculiar gratification. Every faculty of body and mind yields pleasure in its legitimate use; and the natural world is wonderfully calculated to call them all into exercise. The better we understand the formation of the earth, the more we shall be convinced of this, and the more will the conclusion be forced upon us that there is no chance about it, but that God has wrought it all. Why is the surface of the earth so diversified? Why are there hills, mountains, valleys, rivers and seas? Suppose the mountains should be levelled into the valleys, so that the earth's surface should present to the eye one continued plain, how dull and monotonous it would seem, and how long would it be a fit habitation for man? The ocean might overflow its bounds; there would be no increase of the soil by detrition, but a marsh of pools; no running streams—no living springs; there would be a dead calm in a large part of the atmosphere, and no man could breathe it—it would be as deadly as the simoom of Africa. So that if God should suffer the mountains and hills to be washed into the seas and valleys, the earth would be uninhabitable—without form and void. Why is three-fourths of the earth's surface water? Because, were the proportion smaller, there would not arise vapor enough to render fruitful the soil. Do we not then, by reflecting upon what God has wrought for us, by his wise arrangements in the natural world, see clear evidence of his existence, and have our affections drawn out towards him? When we think of him in this

light, can we help loving him? His wisdom and goodness, however, are not only seen in what we have mentioned, but had we time for examination, we should find them equally displayed in everything around us—in the winds, the clouds and rain; in light and darkness, heat and cold; in the thunder and lightning; in the vast ocean,

“ Where the Almighty’s form  
Glasses itself in tempests ; in all time,  
Calm or convulsed ; in breeze, or gale, or storm,  
Icing the pole, or in the torrid clime  
Dark heaving ; boundless, endless and sublime,  
The image of eternity, the throne  
Of the Invisible.”

All these, the better we understand the reasons for their present arrangement, the laws which govern them, and the manner in which they operate, the plainer speak their Author’s name, and the more we realize our indebtedness to him not only for our being, for the prolonging of life every moment, but for its continuance to us under circumstances that render existence pleasant, and not a burden too heavy to be borne.

The structure also of animals, and especially the anatomy of the human frame, cannot fail to cause, by the proofs they present of a designing Mind, one to say with David, “I am fearfully and wonderfully made.” We shall find symmetry and beauty where they are desirable; strength where it is required; and in all we shall observe a general adaptation of means to ends; the eye to light; the ear to sound; the hand, the foot, and every organ to its peculiar use; and each affording pleasure in its proper exercise; and what is more, all as mechanically arranged, and governed by laws as simple as the different parts of a watch. There are the complicated uses of the nerves, muscles, veins, lungs and numerous other organs of the body, which force one to exclaim:

“ Strange that a harp of thousand strings  
Should keep in tune so long.”

And yet these are all so philosophically arranged, that if one



should ask himself the question, how he could improve upon the plan of the great Architect, so as to secure at the same time symmetry of form, easy and graceful motion; strength, durability, self-movement and self-adjustment by which the system is kept naturally in repair, often from fifty to a hundred years—if any one, we say, should ask this question, after a thorough understanding of what it implies, and be an atheist, he must be blinded by prejudices or incapable of appreciating an argument. Ah! it does the heart of the Christian student good at times, when his faith in a Supreme Being grows weak, his view of the distant hills of Canaan dim, and when the vapors arising from the dark waters of the Jordan have shut from the sight the Promised Land, where

“ Sweet fields, beyond the swelling flood,  
Stand dressed in living green,”

it then does him good to reflect upon these evidences of the God he worships. It strengthens him, nerves him for the moral contest he is waging; and invigorated by it he can buckle on his armor again, and in the spiritual warfare contend, under the standard of the cross, more earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

And again, when we consider how much care there has been bestowed upon the formation of our bodies, the question forces itself upon us, Was this all by chance? No, God has made it for the indwelling of an immortal soul. And just here a practical suggestion may be added. If the great God has taken so much interest in us, what manner of persons ought we to be? Should we abuse the bodies that he has formed with such exquisite skill, by indulging in dissipation and revelling in wanton excesses, violating physical laws, and recklessly yielding ourselves up as slaves to every unhallowed passion, till the beautiful house we live in has become only a shattered frame of dilapidated ruins, where fiends and unclean spirits alone dare venture, holding satanic orgies and celebrating with infernal glee the jubilee that the reign of the powers of darkness has proclaimed to the heart's worst, vilest propensities and desires? No; God will not thus be mocked. He visits the pen-

alty of such outrages, not only upon the guilty head of the offender, but upon the third and fourth generation, by inflicting upon them bodies wedded to disease and marred with deformity, as a patrimony entailed for life.

But were this not the case, such condescension, from so great a Being as is manifested in our physical arrangements, ought to awaken in our hearts the deepest gratitude, and cause us to endeavor by every effort in our power to make some slight return for his voluntary love, and not show ourselves entirely unworthy recipients of his distinguished favors. If there is one sin in the whole catalogue of human vices that is blacker in its hue than all others, and which especially demands the detestation of every heart that has the least claim to manhood, it is the base, earth-born sin of ingratitude. Other wrongs may be pardoned; but when we have done all we can to aid another, spent our time and strength, often unable to sleep, our anxiety for him has been so great, and when our endeavors have been blessed, and we have seen him enjoying their fruits; then to have one thus indebted to us, become dizzy with the elevation of prosperity and turn coldly from us, and what is more, impugn our motives, repeat slanderous falsehoods against us, and abuse us in every manner which an evil heart, intoxicated with the pride of success, can suggest or imagine—this, this is almost too much for human nature to bear. And yet this is precisely the course which that man takes towards his God, who violates the physical laws of his being, and suffers his noble, manly frame to become prematurely diseased by neglecting to take proper care of it or by sensual indulgence. God has done too much for man for such an ungrateful return. As he stands forth in his manhood's prime he is the lord of creation. And of what a creation is he the head? For him was made the earth, beautified with its rivers and lakes, its mountains and valleys, its diversified woodlands, its golden sunsets, its spring-time and harvests, its warbling songsters of the grove, its cattle upon the thousand hills, its delicately tinted flowers with their spicy odors; and, in short, with everything that can delight the eye, charm the ear, or afford pleasure to any of his

physical senses. There is music for him in the ripple of the brook, the sighing of the breeze through the forest, the murmur of the distant waterfall, and in the roar of ocean's wave. There is quiet for him in gazing upon the slumbering landscape, sweetly reposing in the beams of moonlight. At such an hour,

“ How beautiful the azure lake !  
 How lovely—still—its water lies !  
 How glassy, calm—no breath to wake  
 The slumbers of the mirrored skies !”

However ruffled may be the spirit when gazing upon such a scene, it gradually melts away from its sternness and becomes subdued and calm. Byron has sung,

“ There is a pleasure in the pathless woods,  
 There is a rapture on the lonely shore,  
 There is society where none intrudes ;”

And who has not found it true? Who has not felt at such a time his heart glow with adoration to his Heavenly Father? There is peace in nature, and it soothingly quiets him who places himself under its influence. But man should not always be alone. There is for him the purest, sweetest enjoyment in his social relations. Here again we see how wisely Providence has arranged everything with reference to man's happiness. He might have created him without the faculty of speech, or any of the warm sympathies for his fellow brethren, which now make life so delightfully pleasant, sweetening every bitter hour of existence, and elevating the whole being from earthly grovelling into the pure ether of spiritualism. Behold here, then, the evidence of a benevolent God. See here what he has wrought!

But we may not linger longer here, although the voice, which is heard from all these, is musical and sweet as the chime of distant notes of melody, floating over still waters at the mellow hour of twilight; and especially so when with an ear attuned to the harmony of nature, we can hear in the language they utter the name of our God, and catch the low, soft cadence of their

up-rising anthem to praise him for what he has wrought, till it vibrates along every nerve, and our whole being is enraptured with the strains of universal love.

Upturning our eyes from these, the light from a thousand orbs above falls upon our vision, and as we gaze from each there comes a voice ascribing all the regularity seen in the motions of the planets and all the glory of the star-lit skies to their Great Creator, God. And as interesting as this earth is to us, they tell us it is as a grain of sand upon the sea-shore, a speck, as the small dust of the balance, compared with the innumerable worlds which have been spoken into existence by the Almighty fiat. All those brilliant, starry gems that scintillate as diadems on the queenly brow of night,

“ When chilling winter spreads his azure skies ;”

and when are sparkling in all their transcendent glory Orion and the Hyades and Pleiades—those constellations undimmed by the lapse of time, which patriarchs and sages of old gazed upon, numbered and gave a name—all those and ten thousand thousand more are worlds, in every probability, inhabited by rational, immortal beings, beautified with forests, running streams, oceans and lakes, hills and valleys, and in all respects exhibiting the same marks of Divine wisdom and goodness as our own.

Now, call to mind that a single leaf of a tree often supports myriads of insects, too minute for the naked eye to discover, that the purest water which bubbles from the living spring, is all alive with animalcules, and then think of the countless forests of countless worlds, the mighty oceans of water, the multitudes of human beings which no man can number, that, from our world and others, have already passed into eternity and have become fraternized with the hosts of angels good and evil; and remember also that the Great Jehovah sees them all, and knows their names, having spoken them all into existence and assigned their spheres of action, and who can help exclaiming, **THERE IS, THERE MUST BE, A GOD, A GOD OF INFINITE WISDOM AND ALMIGHTY POWER.** And what is man that he should raise the puny hand in rebellion against such a Being! What is all

the wisdom, pomp, luxury, and power of this insignificant part of his creation! This earth, with all its inhabitants, and the sun and all the stars yet revealed to us, might be swept into annihilation to-day, and yet none of the beings in the eternal world, save the Almighty, perceive the loss from his infinite creations. Think, ye who disobey him, whose laws you are transgressing, what a God he is! Gaze upon the mighty wheel of iron as it majestically performs its revolutions, with cogs nicely adjusted to the cogs of other wheels; and then, place your head within the power of its crushing teeth to stop its motion and your destruction would not be half so terrible and sure as in resisting the authority of Jehovah. The Hand that holds the stars in their orbits, as mighty sentinels over our slumbering earth must be so all-powerful that it could crush to atoms in an instant, a whole universe of rebellious beings. Self-existent, eternal, there has been no shadow of changing; but while before the birth of time immovably fixed in power he has remained in his own infinity and everlastingly so shall remain.

“The seas have changed their beds—the eternal hills  
Have stooped with age,—the solid continents  
Have left their banks,—and man’s imperial works,  
The toil, pride, strength of kingdoms, which had flung  
Their haughty honors in the face of Heaven,  
As if immortal,—have been swept away,—  
Shattered and mouldering, buried and forgot.”

And not only does God remain thus immutable amidst the changing of all things else, but he does so from his own free choice. And here is the Christian’s hope. As he gazes upon the twinkling gems that adorn the night, he is not only sure that they are the same stars that Abraham, Isaac and his Saviour gazed upon, but he is assured that no blind fate of heathen mythology has guided them thus unerringly in their sublime pathway but an intelligent and a wise Being, a kind Father touched with the feelings of human infirmity; and one, though so powerful and great, who yet will not suffer him to be tempted above what he can bear.

But there is a creation of our God's more noble than this earth and all the planetary or starry system—it is the immortal soul. Whilst all things material must have an end as well as a beginning, we are assured by the pages of inspiration and reconfirmed by the universal belief of all nations and tribes of every age of the world, that the spiritual part of man can never cease to exist, but, if uncontaminated in passing the fiery ordeals of this world, it will go on through the eternal years of infinity from perfection to perfection till it reaches a state of beatitude too glorious for finite conception. Skeptics, in their mad absurdities sometimes assert that the formation of the earth is the result of the natural laws of matter; and that a peculiar state of the atmosphere and earth possesses a generating power by which all the genera and species of animals, and lastly mankind, were brought into existence; but never in their wildest flights of imagination, their boldest speculations or most thorough investigations in the arcana of nature, have they attempted so to account for the origin of a soul, an immortal intelligence. They find it easier to deny a future state of existence beyond the death of the body, than to account for the beginning of such an existence without God. Yet they know they are thinking, reasoning beings; their consciousness compels them to admit this, and they know that the atmosphere and earth, under any state of actual or conceived combination, do not possess these attributes. The veriest skeptical visionary the world ever saw, will not for a moment pretend to such absurdities. Then how can these two substances or a hundred more, which, neither singly or together, show the least indications of possessing such properties, impart what they have not to another substance? There is no intelligence in one grain of sand or a thousand; in any one of the gases composing the atmosphere, or all of them together. What then can come of nothing but nothing, however combined in imagination? And then if not here, whence came the soul but from the creative energy of Jehovah? Go back as far as we may, there must have been a first time when God, having made a human being, breathed into him an immortal spirit; and whenever that time was, it must have been a miracle—a departure from the *then*

course of nature, and a sure indication of the existence of an omnipotent Creator. For the soul never spake itself into existence—it must have been created. But how created we know not. The mechanism of the human frame we can imitate,—we can analyze and tell the composing elements of the bones, muscles and nerves, and in some instances have succeeded in re-composing organized bodies from their constituents; but the soul, what do we know of that? In what part of the body does it reside? How it is connected with it, or what is its form or essence baffles the understanding, eludes the research, and is one of the greatest mysteries in the whole universe of creations. Everything we see about us, everything we ourselves can form, is perishable. How great, then, the wisdom displayed in creating a thinking, intelligent being, that, subject to no laws of decay, should continue to all eternity! Angels, the first-born of our God, must have gazed with astonishment into illimitable space, and seen worlds and systems of worlds in the process of formation, but how much more mysterious must have seemed the creation of immortal spirits like themselves, to inhabit these worlds! To the real Christian immortality is a glorious thought. There is nothing so consoling to his heart whilst enduring labors and pains of body, vexations and anxieties of mind in this world so full of temptations, as the hope that when he has passed through all these trials, suffered his last sorrowful pang, and resisted the seducing allurements of sin for the last time, that when there are no more scoffs and jeers from the skeptic to grate harshly upon his sensitive ear, and that when his faith shall no more be tried by the seeming withdrawal of his Heavenly Father's countenance, then his soul shall burst through its prison house of clay, and with an escort of angels, soar away from all the jarring discord of earthly passions to mansions glorious, beatific, eternal. Every devoted child of God knows that such thoughts cheer many a gloomy, desponding hour of life, lifting the soul, for the time, above its all-crushing pressure, and filling with bright visions the eye of faith, till the whole being is pervaded with a sweet calm, a glow of heavenly joy. A single practical suggestion here may not be out of place. Take from us health and the

means of gaining a subsistence, remove the friends we love the dearest, and those we trust the most, blight every earthly prospect in the future of this world, but leave us the assurance of immortality, and the hope that we are, day by day, approved by our Saviour, and that we shall yet receive his benediction in the spirit-world, and we will not murmur, God assisting us, at any dispensation of his providence, however bitter may be the cup to drink.

And had our Heavenly Father done no more than to give us an existence with such high hopes before us, eternity would be too short for our gratitude to equal his goodness. But he has done more, he has wrought a work for us which exceeds all the other works of his hands. He has redeemed us. When in solemn conclave, angels and archangels sat around his throne to listen to the astounding corruptions of the whole world, not one of those mighty intelligences could have devised a plan whereby man could be won back to a life of purity. In such a council, silence must have reigned. Astonishment must have held them dumb as the Divine mind unfolded the magnitude of the design. And when the solemn question was asked, who is sufficient to become incarnate and undertake the redemption of this lost race, not an angelic spirit in all that vast, innumerable throng but what must have shrunk back and shuddered at the fearful undertaking. And yet God, in the person of his Son, has undertaken the salvation of man, and is sure to accomplish it. A work which angels desire to look into, and which no doubt they are ever celebrating on golden harps in the streets of the New Jerusalem. And how fearfully guilty will those be who, regardless of his condescending love in forming and beautifying the earth for their habitation, in bestowing so much care in creating their bodies, in breathing into these temples of clay an immortal spirit, and in redeeming it, when it had fallen from its integrity, by the precious blood of his Son, who, we say, notwithstanding all this, are led away by evil passions, slaves to sensual gratifications, and refusing his proffered terms of pardon, deny his right to rule over them? This is certainly a consideration worthy the attention of every intelligent being, a consideration so weighty that we may well be



pardoned for its introduction here. God will not be mocked with impunity. He notes all of our deeds. Nothing is concealed from him. His eye is everywhere—in the uttermost parts of the earth, in thick darkness, in heaven and in hell. His laws pervade all space, and his power to execute them is infinitely absolute.

God made eternity; where finite wisdom loses itself in immensity—the understanding of man being too feeble to embrace the idea.

“What is eternity? Can aught  
 Paint its duration to the thought?  
 • Tell every beam the sun emits,  
 When in sublimest noon he sits;  
 Tell every light-winged mote that strays  
 Within his ample round of rays; †  
 Tell all the leaves and all the buds  
 That crown the gardens and the woods;  
 Tell all the spires of grass the meads  
 Produce when spring propitious leads  
 The new-born year; tell all the drops  
 The night upon their bended tops  
 Sheds in soft silence, to display  
 Their beauties with the rising day;”  
 Tell all the sand the ocean laves,  
 Tell all its changes, all its waves,  
 Or tell with more laborious pains,  
 The drops its mighty mass contains,  
 Be this astonishing account  
 Augmented with the full amount  
 Of all the drops the clouds have shed,  
 Where'er their watery fleeces spread,  
 Through all Time's long-continued tour  
 From Adam to the present hour;  
 Still short the sum—It cannot vie  
 With the more numerous years that lie  
 Imbosomed in eternity.”

Let the mind wander forth into infinite space on the wings of imagination, let it soar to the utmost verge of creation, and still there is space beyond. Let it then fix an-

other limit, infinitely distant from this, and when it arrives there, what is there beyond? Space still. Even so is the duration of eternity. It is often said that if a bird could take a grain of sand from this earth and speed its way to the most distant star, so distant that its light may never reach the earth till the final consummation of all things, the time must come when that bird would remove every particle of our world, even though millions on millions of years were required for that conveyance of a single atom of matter. And yet when that time should arrive, what is there beyond? ETERNITY—STILL ETERNITY!

O! what hath God wrought! Or rather, what hath he not wrought! From the smallest insect which the most powerful microscope can scarcely reveal to our vision, to the huge monsters that roam the unknown waters of the deep; from this earth with all its continents, oceans and islands, to the innumerable systems of worlds that wander pathless through infinite space; from the dark despairing spirits of the lost, to the glorified beings of heaven; from time past and present to the uncomprehended ages of eternity—all, all have been wrought by the hand of an omnipotent God! Nothing is too minute for his eye—nothing too great for his power. Knowing the secret thoughts and intents of all hearts, his own purposes and designs are above the understanding of any, only so far as he voluntarily reveals them.

“In its sublime research, philosophy  
 May measure out the ocean-deep—may count  
 The sands or the sun’s rays—but God! for Thee  
 There is no weight nor measure;—none can mount  
 Up to thy mysteries. Reason’s brightest spark,  
 Though kindled by thy light, in vain would try  
 To trace thy counsels, infinite and dark;  
 And thought is lost ere thought can soar so high,  
 Even like past moments in eternity.”

Such is God and such his works. In our review of what he has wrought, we have been like one gathering up a few choice pebbles on ocean’s shore, selecting one here and there

as fancy or chance might dictate. And if, by the examination our hearts have not been made better, if our views are not more comprehensive, and if the comparative value of the selfish enjoyments of this world do not sink in our estimation when contemplating the glories of a future existence, it is not because the themes we have dwelt upon are not calculated, in the highest degree, to excite such feelings in the human mind and heart. Let the wanderer from his father's roof, who has passed through scenes of bloodshed and danger, and revelled years in the lowest sensual gratification, till his hardened heart can blaspheme the name of his God, or he can take the life of a fellow-being with all the careless indifference requisite to sit down to a banquet of feasting, let such a one in some forgotten corner unexpectedly discover the Bible, which was his mother's parting gift, with his name, the name by which she has often called him, written in her well-known hand, and how it will disturb the fount of feeling! It will recall at once all the happy days of his youth, when his heart was as innocent as light, when the smile of his parents rested upon him, and when morning and evening they invoked the blessing of God upon his head. And tears of remorse will flow down his cheeks, long strangers to such tender drops.

So should he feel, who, when contemplating the works of God, sees an evidence of his existence, a manifestation of his benevolence to the human family which he had not discovered before or had long since forgotten. It should touch the chord of love in his bosom, and with tearful gratitude his heart should be raised in a hymn of thanksgiving to the great I AM.

## ART. III.—THE BIBLE.

In this article, our object is to show the great utility and beauty of the BIBLE.

The Bible is a book from God to all the world—the only book adapted to all ages, all conditions and events in time. This book cannot be studied too much, understood too well, or its laws too universally obeyed. This is the light of the understanding, the joy of the heart, the purifier of the affections, the mirror of thoughts, a promise for hope, a consoler of sorrow, a guide to the soul, and a history of heaven, earth, and hell—a description of the past, present, and future. It is a book nothing can be added to, or taken from, without marring its grandeur or injuring its beauty.

What an endless variety of thoughts, couched in such a wonderful mass of beautiful figures; what lofty themes and sublime subjects are treated with perfect ease! How resplendent with natural beauty, illuminated by a thousand varied lights and studded with as many ornaments! The Bible has but *one* declaration to make, and it utters that with the voice of a God, through a created universe. Shining from the excellent glory, it came through a myriad of intervening objects, that it might be adapted to our earthly vision. It is arrayed in charms of truth, more wonderful than fiction. It has culled the choice beauties of creation, and arranged them in artless style for the benefit of the human soul. The spirit, thoughts, acts and passions of men are penned with a master hand, in such a manner as to influence every one to good.

The fishes of the sea, fowls of the air, beasts of the field, the flowers of the garden, stars of heaven, all the elements of nature, pay tribute to enrich the book of their Maker, God. The lion, shaking the dew from his mane; the wild roe leaping over the mountains; the lamb led in silence to slaughter; the cattle upon a thousand hills; the dawn of the morning kissing the rose of Sharon; the lily bowed with diamond dews; the useful apple-tree; the barren fig-tree; the foaming war-horse; the plodding ox; the great rock shadowing in a weary land; the

majestic river enriching dry places; the moon, leading a host of virgin stars; the dews on the brow of the morning; the rains coming on the thirsty land; the rainbow encompassing the landscape; the light, God's shadow; the lightning, his glance; the thunder, his voice; and the wind, the sea, storm and earthquake are his terrible footsteps. All such varied objects are made as if naturally designed in their creation to represent Him, to whom the Book and all its emblems point. The powerfully inspired intellects who composed this Book, seem at home everywhere; and have brought creation as a morning sacrifice to lay on Jehovah's altar. There these emblems as sweet incense, burn, unconsumed, from age to age, giving Divine light to all generations. We will consider **THE SUBJECTS OF THIS BOOK AND WHAT IT TEACHES.**

It stoops not to teach any of the sciences as such; nor does it contradict any of the true sciences. Philosophy, astronomy, meteorology, geology, and even theology, as systems, it leaves for men to frame and study with the widest speculation and largest toleration. Language, arts, logic, rhetoric, metaphysics and mathematics, as such, are not to be studied in this volume. It deals specifically with no subject which man could study elsewhere as well; but reveals those lofty themes unaided intellects could not have reached without the Bible. It has the amplest, clearest, highest, grandest, and most sublime subjects that ever occupied the minds of men. They startle the mightiest intellects, arouse the keenest perceptions, are above the profoundest reason, and overwhelm the loftiest imagination. They come over the world of mind, not as weak suppliants, but to command the highest admiration and strict obedience.

What transcendent ideas in the opening sentence of the Bible! The human mind is introduced to the Infinite of every possible perfection, in the inconceivable act of speaking an incomprehensible universe into existence, order and beauty. Transcendentally wonderful! A word! a world! That WILL, infinite law! What a work, to sprinkle sunny star-dust, and people infinite space with the sublime citizenship of *boundless worlds!*

. This is the first subject, the first work of an Allwise Infinite

**Mind.** This subject embraces all others, and is enough for all created minds to speculate upon and investigate eternally. All the elements of our wonderful globe, their origin, mission, and end; the origin, progress, and consummation of all nations that dwell on earth, starting from the blood of one man—all are in this Book. We have also here the answer to that vexed point, "The origin of evil," its blackness, terrors and destruction. In this volume is the wonder of miracles, the secret of prophecy, the mystery of death, the power of the resurrection, the consistency of a general judgment, the melting elements, the endless hell, and the *new heavens* and earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness and glory inconceivable. Such are the themes of the Bible. The weakest minds have been comforted by them, and the most profound intellects have not comprehended them; for the Book is the fountain of history, the source of true poetry, the foundation of modern civil government, and the real confession of faith for all Christians.

How does the Bible compare with other books? There is no comparison, as will be seen from stating a few facts. The Bible is a solitary book! It claims no relation to any other; it is independent of all others; it imitates none, copies none; hardly alludes to any other; seldom, if ever, quotes any other; and thus, by its majestic silence in relation to all other books, is proof of its own originality and power. Like the loftier chain of mountains on earth, it lends its streams and rivers to bless all below, but never borrows from any. Its writers are humble, firm, God-relying men. John never speaks of Plato, nor Paul of Demosthenes, nor Jesus of any writers, save Moses and the prophets.

The book speaks itself, of itself, quotes itself, and interprets itself. So high and lofty are its regions of thought, one feels blowing on his moral temples, and stirring his life-blood, the free, original, ancient breath of the upper world, unmixed and irresistible as the mountain tempest.

From whence came I? What am I? Whither go I? What shall I do to be saved? How shall I be peaceful, resigned, holy, hopeful in this life? How happy hereafter, when the body drops, as a cloak, from the living soul within?

To these questions neither the Iliad of Homer, the plays of Shakspeare, the works of Byron and Plato, nor any other book, gives a full and sufficient answer. But the Bible gives more than man can ask. And while bearing on its pages the hues of higher heaven, overtopping with ease all human productions and aspirations, communicating with Omniscience, and recording the acts of Omnipotence, how wonderful it is that, at the same time, it is the Bible of the poor, ignorant, and lowly, the crutch of the aged, the pillow of the widow, the eye to the blind, the child's own book, the young lady's friend, the young man's guide, the emancipator of slaves, a city of refuge to the captive, and angel-whispers to the dying! It is this Book, and this alone, which utters the cry, "Look unto me, all ye ends of the earth, and be ye saved."

One common door is opened to the great, throbbing heart of suffering humanity, disclosing supplies of the Infinite in the inner heaven. Enough for all—every being and every want. O! BOOK OF BOOKS! It proclaims its unearthly origin, and shows that the blotting out of the sun could not be more lamented, or a greater loss, than the extinction of the Bible. For, while other books are planets, shining with borrowed radiance, this book, like the sun, shines with original and Divine glory. Other books have their loftiest altitudes arising from earth; this book came down from heaven. Other books appeal to the passions, fancy, or understanding; this book to the very soul. Other books seek our attention; this book commands it. It speaks with authority; and it is the authority of Omnipotence.

Other books guide gracefully along the winding ways of earth or onward to the mountain-summits of the ideal; this, and this alone, conducts up the stairway of the skies, to the city of light. Other books, after shining their little seasons, may perish in flames, like those which destroyed the Alexandrian Library; this must, in its essence, remain, pure as gold, and a thousand times more valuable. Other books may pass away, like bubbles, on the stream of time; but this book shall remain like a boundless ocean and the brightness of the eternal firmament, forever and ever.

Byron has said—

“ Within this awful volume lies  
The mystery of mysteries,  
Happiest they of human race,  
To whom our God has given grace  
To learn to read, to fear, to pray,  
To lift the latch and force the way;  
But better had they ne'er been born,  
Who read to *doubt*, or read to scorn.”

Let us now consider some of the circumstances under which this profound Book originated. This wonderful Book borrows not a hint, and confesses nothing to the march of human intellect. It is before, and the foundation of, all modern and moral reforms. It was issued in numbers; but not from doctors, professors, or presidents of a refined age of letters, schools and colleges. It is not a product of over-strained and jaded brains, cramped by fashion, chained by custom, and made soft and sickly in heated rooms—human pens of brick and stone walls. The Bible comes not from countries made effeminate by luxury or weakened by a degenerating civilization. Not only the superior of all books, but it steps forth the first in time, in quality, in worth, and without an equal.

The geography of the land of the Bible is an illustrative commentary on its compositions and writers. It begins not with a solitary mountain, or seven hills like Rome, or an island, like Britain, or with a continent like North America.

The land in which the Bible originated was a young and virgin world, bookless and schoolless, to be educated, governed and saved. The writers of the Bible were educated, but not schooled men. Their studies were the arched heavens, their apparatus a well stored universe, and their teacher God. They seem to have lived in the heart of nature, and the eye of the world. The sun looked on them from the prismatic east; they drank in fire, the hallowed fire of eastern day, from an hundred sources in the mornings of unclouded brightness, amid sparkling dews, blushing flowers, and luxuriant vegetation. They had, too, their hills and valleys, their running brooks—a



land flowing with milk and honey. The land of the Bible is a land of brightest skies, and the blackest heavens, of the loftiest crags, and thunder-split hills, a land swept by sudden tempest, made desolate by whirlwinds, rocked by earthquakes and starved by famine. Yea, it is a land of mountain goats, wild leopards, the crouching lion, and lofty eagle. These writers, with a few exceptions, were peculiar to their times; runaway slaves, shepherds, hunters, fishermen, and tillers of the soil. Their manly forms breathed the well oxygenated mountain air, their brain was vigorous, and their iron muscles were well knit with toil, fatigue, fasting and frequent travel. "They were mighty men of old," moral and intellectual giants, grasping immense subjects and thoughts, and doing a great work on earth, and they have gone up to be angels around the burning throne. The age and manner in which this master production was given, commencing with Moses 1700 years before Christ, and closing with John nearly 100 years after, and embracing only 1800 years of the darkest ages, with some sixty-three different thinkers and writers, living hundreds of years apart, conspire to make it still more a wonder, and a moral mystery among books. And when it is found to be the first book written, containing much important history of the past,—poetry, the life of all the present,—laws for all human beings,—prophecy, all the developing, transcendent future, it will be seen that it is perfect, a complete whole, containing more than man can think or ask; and a spontaneous outgush of the soul, exclaims, "THIS IS THE BOOK OF GOD TO MAN."

The Christian, the philosopher, the poet, the naturalist, the student, the aged, the man and even the child, all dwell with peculiar emotion on the fearful scenes of the Bible. It is a panorama of a world, which entertains and astonishes heaven, earth, and hell, with wonder. Come, then, all who love the wonderful and sublime, come, and let us ascend the lofty mount capped with glory. Come up, higher, and yet higher. Climb up yonder over all the rocks and rubbish of man's speculations; higher and yet higher go. There, on the loftiest peak, pictured by a well-refined imagination, take your position. Wait a moment. Compose all your thoughts—summon all your powers.

The first great scene of the Bible, is to open to you the richest grandeur mortals can conceive. Adjust the telescope of faith to the eye, turn backwards, take an intellectual sweep of powers and forces, clear back before time began, before all worlds, and all created beings. Sunless, starless, empty, boundless, eternal SPACE, and an INFINITE GOD. ALL ROOM, and all POWER! Everything is to be accomplished when God begins to work.

Eternal silence breaks! The voice of God fills space! Creation's morning dawns! The light shines, and there has commenced the first of the six, most wonderful of all days' work—most wonderful, whether they are to be interpreted as literal days or immense cycles. Mark well the shining footprints, the handiwork of the Creator in the birth of infinite systems and worlds.

The formless sea appears—dark, undefined, deep-heaving waters,—and above its surging waves, the brooding wings of the Eternal Spirit are felt. Then the expanding firmament arises, dividing the waters from the waters. Then the sky arches, day and night divide, and are like lights and shadows; and the sun paints the flower beds, landscapes, and glows with its prismatic hues in the rainbow. He speaks, and again there starts from boundless seas the mountain peaks, a globe of earth, an island for the blessed, amid the heaving waters.

Another command is given. The nice affinities of matter assume their motions and positions. Plants, shrubs, and trees, bearing fruits and seeds, spring forth to life and perfection, according to established laws. "Nature sows and reaps herself" for ages all untold, save in the stony records of our globe.

Once again, the creative *fiat* is heard; the startled waters leap forth, alive with the finny tribe, from the huge monster to the minnow, to live and sport amid its briny waves. Aye, mark,—the dust of the earth is living, too. It creeps, it runs, and flies.

Thus the vast temple, with its ample apartments, was finished and furnished; but the lord of the mansion has not arrived; the armies are ready, but the commander is wanting; the stage is erected, but the actor is behind the curtain. The origin of man! What a mystery to the learned, who are ever coming

to a knowledge of the truth! The ideal of vain philosophy is progression, endless, of infinite nothing; eternal laws without God or cause. Hear it. A matured oyster, a developed fish, or unfledged bird, or an educated, genteel monkey, are claimed as the progressive forefathers of many of the modern philosophers, and who can dispute their origin, when listening to their reasoning?

But, as for man, this old Book, which always utters that which is true and great, declares that God, in council with himself, said, "In our image let us make man." Yonder, see that beautiful, human form; each feature is perfect. A model man! God, the designer and workman!—Angels stand gazing, wondering and admiring, when a soft breeze, filled with odoriferous perfumes sweeps by; the nostrils of clay become elastic—extend, the bosom heaves, the eyes open, a smile plays on those lips. The angels sang, and all the sons of God shouted with joy; for the first man is created; not developed from fish, beast or bird. Thus the heavens and earth were finished, with a man to name, tame and rule all beneath him. By his side blushed beauty, in woman, the mother of the race. And they were not in a savage condition, but in the garden of God, in paradise, where every form was beauty, each sound music, and every act bliss. Hear the poet:

"From sapphire fount, the crisped brooks,  
Rolling on orient pearl and sands of gold,  
Ran nectar, visiting each plant, and fed  
Flowers, worthy of Paradise which not nice art,  
In beds and curious knots, but nature's boon  
Pour'd forth profuse on hill and dale and plain.

\* \* \* \* \*

Groves whose rich trees wept odorous gums and balm;  
Others whose fruit burnished with golden rind,  
Hung amiable, Hesperian fables true,  
If true, here only, and of delicious taste.  
Betwixt them, lawns, or level downs and flocks  
Grazing the tender herb, were interposed,  
Or palmy hillock; or the flowry cap  
Of some irriguous valley spread her store,  
Flowers of all hue, and without thorn the rose."

Thus the heavens and earth were finished, and God rested on the seventh day, and sanctified it, making a Sabbath for a world.

The curtain drops. Man falls. The world becomes corrupt and for lack of repentance, is baptized in an awful flood, which washed away a world of sinners, not from, but in, their crimes. The purified earth arises from the watery grave, and from God, the Almighty administrator, receives the right hand of fellowship, and is re-peopled.

The second scene of the Bible opens with the sound of the trumpet, on Mount Sinai, which waxes louder and louder as the world grows older, and the millions of Egypt's slaves (God's emancipated freemen) standing around that bare, dark, craggy mountain, wrapped in a mantle of clouds, rising above all the surrounding hills, capped with fire, the lightnings playing about the summit, thunders crashing continually, the trumpet which shall call the dead, sending forth its awful key-notes, causing the whole mountain to tremble, and above all, at regular intervals, the voice of God uttering those thoughts which burn, in tones of thunder, which the people begged nevermore to hear. And the lone man, Moses, is climbing the lofty steeps, amid clouds, fire, smoke, thunders, lightnings and the voice of God, until he stands face to face with the universal Lawgiver. That was a scene fearfully grand. There, forty days and nights, he waits, in legislative council of the King Eternal, until that finger dipped in glory, which had touched the firmament, and left in its trace the silvery path, the milky way, cuts the most comprehensive of all codes of laws on the tables of stone, statutes that may be introduced into all nations, written on all hearts, kept in all consciences, and become the universal practice of all men—**THE MORAL LAW**. All our duty to God and man is comprehended in four words, **LOVE GOD, LOVE MAN**—a condensation which may be expanded into all the emotions, desires, affections and conditions of the whole race of men. All civil codes should be based on these words.

Here you will allow me to give a quotation from Prof. Wines on the Jewish laws :

“ Governments are constituted for the benefit of the many, not the few. While in most ancient empires and governments the people were regarded as of very little importance, everywhere, even in the States which boasted of their freedom, the masses were degraded, brutalized, and oppressed by arbitrary power.

To this rule the Jewish republic formed an illustrious exception. Liberty to the masses, general competency, physical comfort, ease of mind, repose and opportunity of reflection, moral and religious instruction to all classes, equal laws, equal rights, and equal justice. These are the paramount features of the Hebrew constitution, so far as its political relations were concerned; and they mark its kindred to our own and set it widely apart, and distinct from all other governments, which existed with it, and for many ages after it.

*It was not in Greece* that liberty was born and cradled; this idea is, indeed, taught to our youth in the halls of learning, and proclaimed to our people from the halls of legislation. But it is none the less an error. Far other and higher is the origin of a blessing, so intimately interwoven with the welfare and progress of man. It was not the wisdom of Greece speaking in the halls of either philosophy or legislation, but the wisdom of God, speaking from heaven, through his servant Moses, which taught mankind the doctrine of popular rights. Nothing can be wider of the truth than the idea that it is in the political forms and usages of Grecian and Roman commonwealths we are to seek the origin and elements of our own republican institutions. No; but it is in that admirable frame of government, given by the oracle of Jehovah, and established by the authority of the Supreme RULER of the world, that we find the type and model of our own Constitution. Even the Declaration of American Independence, that terrible hand-writing on the wall of despotism, which has troubled the thoughts of many a tyrant,—that glorious pledge of liberty to the oppressed of every clime, was but an echo from the deep-toned thunders of Mount Sinai.”

Such are the precepts and laws of the Sacred Volume. They are golden rules, a perfect law of liberty, a form of government for Church and State in all ages of the world. They are laws better than the Medes and Persians, so perfect they never can be altered or amended for the better. They are laws balanced by eternal justice, their executive, God; their fulfilment, everlasting life, and their penalty, eternal death.

From the scene of the flaming mount and the burning law,

we pass down through the rise and fall of empires, the crumbling of nations, the darkness of heathen worship, the finger-pointing prophets, amid sacrifices, offerings, ceremonies, the priesthood, and temple worship to the great system of mercy, where the rainbow of love spans the moral heavens, where mercy and truth meet together, and righteousness and peace kiss each other in the Lamb of God, a sacrifice to take away the sins of a world.

On this most wonderful of all scenes, we must dwell a few moments, though eternity alone shall unfold the riches of its glories.

We will now briefly consider the person, character, attributes, life and death of Jesus Christ. Such a complicated, distinct, lofty, lowly, yet great central character has appeared on our globe but once.

All conquering warriors, deified men, fabled gods, poetical incarnations, fill the lying classics and swell the pages of heathen mythology. But the New Testament has a description of but one God, one incarnation, one life of sinless perfection, one efficacious death, and one triumphant resurrection. This is poetry, truth dwelling in beauty, humanity exalted, and saved by being united to Divinity,—God and his church in Jesus Christ.

Bonaparte said, "Jesus Christ was not a man. Men I know, and I know that Jesus Christ was not a man." Poor Bonaparte, better had it been for him if he had known Christ better. Byron said, "If ever man was God, or God man, Jesus Christ was both." This was the Logos.

Our incomprehensible book says, "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead, bodily. Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; 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."

To cleanse a world from sin, to purify Adam's race, to save from the torments of hell, and elevate to heaven was the work of Jesus. Never was there such a work to be done in so limited a period; from the manger to the cross, God manifested his wonders through the man. One whole life without a fault,

mistake, lust or hate. Not a thought, look, or emotion, but what runs in the exact channel of human rectitude. He did the most exalted things without the least manifestations of pride. He preached the doctrines of the absolute religion, so that it rebuked all false religions, he fed multitudes, opened the eyes of the blind, healed the lame, calmed the storm, walked the waters, cast out demons, composed the maniac, and raised the dead. The air was rent with the shouts of applause. Town, city and country were forced to publish his reputation. He moved with the majesty of a king, and he was feared as a God. No flattery could debase, no temptation could turn him aside, no insult could provoke him; pride, anger, malice, and revenge, in their combined forces, in Judea and Rome, spent all their power on the lone Nazarite. Yet he was calm, collected, self-possessed, and triumphant in all places and under all circumstances. In the hottest of the battle, with the greatest odds against him, under the most adverse difficulties, he bears away the palm. Who in spirit has not visited Jerusalem? attended that mock trial, heard the hooting mob, saw Judea's and Rome's allied forces, the world and hell in arms, to crush out truth? Who has not seen that purple robe, that terrible crown of thorns, the iron spikes, the hated cross, the sponge, the vinegar, the spear, the hardened soldiers, and the tender, weeping Marys? Above and higher than every other object was that composed yet suffering Christ. Love, pity, justice, pardon, and power, all glowed in that wonderful countenance, worn with care, weak with hunger, burning with thirst, faint with the loss of blood, the thorns chafing the temples, the tender nerves grating on iron spikes, the whole fleshly form quivering under the sins of a world, in the worst torture. Yet in it all, what a look of God-like forbearance and submission; not an imprecation, not a murmur or a curse. O, provoking earth! O, maddened hell! thou hast tried the love of heaven, and in his agonies, those parched lips, breathe only love and mercy. To the trembling mother he said, "Behold thy son." To John, "Behold thy mother." To another sufferer, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Forgetting himself, he remembered only the sin-cursed world. How that prayer, the prayer that moves three

worlds, echocs over the reckless mob, and the whole sinful race of men! "*Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!*"

But O, the last great death cry! Every enemy has been met and vanquished, save this. The struggle comes, the king of terrors is met, the great Conqueror (Jesus) allows himself to be led into the prison house of universal death. The Divinity withdraws from the humanity, and he exclaims, "MY GOD! MY GOD! WHY HAST THOU FORSAKEN ME?" "IT IS FINISHED. IT IS DONE."

The circumstances attending this death were worthy the character of the object. While he was suspended, the pulse of the universe seemed now to stand still, and now, to run on in the fiery haste of a feverish paroxysm. There was a great earthquake, as he turned the key in death's door; that key that never turned before. The adjacent graves opened, and his voice startled the slumbering dead. The rocks were rent as with a burning hand, and it seemed as if that same hand ran along to tear the veil of the temple asunder from top to bottom. About the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land, until the ninth hour.

It was meet that a deep darkness, a darkness which could be felt (expressing the *anger* of God, the evil of sin and the anguish of the Saviour,) should cover the whole earth—that nature, unwilling to look upon the features of her expiring Lord, should throw the dark crape of night over the scene! Nay, is it a conception too daring, that this night filled the universe, that all the bright lights of heaven were darkened over the Cross, that not one orb ventured to shine, while the SUN OF RIGHTEOUSNESS was in the eclipse of sin, that the shadow of Christ's dying brow swept over suns, constellations, and firmaments, for three hours, while Jesus hung bleeding? All was gloom and darkness, save the throne of God; but, as he passes away into the ancient Paradise, the pavilion of God, the battle fought, victory won, and captivity led captive; the eclipsed universe again beams forth with its wonted beauty and glory, and as Christ comes back from the dead, new light, life and glory dawn upon the race. The Resurrection of Christ is the type of the



resurrection of a sin-cursed and death-smitten world. It is the BIBLE, this much neglected book, that has marked the only way of escape from sin, death and hell. To the story of the Cross, and the Spirit of Jesus, may be traced all the great reforms now blessing the lost world. They are all found in this great commission—Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; and when this gospel shall have been preached to all nations, then shall the end come.

We now approach the last scene. But, who shall describe it, so awfully sublime and overwhelming? The end, the end, the final consummation of all things, all plans and all events.

Poets and learned men have spoken of this coming day.

“Great day! for which all other days were made;  
For which earth rose from chaos, man from earth;  
And an eternity, the date of gods,  
Descended on poor earth-created man;  
Great day of dread, decision and despair!”

“Amazing period! when each mountain height  
Outburns Vesuvius; rocks eternal pour  
Their melted mass, as rivers once they pour’d.”

“Eruptions, earthquakes, comets, lightnings play  
Their various engines; all at once discharge  
Their blazing magazines, and final Ruin  
Fiercely drives her ploughshare o’er creation!  
Above, around, beneath, amazement all!  
Terror and glory joined in their extremes!  
Our God in grandeur and our world on fire!”

“The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces, the solemn temples, even the great globe itself, shall waste away like a baseless fabric.” But it is the Bible, the book which gives such a graphic description of the beginning, that justly describes the closing scene.

In Daniel we read—“I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, the hair of his head like the pure wool: His throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A

fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousands stood before Him: the judgment was set and the books were opened."

The apostle Peter says: "For the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." The language of the revelator John is still more graphic. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." "And I heard as it were a voice of a great multitude, as the voice of many waters, and as a voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth." Amen.

Such is a brief review of the Bible, the God-given Bible. In it are the elements to make the man and educate the angel. It connects the beginning with the end, heaven with earth, man with God, sin with misery, righteousness with happiness, and time with eternity. Study it well, study it always, every where, at home, abroad, on the land, on the sea: make it thy parlor book, evening and morning book; put it, and keep it in all the common schools, in all the halls of learning; first in all libraries; in courts of justice; in the jails, poor houses, prisons, houses of ill-fame, and taverns and gambling houses; give it to India, Japan, China, and all the nations of earth, and do not forget the islands of the sea. From the loftiest monarch to the meanest slave, teach all to read and obey the Bible. When thou hast mastered this Book, communed with its Author, thou hast a passport for an endless pleasure excursion through the boundless regions of God's universe.

#### ART. IV.—RELATION OF MODERN PHILOSOPHIC THOUGHT TO FAITH IN THE GOSPEL

The world is still divided on the question, Is Natural Reason or Special Revelation the proper guide of men? It has been long debated, and with both fierceness and feeling. The controversy is not yet ended. The old combatants disappear only to give place to new ones; fresh issues spring up in the place of those which are extinct, and one battle-field is forsaken only to seek out another. Both parties claim and boast over the victory, and perhaps with about equal consistency. It would seem natural by this time to ask whether there is not room and service for both Reason and Revelation in the world; whether both do not bear sacred commissions; whether both do not speak with authority; and whether there is not a way of adjusting their differences and teaching them to work in harmony and help each other. It ought to be deemed a scandal that a philosopher should at once be suspected of skepticism, and that a devout Christian should be presumed a credulous, unreasonable bigot, without a hearing. We are surely in a sad plight if we can reach philosophy only by leaving faith, and can hold fellowship with the gospel only when we have crucified reason.

In discussing the Relation of Modern Philosophical Thought to Faith in the Gospel, it is necessary that we set out with a distinct understanding of our essential terms. Etymologically, Philosophy is the love of Wisdom; and if we were so to understand it, there would scarcely be room for a difference of opinion respecting the relation of study, prompted by that love of wisdom, to faith in Him who is the highest teacher and embodiment of real wisdom—the wisdom of God. But, as Webster says: "In modern acceptance, philosophy is a general term, denoting an explanation of the reasons of things; or an investigation of the causes of all phenomena, both of mind and matter. When applied to any particular department of knowledge, it denotes the collection of general laws or principles under which all the subordinate phenomena or facts relating to

that subject are comprehended. Or it is the hypothesis or system according to which natural effects are explained;” and by which facts are separated from semblances, and their existence sought to be accounted for. When human thought is occupied in this way it is described as philosophical thought; not always because it classifies and explains correctly, but because of the form of its exercise. Popularly speaking, we are said to philosophize, not so much when we are thinking closely, profoundly and well, as when we are thinking according to certain modes. Seeking to classify facts and phenomena, applying general principles to specific cases, tracing effects to causes, or inferring effects from causes, balancing probabilities, weighing evidence,—these are some of the principal ways in which the mind exercises itself philosophically. Modern philosophic thought, therefore, differs from that of any other period, chiefly by exercising itself on other subjects; by exhibiting *more or less* depth, breadth and clearness; by the different motives and spirit which actuate the thinkers; and by the different tendencies it discloses, and the different results which flow from it. Essentially, philosophical thought is always the same; in its circumstances and details it may be almost endlessly variable.

By faith in the gospel is here meant that hearty reception of the New Testament as an inspired record; that real belief in the truth of its great moral and spiritual doctrines; and that obedient and affectionate trust in Jesus Christ, whom it reveals as the only perfect Saviour, which makes the gospel the highest teacher of the understanding, and the mightiest quickener and purifier of the heart. To shorten and simplify our definitions, we may say:—Philosophical Thought seeks to interpret and harmonize nature and life by the processes of human reasoning; Christian Faith accepts Christ in his gospel as a higher and divine Teacher, and as a needed and perfect and ready Helper.

How do these two exercises of the human mind stand related to each other? is the question with which we are to be occupied:—or rather, How does the more prevalent style of philosophical thinking at the present day affect this faith in the gospel?

There are two methods of reply;—one is by carefully ana-

lyzing the two mental exercises, and so discovering their points of sympathy or antagonism; the other is by a careful collection and study of the facts which exhibit their reciprocal influence. The relation of a political office to moral integrity might be ascertained, either by determining how much pressure men's consciences can safely bear, and how sorely they are pressed in official life; or by counting up the actual occupants of official stations, and learning how many have come out from the ordeal as pure as they went in. It may be an easier and more satisfactory method to gather testimony from both these sources indiscriminately, whenever it offers itself. If the method be less exact, the lessons may be quite as lucid and as readily learned.

It is natural to begin the investigation by saying that philosophy and faith are both normal to the human mind. We were made both to reason and to trust; and that is but half a life which lacks either element. We have faculties for both exercises; and they were given, not for ornament or without a purpose, but for use. The world in which we live is full of stimulants to both sets of faculties. Circumstances are always occurring which impel both to reason and to trust. Necessity is laid upon us to do both things; or we suffer little penalties by refusing. He who will not reason must be a perpetual and pitiable, and, sooner or later, a fatal blunderer; he who will not trust must live a hermit and die a fool; for he can hold no fellowship with men without confidence, and all knowledge springs from axioms that will not be proved. It is the same mind that exercises both those functions, that shows itself in both these forms. And the propriety and the need of exercising itself thus, remain through all the stages of its existence, and pertain to every subject to which its attention is given. Whether a man be eating his dinner, or seeking the salvation of his soul, there is an opportunity and a demand for the exercise of both his philosophy and his faith.

Again. The gospel never proscribes reasoning or philosophical thought, nor intimates that such thought is necessarily hostile to the spirit it breathes or the life it prescribes. On the other hand, it makes its appeals only to thinkers. It demands

thought; it gets effectual access to men only through their thought. "Come and let us reason together," is the language of its Author, addressed to men in all times. The gospel itself reasons as well as announces; its logic is as sharp as its statements are wonderful. Never were syllogisms more faultless than are those it constructs. Nay, more; one of its chief complaints is that men will not reason over the great matters it propounds. "Israel doth not know; my people do not consider," is the complaint which Heaven is ever repeating and emphasizing over man's intellectual stupidity. He will not consider the operations of God's hands; and for this we are told that retributive discipline is ever on its way. The proper *authority* of the intellectual verdicts are distinctly recognized, when Christ says, "Why even of yourselves, judge ye not what is right;" and he makes a most important appeal to the *philosophical* faculty of his hearers when he tells them, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not."

All this implies that true philosophy is the ally and partner of a genuine faith. Their proper relation is not that of natural enemies but everlasting friends; their real function is not conflict but coöperation.

But does modern philosophic thought coöperate with and promote Christian Faith? Does the *theory* find verification in *fact*? Are our modern philosophers the most eminent of our saints? Are our boldest theorizers at the same time our devoutest worshippers? Is speculation coupled with prayer? Are those who claim to be preëminently the disciples of Reason most obviously the followers of Christ? Does Christian virtue generally thrive most where any phase of modern philosophy has acquired the homage of the people?

It would hardly be wise to answer these questions by a dogmatic or oracular monosyllable. And yet it may be freely said that there does not seem to be a very strong sympathy between the chief devotees of these modern philosophical schemers and those who are recognized as the truest Christians. We may go farther and say that it is rare to find a decided adherent of the modern philosophy who does not either confess his distrust of the Scriptures, or so interpret them that they are robbed of

half their meaning, and their power in the estimation of most who are recognized as Christian people.

There must be causes for this, whether we are or are not able to detect them. How and why does the philosophic thought of our day interfere with faith in the gospel, instead of promoting it? Why should it ever interfere? Is the interference real, or only apparent? Is faith really the loser through the philosophy; and if so, are the losses permanent or chiefly temporary? To some of these questions we may perhaps find a partial answer.

*How does philosophic thought interfere with faith in the gospel?*

1. It may do it by being excessive in amount. That is, it may be *relatively* in excess; for none of us can absolutely reason too much. The broadest generalizations of real philosophers are doubtless childish fancies in comparison with the common thought of superior beings; and even in comparison with what our thought may become in a higher state of existence. Still we may speculate and philosophize so much that no time or inclination or energy is left for those other forms of mental effort which promote the spirit and enlarge the power and sphere of faith. A farmer who gives all his dressing and labor to his orchard, will have a sorry looking cornfield. His fruit-bins may have a fine appearance, but nobody who felt any interest in his real success could look at them without sighing over the aspect of the granary. Faith is the fruit of culture—not of general but of specific culture. And he who devotes the time and attention and effort to philosophy and logic which are needed for meditation and Bible reading, and prayer, and Christian intercourse and effort, can expect no other result than a deadening of his spiritual sensibilities, a dimness on his spiritual eye, a fading away of the great spiritual realities that once filled the firmament and thrilled the soul.

2. Philosophical thought may interfere with faith by means of the associations to which it leads. As a fact—whatever may be the significance of it—very many of the reputed lights in modern philosophy—whether they be stars of the first or twentieth magnitude, or of any other intermediate one—are avowed

or covert skeptics; not a few of them are backsliders from Christian professions if not from Christian principles; and the spirit they possess is such as to suggest that they owe the religion of the Bible a spite, and only wait a favorable opportunity to revenge themselves on it, by stripping it of sanctity and exposing it to reproach. Some of these persons are open-mouthed infidels, who can readily sneer at Christianity; others are "*rational Christians*," as they express it, steadily "progressing" from the simplicity and narrowness of their early faith to a broader and more comprehensive view of the gospel and of life. They declare themselves to have left, according to Paul's suggestion, the *first* principles of the doctrine of Christ that they may go on to perfection,—whereas the truth often seems to be that they have left its *whole* principles and gone on to perversity.

Now whosoever is strongly inclined to philosophical thought on religious subjects, is likely to be drawn, directly or indirectly, into association with this class of minds. The effect of such associations can hardly operate in more than one way, if they be persisted in through sympathy. The philosophical tendency will be increased, leading to excessive indulgence; the faith of believers often sneered at and caricatured, or sighed over as a weakness which every true man ought at once to overcome—this simple faith will soon part with the sacredness it has worn, and the peculiar virtues it promotes will at length be looked on as ignoble things. It is no place to nurture Christian faith in the circles where it is ridiculed as moral vassalage, or pitied as a mental weakness. Very few will come back from such places with the veneration for holy things which they carried there. It is not easy to stand firmly by a principle which our acknowledged teachers and intimate friends are fairly repudiating. And as the process of unbelief goes on, the tempted become at length the tempters—

3. Not a few persons entertain extravagant and erroneous views of Christian doctrine; subsequent thought and investigation may convince them of the error and extravagance; and they jump to the conclusion that the gospel is all a mass of irrational dogmas, because one of their own foolish notions of it



proved to be without foundation; and that every believer in it is just as simple as themselves in the faith he cherishes. Four-fifths of all the direct attacks upon Christianity are really attacks upon something else under its name, with which Christianity never had any real sympathy. Paine, in his *Age of Reason*, proceeds generally to frame some abominable statements, make the Bible seem to utter or endorse them, and then lets off his verbal indignation at the book and at all who have faith in it. Whether *he* had ever believed too much, and so sought to atone for it by disbelieving everything, may be a question; but it is just what not a few of the philosophers of modern times are accustomed to do.

4. There are not a few to whose reason the gospel has never seemed to make a real appeal; and when, at length, the reasoning faculty wakes within them, they enjoy its exercise, and turn elsewhere for stimulus, taking it for granted that the keeping of their faith will forbid all rational inquiry. The fault of this strange misconception sometimes lies chiefly at the door of those who are its victims, and sometimes it is to be charged to the account of those who teach them religion. Many persons take their religious faith on recommendation, without a word of personal inquiry, and hold it for a long time, so far as they really do hold it at all, without stopping to ask what reason they have for accepting or retaining it. Most people have a great horror of real patient thinking, in an independent way, on any subject; and the spite against such thought on religious subjects seems to be peculiarly strong and deep. They find opinions drawn out and served up to them in the church's creed or the minister's sermons, and so can supply themselves with a religious system in a very cheap way. It costs them neither money, thought nor time, only a quiet assent is demanded; and they hasten to take it as if inwardly chuckling over their favorable bargain; they leave it without examination afterward, as though they feared the evidence of a cheat. It is not strange that such persons should be perplexed when they find that their opinions are cavilled at, and be frightened by an opposing argument, and captivated by whatever has a show of reason that is offered as a substitute for their present unstudied creed.

The faith that comes spontaneously, or reaches us by the road of hereditary descent, is often of doubtful value; that which is born of mental struggle is a child whose life is wedded to our own.

Besides, it must be added, not a few of the set teachers of religion, in the pulpit and out of it, never try to make the gospel appear rational, nor seek to base its claims upon its rational consistency. They defy reason, and attempt to crush it into silence by authority. They warn their pupils against reason, as if one must become a dunce before he could become a Christian. That may do for a while with most reverent natures; it may always do with stupid or servile natures; but to many others of a higher stamp the reaction is likely to come. The reasoning faculty will at length awake; it will traverse all the fields of thought with increasing boldness and resolution; and the new experiences will seem like the starting up of a new life. Once awake and active, the philosophizing spirit cannot easily be quieted again. Hereafter it will raise its questions, suggest its doubts, examine, modify, and even reject what authority has long since and many times asserted. If the previous experience has been such as to satisfy the inquirer that philosophy will not be tolerated by the religious faith that was holden, then the faith will probably be suddenly or gradually thrown up for the sake of mental freedom; and the mental freedom is then almost sure to be abused. The philosophy becomes a battery whose ordnance is pointed at the retreating faith. The unreasoning Christian has become the skeptical sophist. His faith was one which lacked philosophy; now the philosophy is one which is both near-sighted and cross-eyed.

5. There are many dogmas taught in the name of Christianity, which are exploded by philosophical thought; and these dogmas are not unfrequently accepted as fair specimens of what Christian sentiment is; and so it is all repudiated without farther inquiry, as a scheme, illogical, absurd, and monstrous. Any sentiment which contradicts intuition, fights against facts, is at war with analogy, and mocks at all plain reasoning, may perhaps gain the credence of enthusiasts, and get the endorsement of ignorance and thoughtlessness; but it cannot long pre-

serve its hold upon the sympathy of thinking men. That such sentiment is more or less promulged in the name of religion, cannot very well be questioned; and however unjust and illogical may be the procedure, and however unwarrantable the conclusions, not a few minds allow themselves to be pressed over to the ground of real skepticism. The philosophy has disproved more or less of the articles of the creed, and the next step is a repudiation of the gospel from which the creed makers profess to have drawn it. Instead of studying the gospel to see whether it teaches the falsehoods, they take the shorter but not the wiser course, and dismiss it as a fountain of falsehoods.

6. There are others who regard themselves as having discovered a new system of truth when they begin to pick up the first decided fruits of philosophical thinking; and become so captivated and infatuated that they deem philosophy is opening to them a new and higher spiritual world, of which Christianity and ordinary Christian people are wholly ignorant; or from which they are always seeking to keep men away. It would be immensely ludicrous if it were not so sad to see the credulity and presumption which are often exhibited here. A young man, hardly out of his teens, begins to reason over moral subjects—begins some years later than an ordinarily bright mind ought—and the first logical conclusion he draws inflates his vanity and gives him a most exaggerated idea both of his personal importance and his spiritual possessions. He gets the merest smattering of science, and is astonished and enraptured at his own wisdom;—and looks down half in patronage and half in pity upon the mass of people about him, supposing them as benighted as his former self. He says some simple thing about the laws and the order of Providence, in a tone which implies that he deems himself uttering the most novel and wondrous profundities. He stumbles upon an objection against the accuracy of the Scripture record, an hundred times repeated and as many times answered, and he pets and parades it as though it were a great and original invention, outrunning all the highest achievements in theology. He lays hold of a principle familiar to all intelligent Christians, and supposes he has found

the key which will unlock all the secret apartments of the universe. He does not know that every sound principle which his philosophical thought has shown him was long since assigned its place in the scheme of Christian truth, and that the unsound ones were long ago tested by Christian scholars, exposed, labelled, and cast out to be the scorn and warning of all future times. To this class of persons Christianity, as taught in the Bible, is an antiquated and deceptive scheme; their new philosophy is either a substitute of greater value and richer promise, or a revised and improved edition of the gospel, bringing it down to meet the larger wants of this wiser age. They insist that the universe ought at once to be cleared of all mysteries and apparent discrepancies; and because their philosophy has just helped them to remove one apparent contradiction which long since ceased to be such to all intelligent observers, they jump to the conclusion that the world is to give up all its secrets to their "open sesame," while reverent students of the old Bible must forever grope in darkness. No age has wholly lacked examples of this pitiable, presumptuous empiricism; but few ages have shown a larger, a weaker, or a more bigoted and pompous collection of such specimens than ours. And this weakness has not only appeared in society, and indulged its carping in sanctuary pews; it more or less infests our churches and dishonors our pulpits.

7. Another way in which this philosophical thought operates against the development of Christian faith, is in keeping its disciples so busily occupied with the study of natural-physical law, and the observance of physical regularity and order, that law and order come to seem the mightiest things in the universe. Philosophical thought is generally and naturally engaged in studying finite and secondary causes—local and diversified phenomena. It deals with what may be seen and felt—its chosen realm is the lower and the more material world; and this is often studied as though it comprehended the whole universe of being.

Law is glorified, but the Lawgiver is unrecognized; order is worshipped, while He who established it and preserves it as a ladder by means of which the soul might climb to his feet, receives

no homage, and is hidden from the dull eye by the very creation which was meant to symbolize and reveal him. And, in proportion as thought is taught to stop in phenomena, it comes gradually to ignore and then to discredit the Cause. As the order of the universe is studied, it comes at length not only to see "Heaven's first law," but to seem even Heaven itself. The view of regularity shakes the faith in special intervention; and because there is so much teaching done in the orderly way, the ear hears no utterance from the lips of the special messengers. Because miracles are against the observer's experience, there is a tendency to strip the gospel of everything miraculous. Counting up so constantly, the pillars that make the great temple of nature stand so firmly, they forget to ask of Him who reared the temple so gloriously. Studying the complex and admirable mechanism of creation, they have no eye to see the Infinite Artisan who sits above it; and while they watch its steady movements, they overlook the subtle but omnipotent spiritual influences that animate while they transfuse it through and through.

There is scarcely need of saying a word by way of showing how this kind of philosophical thought operates against Christian faith; for the two fundamental ideas of Christianity are, first, the being of a personal God, and second, the constancy and the universality and the freeness of that special influence which he is forever exerting in the accomplishment of his highest moral ends. A materialistic philosophy is forever the secret or the open foe of the religion taught in the New Testament, and made mighty by the work of faith.

8. This philosophical thought, being simply an exercise of the intellect, it becomes disproportionately developed. The culture of the heart is neglected; and Christian faith implies and springs from a right state of the affections quite as much as from a vigorous activity of the intellect. A pride of intellect is thus nurtured; the sense of dependence and the meekness of humility are greatly wanting. Such men presumptuously and proudly trust their own insight instead of seeking God's guidance; and lean on the deductions of their own logic instead of falling trustfully back upon the offered arm of God's faithful-

ness. So long as men assert the adequacy of their own wisdom and strength and skill, feeling that they can and will get on without any appeal to or help from God, Christian faith is impossible; for that always implies the sense of ignorance and weakness, and the earnest craving after heavenly illumination and support and sympathy. And the philosophical thought, which is now so prevalent, is more apt, judging from its effects, to scoff at than to seek after humility; it abounds in pomposity far more than in prayer; and would rather scale heaven by audacity than win it by love.

9. Another way in which philosophical thought interferes with faith is, by being made prominent as a feature and so powerful as an influence in our colleges and seminaries. Very largely our public spirit, aims, and life are determined by these educational influences, directly or indirectly. Our teachers are a great power in society; and their empire reaches to the individual heart. And a large portion of the minds, that are afterward to be the leading and controlling minds among a people, are developed, trained, and directed largely by this body of educators. They are taken at their plastic and formative period, and the influences surrounding them are full of moulding power. And that formative influence is only the more effective because its methods are so subtle and its action so silent. And the fact that philosophy is so much commended there, and faith is so much ignored; the fact that the intellect is so stimulated to explore, and the heart is so little pressed to submission; the fact that honors and applause so wait to reward the student, and so little of deference is guaranteed to the Christian—this fact may do something to explain why science is so often reproached with unbelief, and the true martyr-spirit is so often branded as enthusiasm.

10. And, finally, the direction which a large part of our philosophical thought is taking and the objects about which it is chiefly conversant, suggest a reason for its practical hostility to faith. The triumphs which are now most sought and most gloried in are triumphs in the material realm. Research, invention, skill,—all these gravitate downward rather than upward. Outward gains are almost the only ones which the mass of men

recognize. Anything which saves labor and rewards it better; which opens new fields for money-making and keeping; which exhibits new resources in the earth or the air, that can be wrought for outward enrichment;—anything which does this is pretty certain to be praised liberally and liberally paid for. The effect is obvious enough. Material demands bring material supply. The loud call for delvers in the earth is responded to, and the laborers come crowding up, asking only to be told where they shall dig, and for the certainty of being paid a good price for the service. Whether it be the cunning of the fingers or the cunning of the brain that is wanted, it can be had by the seeking; whether it be the strain of the muscles or the strain of the intellect that is required, either will be given in return for adequate compensation. As a result of this tendency, speculative thought takes mostly this material direction, and busies itself with these material objects and aims; and so largely overlooks the great spiritual interests with which the gospel specially concerns itself. Philosophers are evermore seeking to give full answers to the question, “What shall we eat and what shall we drink, and wherewithal shall we be clothed;” while heaven is ever ringing upon dull and stupid ears that other question, “What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?” The fewest voices seek to reply to that.

Such seem to be the more prominent ways in which modern philosophic thought operates to interfere with the growth and exercise of real Christian faith. Illustrations of these various forms and effects of them might easily be adduced, drawn from the circles of life with which we are all more or less familiar; but the presentation of them would have made this paper considerably longer than it is; and besides, examples of these methods of thinking, and of the disastrous results of them, will doubtless readily occur to almost every mind.

But there are two sides to this question, respecting the relation of philosophy to faith. If the discussion were to rest here, it might be inferred that philosophical thought was a calamity to men, and ought to be thoroughly and earnestly discountenanced by every Christian teacher. And the case might seem

still worse; for such styles of thought are almost inevitable where intellect is awake, and righteous toleration takes the place of bigoted proscription. The alternative is to go back to mediæval darkness and vassalage, or risk the development and increase of this philosophical method of thought. And it is natural to ask if there are not other tendencies in it, and other results flowing from it, which exhibit its alliance with faith, and its power to promote it. May it not so work as to help the gospel instead of hindering it? Indeed, is not its power in this direction already, to some extent, made manifest? Are not its first fruits already appearing, giving promise of a rich and precious future harvest?

It only remains now to attempt an answer to these questions, and so to estimate the character of that influence exerted by philosophy on faith, consistent as a whole, in amount and time.

Philosophic thought may help faith,

1. By promoting activity of mind, and so providing for an interested and intelligent attention to the claims of Christian truth when they are presented. It renders minds capable of comprehending and appreciating an argument, of perceiving and weighing testimony, and of judging with more accuracy when a point is proved. One of the commonest and largest difficulties to be overcome in dealing with minds religiously, is created and preserved by the want of habits of thought among hearers. There are many in every religious congregation who find all reasoning, deep; and all systematic evidence, dry. It is almost impossible to prove a point to them so that it will remain proved as long a time as was occupied in framing the argument. If really reached, they are chiefly reached by influences that appeal to sensibility—a sensibility which rises and falls in the changes of moral temperature, like a column of mercury in the thermometer in March. Now an ability to think philosophically—still more the love and practice of philosophical thought—put minds into a new relation to Christian truth. They are interested hearers; and there is a basis upon which to build a hope of effectually reaching both understanding and heart. They already hold, through their logical thought, the



premises of the argument whose conclusion is a testimony to the divinity of the gospel.

2. Habits of philosophical thought will enable the Christian teacher—in the pulpit or out—so to state the truths of the gospel that they shall get the endorsement of thinking men, instead of shocking their understanding, and provoking resistance by extravagant assertions and transparent sophistries. He is not helping but hindering the progress of the gospel who deals in over-praise; who claims more for it than the truth warrants, or assigns to it a sphere and a work which are not its own. Christ asks nobody to tell more than the truth about him; and however high the motive in exaggerating, it is always a harmful procedure. Truth is always better than falsehood; and there is always far more power, and better, in the clear and distinct statement of a truth, than in the most noisy and enthusiastic ranting. And he who has learned to think philosophically, is thereby helped to state Christian doctrine truthfully, and with the best effect upon his hearers. He speaks then to minds which are fountains of power, and commends his message to the intelligence and the conscience of his hearers. The word is clothed with new authority, and felt with new emotion.

3. Philosophical thought may be an aid in purifying and perfecting faith. It is a sort of crucible where the dross may be purged away from the fine gold of Christian sentiment. The fault with many honest Christians is, they believe too much. Their faith runs into credulity. They confide where they ought to doubt, and assent where they ought to deny. They endorse contradictions; and are found fighting on both sides of a controversy. With the real truth they believe, they have associated the strangest errors, which rob the truth of half its natural power. Besides, there are other truths which consistency requires them to accept that are rejected; and others still that are only half comprehended, or have never been assigned their legitimate place. Habits of philosophical thought may render great service in distinguishing and separating the precious from the vile; in making religious sentiment harmonious and complete; and in giving to each truth its legitimate influence and place.

4. Philosophical thought tends to make one's faith more stable and enduring. He who, in accordance with the exhortation of Peter, is ready, and able, to give to every inquirer a reason of the hope within him, is not likely to have his faith shattered by every blow of skepticism, nor carried to and fro by every wind of doctrine, nor taken captive by every pompous empiric who announces himself the herald of a new era, or the apostle of a new Messiah. It is a melancholy fact that almost every ambitious aspirant for religious leadership has been able to palm off his system, in spite of its absurdities and vices, upon so many of those who had called themselves by the name of Christ. A multitude of unstable souls have been found, who would not hesitate to swallow the absurdities, as being either in keeping with their former faith, or as an explanation of it, or a supplement to it, or a fulfilment of its prophecies. The proper exercise of philosophical thought would prevent much of this evil. Opinions would be definite and firmly settled, and thoroughly embraced. We should have a great deal less of hereditary faith, and far more of that which is acquired. The soul's religious beliefs would not devote a passive acquiescence in venerable dogmas, either true or false; but would stand for the highest achievements of the intellect, and symbolize the noblest heroism of the heart. There would be a better reason for holding to a confession than that a long ancestry had sent it down as a legacy; it would be a mine of spiritual wealth out of which the soul had enriched itself without the fear of exhausting the treasure. A firm adherence to the doctrines of Christ would not be the fruit of prejudice or bigotry; but the fidelity of an intellect to its convictions, and the constancy of the heart to the chief object of its love. Errors, whether lifting up their voices in the desert or the city, would be left to preach into the air, or be exiled by the piercing glances they could not endure.

5. Striking another and a different view of remark, philosophical thought may coöct with faith in another way. Minds often reach a point, in their philosophical explorations, where they can get no farther without recognizing and accepting the doctrines of the gospel, or getting aid from revelation; and so, after repeated trials to go on, followed by repeated failures;

baffled in every attempt to overcome the difficulty; retracing every step they have already taken and finding it legitimate; testing every link in the chain of philosophical thought, by which they have been brought where they are, and finding it sound and unyielding; seeking, perhaps, to dismiss the subject of inquiry, and still finding it return with increased clamor; struggling to get on, and finding no guide for another step save the Great Teacher of Nazareth;—they at first listen to Him, then wonder, then yield to him, and at length walk on thanking God for divine illumination when human reason can grope its way no farther. Philosophy thus equips the mind, and sends it on its untried journey; and the path is found to lead to the Cross. The star lures on the eager traveller, but it stops short over the head of the Messiah, and will no more move forward till the knee is bent before him who proves to be the Sun of Righteousness.

6. Philosophic thought often throws light upon revelation, and so exalts, enlarges, and illuminates faith. David's meditation beneath the stars has been invested with a far loftier and profounder meaning since astronomy stretched the lines of creation away into the infinite space, and expanded each luminous point above us into a mighty centre of worlds. The care and sympathy which God exercises in behalf of his creatures, often asserted by the gospel, had never implied so much as since geological research laid bare his creative and providential plans, as they are sketched out on the rocky pages that lie beneath our feet. The old cities, which the Bible had alone described, and which skeptical historians were bent on resolving into fables, report their histories in the ear of philological exploration, and make the darker passages of prophecy flame with light. Every branch of science is illustrating Christian truth; all history offers testimony to the divinity of the gospel, and there is scarcely an invention but offers a new instrument to the hand of the gospel whereby it may the sooner and the more surely work out its ministry among men. From the valley where faith has walked in obscurity, philosophy offers her aid to lift it up to the mountain-top, where it may be transfigured before the eyes of the world. By exhibiting the works and interpreting

the ways of God, philosophy has pointed to his greatness as if she would teach and beget the reverence, the humility, and the sense of dependence which lead souls to the great Giver of help and life.

7. Philosophical thought discloses, increases and deepens the necessities which lie in the heart; and then, by only echoing back their cry for relief, it shuts the soul up to the only source of help. The more a mind expands with exercise, the broader the field of its exploration becomes, the more numerous the elements that enter into its interior life, the more its capacities are revealed, the deeper its experiences become,—just so much more imperative are its demands, so much the fiercer are its cries of "Give, Give." And it is the nature and office of philosophical thought to bring to the mind's own consciousness the vast capacities, the deep necessities, and the thrilling destiny that attach to it; while, at the same time, it becomes more and more inadequate to still or satisfy the inward craving. It awakes an aspiration that may nevermore sleep again, but it can show no worthy goal. It sets hopes germinating which it cannot mature into fruit; and it starts up fears it has no power to allay. It sets tasks which induce a weariness it cannot remove nor beguile; and provokes an inward hunger which it can feed only with husks. And by all this that it accomplishes and fails to accomplish, it may send the yearning soul at length to the feet of Him in whose sympathy and discipline all yearning is satisfied, and all real good is sure.

8. And, finally, so many of the gorgeous castles which philosophy builds are proved to be only cloud castles which any unexpected breeze may precipitate into confusion, and whose ruin any moment may witness; so many of its promises only cheat the believer; its pledges are so large and its performances are so small; it plans so broadly and executes so narrowly; its history falls so far short of its prophecy; its fancies are so gorgeous and its facts so contemptible;—so many of its oracles speak only to lie, and so many of its schemes are inaugurated only to fail;—so many of such developments have appeared that it may be teaching the lesson effectually to not a few minds that God alone is the Rock for men's feet and the

Refuge for men's souls. Philosophy has gone on repeatedly, with increasing presumption, to work out her results for men,—all the while ignoring the law of human duty and Divine retribution; and the bitter harvests, it may be hoped, have not been reaped in vain. The French Revolution proclaims forever that men cannot do without God; and that the deification of human reason heralds an overthrow and a Reign of Terror not less fearful than follow the worship of any other Baal. It matters little whether the retribution come through miracle or along the highway of providential order, its work will be surely accomplished, and its feet make haste. And the miserable failure of every attempt to substitute any scheme of philosophy for the redemption offered in the gospel, may be working the conviction—silently, but deeply and effectually—into men's hearts, that an obedient and affectionate trust in Jesus Christ is the only way of life, and the only path to redemption. And as, from the charred and blackened soils, over which the fire has passed, laying all the trees of the forest low, there comes up a greener and thriftier growth, so from the moral desolations which a blighting philosophy leaves in its track, may there come up more glorious forms of life, when a heavenly Faith comes on at length to restore the ruins of a blighted nature. When man's proudest temples have all crumbled, the soul may sooner learn to hasten to the Heavenly Builder, who puts forth his hand to make all things new.

Such are the ways in which philosophy may contribute to the growth and power of faith.

If it still be asked, whether the disastrous or the beneficial influences are the more prominent and powerful, it may not be easy to answer directly and fully. This, however, may be said: That the evil results are likely to follow in the early stages of philosophical thought, and the favorable results more naturally appear at a later period. The pioneers in almost every department of science have been welcomed by skeptics, and well nigh dreaded by Christian men. But, in turn, every real science has at length lent its influence to sanction and strengthen the word of God, as he has spoken it in the Scriptures, and poured it upon the world through the lips of his Son.

It was once a heresy and a crime to teach the simple facts of astronomy; and all true religion was regarded as in danger of being flung off from the world by the centrifugal force of its daily revolution. Bad men confidently prophesied that the reign of the New Testament was at an end, when the deists of the last century had declared, in the name of metaphysics, the impossibility of miracles, and arraigned consciousness as a liar. But nobody now regards the theory of planetary motion as a blow struck at Genesis, Job or the Psalms; and schoolmen are at length trying to show that the gospel may be evolved from mental philosophy. Some of the earlier tyros in geology were going at once to prove the Bible a lying record; but as they went on to make their generalizations broader and more careful, the discords they had seemed to hear became resolved into glorious harmony, as the elder and the newer voices swelled out together the song of creation.

A smattering of philosophy is somewhat apt to make self-conceited skeptics; while a larger and a truer study may be expected to bring the same men out true believers. And so the various phases of philosophical thought, which are prevailing, may yet add another to the already numerous testimonies which have come up from similar quarters to the genuineness and the necessity of our Christian faith. These are the days of its self-willed and egotistic childhood; a wiser and a more modest spirit will probably come through time and experience. It may sneer at our faith now;—and it is no new thing for it to be sneered at; it was long since used to such treatment;—but it may tremble yet before that faith if it have not the spirit to bow down before it and adore. The prodigal son, with his inheritance in his pocket, and ambition for independence in his heart, could turn his back upon duty and home; but the poverty and husk-eating which his waywardness purchased for him, at length brought him back to the door of his father's dwelling, a wiser as well as a humbler man. This philosophy will doubtless operate to destroy reverence and weaken faith for a time; not a few may be led hopelessly astray by it before the wiser and better spirit shall become dominant,—and that is a thing to be deeply regretted; but in the long run, we may hope it

shall operate to purify and invigorate our Christian faith. The quickening it is giving to intellect will prepare it to grasp the truth of the gospel with a stronger hand, and employ it for promoting human welfare with more energy.

It is useless, if it were desirable, to attempt to check this spirit of philosophical inquiry. The reason of things will more and more be sought for; and the tendency to reduce all facts and phenomena in nature and life to systematic form, and to seek the law of order everywhere, will grow more strong and more active every year. It is a legitimate field of effort; and Providence both beckons and impels toward it. We need wisdom to direct this thought into right channels, so that it shall become the ally and not the antagonist of faith. They must harmonize in every true life, for only while they coöperate can either do its true work. As Rogers has said with equal force and beauty:—

“Reason and Faith are twin-born;—the one in form and features the image of manly beauty—the other of feminine grace and gentleness;—but to each of whom, alas! is allotted a sad privation. While the bright eyes of Reason are full of piercing and restless intelligence, his ear is closed to sound; and while Faith has an ear of exquisite delicacy, on her sightless orbs, as she lifts them toward heaven, the sunbeam plays in vain. Hand in hand the brother and sister, in all mutual love, pursue their way, through a world on which, like ours, day breaks and night falls alternate; by day the eyes of Reason are the guide of Faith, and by night the ear of Faith is the guide of Reason.”

Well will it be if we may first learn ourselves, and then teach others to accept, this double guidance, till the blinded eyes behold midnight changed to noon, and the long-closed ear catch eternal melodies as they break in upon the depths of its silence.

## ART. V.—CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

1. *The duty of Christian Baptism.*

This is distinctly taught in the Christian Scriptures. Matt. 28: 18, 19, "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach (*mathetuate convert*) all nations, baptizing them into (*eis*) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Mark records the same law, 16: 15, 16, "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

Some claim that this baptism was not in water, but by the Spirit; but no man is ever anywhere, or at any time, *commanded* to be baptized by the Spirit. The baptism of the Spirit is always a *promise*, and never a command. But the above law contemplates obedience. We can obey this law; but we cannot obey a promise, hence we cannot obey the promise of baptism of the Spirit. And as this baptism is a command and not a promise, it must be baptism in water, or some baptism which we can actively observe, and not one to be passively received.

Christ gave to the apostles this commission, to preach, convert, and baptize. Let us see how they understood it. The first sermon preached after the resurrection was by Peter, on the day of Pentecost.

The people believed and cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter replied, Acts 2: 38, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." If Peter had supposed that the baptism which Jesus *commanded* was the same as that which he *promised*, *i. e.*, had he supposed that all the baptism which he was to teach, was that of the Spirit, he certainly would not have uttered both a command and a promise as he did. What sense is there in



such a rendering as this, "Repent and be baptized by the Holy Ghost, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost."

Acts 8: 12, "But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women." 36—39, "And as they went on their way they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch said, See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? . . . . . and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water," &c.

Acts 9: 18, "And he (Saul) received sight forthwith, and was baptized."

Acts 10: 47, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we. And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."

It is worthy of remark that Peter did not baptize these Gentiles himself, but commanded them to be baptized by others. This was doubtless often the case with the apostles. Paul baptized but few himself, and must have done as Peter did, when any believed, "*commanded them to be baptized*" by others.

Acts 16: 15, "And when she (Lydia) was baptized, and her household," &c. 33, "And he (the jailor) took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway. 19: 5, "And when they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."

These quotations from the practice of the apostles show conclusively that baptism occupied a very important position in the work of converting men to Christ. Faith, repentance, and baptism, are intimately connected, and the latter is just as positively enjoined as the former.

## 2. *What is the act of Christian baptism?*

If there is no specific act, or form commanded, then it will be impossible to know what baptism is. Baptism is something to be done, an act to be performed, and the form of that act must be described, or we cannot possibly know what we are to do. Whoever asserts that the *form* of baptism is not defined

in the Scriptures, really asserts that no baptism at all is required. If God commands an act, and still does not tell us what the act is, it is the same as if he had not commanded it at all. For how can we do an act of which we have no definite knowledge? It is a transparent folly for partisans to claim that Christ has commanded an act, and has not informed us what that act is. But those who assert that the Saviour specified no form of baptism, belie their own statement, by constantly teaching that it is to be performed either by *sprinkling*, *pouring*, or *immersion*. Thus leaping, from *no form* to *three forms*, at one bound. Now if *three forms* are authorized, in the law of baptism, how do we know it? It must be by the sense of the words used in the law. *Baptizo*, and its derivatives, are invariably used to denote the act of baptism. And does *baptizo* specify *three forms* of action, or three acts? Does the command to be baptized enjoin either of these acts, or merely one act? We believe that it requires *one act*, and not three; that the word defines one form of action, and not three, and hence baptism can have but one form, and that *immersion*. That immersion is the only form of baptism, we argue,

1. *From the established meaning of the word baptizo, which the Holy Spirit always uses in describing this rite.*

But this statement is disputed; and how shall we settle it? Many say that it means to *sprinkle*, or *pour*, as well as to *immerse*, and some claim that it means to *sprinkle* only. Who will decide what the word does mean? The Christian sects are divided upon this point; and how can we learn what is true? The word is *Greek*, and certainly means some form of action. But who can tell what form that is? To whom shall we appeal? What witnesses shall we bring upon the stand to settle the true meaning of the word? Both parties cannot be right; and we desire to know the truth in the case.

Shall we call upon the witness-stand the learned advocates of sprinkling? They are parties interested, and a man's testimony in his own behalf is always looked upon with suspicion. Shall we call upon the learned advocates of immersion? No, for they also are parties interested, and however honest, they may be biased by prejudice, party zeal, or education. We

must have, if possible, impartial, candid, disinterested witnesses. Can we find them? The renowned students of the Greek language, who have studied and written as *scholars* and not as sectarians, the standard authors of the Greek Dictionaries, whose definitions of Greek words are received with confidence by the Professors, and learned men of all sects, in all colleges, and universities, shall be our witnesses. They are familiar with the meaning of all Greek words, in all dialects and contingencies, and give the world the result of their research and learning, in their dictionaries of the Greek language. If candid and competent witnesses can be found anywhere, these are the men. If we cannot take their testimony, we certainly cannot rely upon mere theologians, who read everything through sectarian spectacles. And with such spectacles, honest men often see things which have no real existence. Many honest men think that they have good reasons for adhesion to Papal dogmas. The practice of celibacy can be supported from Scripture by a very specious argument, and many regard it as conclusive. The honest men of every sect (and we think there are many of them) think they see good scriptural reasons for their various notions and practices. But they cannot all be right. They may all be wrong. It is obvious, then, that we should look with distrust upon the testimony and reasonings of such persons, and seek light from such witnesses as we have now called upon the stand. And what do they say that *baptizo* means? They *all* say that it means to *immerse*, and *none* of them say that it means to *sprinkle*. Our position upon this point is definite, absolute, and if any one will present the book, the man, who is good authority in the colleges of the Pedobaptist sects, who defines the word to mean to *sprinkle*, we will give it up. But we *know* that such a dictionary cannot be found. Scores of dictionaries assert that *baptizo* means to *immerse*, and not *one* of them says that it means to *sprinkle*. If it really does mean to *sprinkle*, as sectarian teachers say that it does, why have not these *savans* in the Greek language discovered it? We are told that it signifies no particular act. Then why do all these authors invariably define it as denoting *one* certain form of action? How is it that these religious

partisans stand alone, and opposed to the hosts of learned Greek scholars, in asserting that *baptizo* has no particular signification? All of the dictionaries say that it does specify a particular form. But these devotees of sprinkling stoutly affirm that it is entirely indefinite in its meaning. In whom shall we confide?

We prefer to accept the testimony of *scholars* rather than that of *sectarians*. We have the statement of such eminent scholars, and authors of Greek Dictionaries, as Scapula, Henricus Stephanus, Robertson, Donnegan, Pickering, Schleusner, Pasor, Parkhurst, Bass, Greenfield, Bretschneider, Stokins, Liddell and Scott, and Robinson. Fourteen men, good and strong, and universally received by Pedobaptist professors in colleges and universities, as good authority upon the meaning of Greek words. And these all agree in testifying that *baptizo* means, "*to immerse, immerge, submerge, wash by immersing, sink, plunge, overwhelm.*" And none of them hint, or imply, much less assert, that the word ever means to sprinkle. With these fourteen witnesses, all authors of Greek dictionaries agree.

Now, shall we set all of this testimony aside, and follow the statements of men who are, by education, prejudice, sectarian interest, exposed to one-sided views and partial statements? Who are the more likely to be right, these scholars who have investigated all forms, idioms, uses, and constructions of the Greek language, for scientific purposes, or trained partisans and defenders of a sectarian creed? Every candid reader will be ready with an answer.

We beg privilege, before leaving this point, to introduce one more witness. He is the distinguished Prof. Charles Anthon, of Columbia College, New York. The subjoined explains itself:

NO. 1 BOND STREET, NEW YORK, March 23, 1843.

*Prof. Charles Anthon:*

In conversation with Dr. Spring, last evening, he stated that in the original, the word baptism, which we find in the New Testament, has no definite or distinct meaning;—that it means to immerse, sprinkle, pour, and has a variety of other meanings—as much the one as the other, and that every scholar knows it; that it was the only

word that could have been selected by our Saviour, having such a variety, as to suit every one's views and purposes. May I ask you, if your knowledge of the language from which the word was taken has led you to the same conclusion? And may I beg of you to let the deep interest I take in the subject plead my apology. I have the honor to be, with great respect, most respectfully

Yours,

E. PARMLY.

COL. COLLEGE, March 27, 1843.

*My Dear Sir:—*

There is no authority whatever for the singular remark made by the Rev. Dr. Spring relative to the force of *baptizo*. The primary meaning of the word is to dip, or immerse; and its secondary meanings, *if it have any*, all refer, in some way or other, to the same leading idea. Sprinkling, &c., are entirely out of the question. I have delayed answering your letter, in hope that you would call and favor me with a visit, when we might talk the matter over at our leisure. I presume, however, that what I have here written will answer your purpose.

Yours truly,

CHARLES ANTHON.

It is not necessary, perhaps, to state to the reader that Prof. Anthon stands in the very front ranks of classical scholarship in America; and that he is not a Baptist, but an Episcopalian.

The wonderful blinding power of sectarianism finds no more marked development than in the insensibility of Pedobaptists to the force of such testimony as we have introduced above. It is remarkable how the merest subterfuge, the most transparent fallacy, satisfies them, and neutralizes the force of the most positive and direct testimony against them. The popular plea that the word *baptizo* does not signify the same *act* when used in a religious sense, that it does when used in a secular sense, is among the weakest of fallacies, and yet learned and eloquent teachers urge it with apparent sincerity, and thousands receive it as conclusive. But does a word which defines or represents an *act* change its meaning when used religiously? The *act* may have a new object, or signification, but if the word denotes a different *act*, it must change its fundamental meaning, which is unusual, strange, inconsistent. Baptism may have

many objects. We may baptize to wash away the filth of the flesh, for pleasure, as a penalty, and as a religious rite. The design of the act may be different in every case of a hundred baptisms; but the form of the act must be the same, or we ought not to call it by the same name. Does the act of eating and drinking for religious purposes differ in form from the act of eating for secular purposes? There is just as good reason to set up the plea that we are not confined to the *act* of taking bread and wine into our mouths, in observing the Lord's Supper, because the Supper is for religious ends; as that the classical sense of *baptizo* is no guide to us in performing this *act* of baptism. Why not set up the plea that eating and drinking denote mental acts, such as attention, faith, study, approval, pleasure in, love for a certain object, and hence to eat and drink at the Supper, is merely to look upon the elements, or look upon Christ, think of him, love him, remember him; and thus turn Quakers, and dispense with the (vulgar) practice of eating and drinking literally in honor of Christ? There is vastly more propriety in such a course than there is in pretending to do *the act* which Christ commands, saying "I baptize," when an entirely different act is performed, when the party *rantizes*, sprinkles, does an act which has no resemblance to that which *baptizo* always signifies. What would one of Paul's Greek hearers have said, had Paul wet the tips of his fingers and placed them on the forehead of a person, saying, "I baptize thee"? They would have laughed him to scorn. A man cannot be baptized by sprinkling any more than he can *walk* by flying. But we have another class of witnesses that we can rely upon with confidence. Authors of Cyclopædias of literature. We must reject *religious* Cyclopædias, for they are usually written by men who are deeply interested in the sects, and may be biased in judgment. Mere literary authors are more likely to be free from these damaging influences, and to them we will appeal.

*Chambers' Cyclopædia, or Dictionary of Arts and Sciences.*  
London, 1786.

"Baptism, in theology, formed from the Greek, *baptizo*, of *bapto*—*I dip*, or *plunge*, a rite or ceremony by which persons are initiated into the profession of the Christian religion.

The practice of the western church is to sprinkle the water on the head or face of the person to be baptized, except in the church at Milan, in whose ritual it is ordered that the head of the infant be plunged three times into the water, the minister at the same time pronouncing the words, 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost'—importing that by this ceremony the person baptized is received among the professors of that religion which God the Father of all revealed to mankind by the ministry of his Son, and confirmed by the miracles of his Spirit. A triple immersion was first used, and continued for a long time. . . . But it was afterwards laid aside because the Arians used it; it was thought proper to plunge but once. Some are of opinion that sprinkling in *baptism* was begun in cold countries. It was introduced into England about the beginning of the ninth century. At the council of Celchyth, in 816, it was ordered that the priest should not only sprinkle the holy water upon the head of the infant, but likewise plunge it in a basin."

*Brande's Cyclopædia*, New York, 1843.

"Baptism, (Gr. *bapto*, *I dip*). The rite of initiation into the community of Christians, ordained by Christ himself when he commissioned his apostles to go and baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Baptism was originally administered by immersion, which act is thought by some to be necessary to the sacrament."

*Edinburgh Encyclopædia*.

"In the time of the Apostles the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel, with the words which Christ had ordered, and to express more fully his change of character, generally assumed a new name. The immersion of the whole body was omitted only in the case of the sick, who could not leave their beds. In this case sprinkling was substituted which was called *clinic baptism*. The Greek church, as well as the schismatics of the East, retain the custom of immersing the whole body, but the Western church adopted in the thirteenth century the mode of baptism by sprinkling, which has been continued by the Protestants, the Baptists only dissenting."

With this testimony argue the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, *London Encyclopædia*, *Rees' Cyclopædia* and *Encyclopædia Americana*. They all state that the word *baptizo* means to *dip*, *immerse*, and that the practice of the early church was to immerse.

and that sprinkling was introduced several hundred years after Christ.

Our next company of witnesses is church historians. Though these persons are members of religious sects, yet as historians of the church they are likely to be better informed, and more unprejudiced than other religious authors. And as those whom we quote were all Pedobaptists, if they had any prejudices they must have been on that side of the question. Hence if they testify to the same that the former witnesses have, we ought to give their testimony great weight. When men testify against their own cause and interests, we are obliged to conclude that they are candid men, and that the case is clearly against them, or they would not confess judgment.

*Mosheim* says,

*First Century*—"The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century, without the public assemblies; in places appointed and prepared for the purpose, and was performed by *immersion* of the whole body in the baptismal font."

*Second Century*—"The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and his pompous allurements, were *immersed* under water and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the express command of our blessed Lord."

*Neander* :

"Baptism was originally administered by immersion; and many of the comparisons of St. Paul allude to this form of administering the rite; the immersion is a symbol of death, of being buried with Christ; the coming forth from the water is a symbol of the resurrection with Christ; and both taken together represent the second birth, the death of the old man, and the resurrection to a new life."

*Waddington's Church History* :

"The ceremony of immersion (the oldest form of baptism) was performed in the name of the three persons in the Trinity; it was believed to be attended by the remission of original sin, and the entire regener-



ation of the infant or convert by the passage from the land of bondage into the kingdom of salvation."

*Geiseler's Church History :*

" The custom of considering certain doctrines and rites as mysteries (in the third and fourth centuries) would naturally have some effect on the mode of admission to the church. Baptism was preceded by a long preparatory course, during which the catechumens were gradually led, from general religious and moral truths, to the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, by teachers appointed for that purpose, and must pass through several grades before they were deemed fit to be actually admitted. The course usually occupied several years, and often the catechumens voluntarily deferred their baptism as long as possible, on account of the remission of sins by which it was accompanied. Hence it was often necessary to baptize the sick, and in that case sprinkling was substituted for the usual rite. The baptism of infants became now more common. The use of exorcism is distinctly mentioned, and all who had been baptized, even the children, partook of the Eucharist."

The testimony of these last witnesses of course is circumstantial, not positive, as they speak of the current practice of the church during the first, second, and third centuries. This practice may or may not have been in agreement with the words of Christ.

But when we consider that Christ used a word which all authors of Greek dictionaries affirm to mean *immerse*, and never to sprinkle; that the primitive church did uniformly immerse according to the testimony of all standard historians; that the practice of sprinkling sick persons even, is not mentioned for two hundred years after Christ; and that sprinkling grew into use very gradually, and did not prevail generally in the Papal church until more than a thousand years after Christ; and that the Greek or Eastern church practice immersion to the present day; the case becomes a strong one, and we do not see how any one can resist the force of the above testimony, as it gives a rational and self-consistent account of the origin and growth of the custom of sprinkling, which now prevails. The story is a simple and plain one. Sprinkling grew up as a corruption, with the other errors which make up the Papal system; its

growth was gradual; the first two hundred years of the church does not furnish an instance, nor a hint of an instance, of sprinkling; it did not prevail to any noticeable extent when the Greek church separated from the Roman in the tenth century, else traces of it would have been found in the Greek church. But at the time of the separation of the Protestant sects from Popery, sprinkling had almost entirely supplanted immersion, and the Protestants did not protest against this error, but adopted it, and still practice it.

Does any one ask, then, for the origin of sprinkling for baptism? We find the most impartial and competent witnesses agreeing in the testimony that it was born and grew up in the bosom of Papacy. It comes to us with the same authority (no more, no other,) as the scores of false teachings and practices of Papacy. We have no more doubt that sprinkling is a Papal rite, than we have that the confessional is. The testimony of the most learned and candid men of many generations makes the evidence conclusive, that every person who is sprinkled for baptism receives a Papal rite, the mark of the Beast, and not Christian baptism, as he may suppose. It is *rantism*, and not *baptism*, that he receives; and *rantism* is Papal, and not Christian. If this is not so, why are all the Greek Dictionaries agreed in defining *baptizo* to mean to immerse? Why do not some of them say that it means to sprinkle? Why do standard church historians tell us that the primitive church did not sprinkle, but immersed? Why do they all agree in saying that sprinkling grew up gradually in the church, and did not finally prevail until more than a thousand years after Christ? Why is there not a hint of sprinkling for baptism in the New Testament? Why is there not some allusion to it for two hundred years after Christ? Why do the apostles and Christian fathers for two hundred years, always refer to baptism as an immersion, when they allude to the form of the act at all? There can be but one answer to these interrogations: *Sprinkling* for baptism did not originate with the apostles, but is the child of Popery. For this cause we oppose it, and urge all the good and honest to abandon this Papal tradition, and restore Christ's ordinance. We speak plainly upon this subject, not

that we would wound the sensibilities of those pious people who practice sprinkling, but to arouse them to a sense of the fact that every act and argument in defence or perpetuation of sprinkling, gives vitality to a limb of Papacy. We desire that all of the stains of Papacy may be *wiped out*. We long to see the last mark of the Beast blotted from the Protestant sects, and hence we feel bound, in conscience, to deal vigorously with this rite, and plead for the restoration of *Christian baptism*.

---

#### ART. VI.—KINCAID'S MISSIONARY LIFE.\*

The work of missions belongs to the church in general. At home the walls of sectarianism are crumbling down, and Christians, while agreeing to differ on some points, are coming to regard each other as brethren in the Lord, and are thus securing practical Christian union. But there is less of this sectarianism, and more of this union on the mission field than anywhere else. Probably one reason is, that the field is so vast, there is room for all to work, without seeming to come into collision with each other; and another is, the interests involved are seen to be so important, that those engaged in preaching to the heathen "the unsearchable riches of Christ," have no inclination to dispute with their fellow laborers, but are glad to devote all their energies to the work in which they are engaged; and they rejoice in the triumphs of each one, although he may not belong to their denomination, because they regard it as a triumph of the cause in which they are engaged.

And if missionaries thus view the field in which they labor, and the work in which they are employed, there is no reason why Christians at home should not do the same—no reason

\* THE HERO MISSIONARY; or, a History of the Labors of the Rev. Eugenio Kincaid. By A. S. Patton. New York: H. Dayton. 1858. pp. 312.

why they should not become acquainted with, and rejoice in the success of any evangelical missionary of whatever denomination or country. Time was when the records of missionary labors were scarce, or existed mostly in the unattractive form of journals; but missionary literature is now constantly increasing, and fills many attractive volumes. We are glad of this increase, and we wish to find these works extensively read, that the character of the missionaries may be known, their toils and trials be understood, the success which God vouchsafes them be declared, and the desolation and moral and spiritual darkness which call for their labors be revealed in all its vast extent; that the church may awake to a true sense of its duty to the heathen, and thus the missionary spirit be fostered and increased.

With these views, we devote a few pages to a sketch of the work before us, which contains the history of the labors of a living missionary, who, although belonging to a different section of the church of Christ from that with which this Quarterly is connected, is one of a noble band of brethren, who, having been called of God to an important and arduous work, throw their whole soul into that work, and can say with Paul, "Neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God." The title of the work is, "The Hero Missionary," and while men often write of and exalt those they call "heroes," and who are not unfrequently those who imbue their hands in the blood of their fellow-men, we believe that in a history of the world yet to be written, many of the greatest heroes, whose deeds shall be recorded in its pages, will be found numbered among the missionaries of the cross. The work is divided into twenty-five chapters, commencing with "Life's beginnings," and closing with "Retrospect and Prospect."

Eugenio Kincaid, a missionary of the American Baptist Missionary Union, was born in Wethersfield, Conn., and is the son of Noah Kincaid, a respectable physician, and a member of a Presbyterian church, who still lives. At the age of sixteen, Eugenio became the subject of the renewing grace of God.

His mind becoming exercised on the ordinance of baptism, he went to a Baptist minister for a book which might afford him light on the subject. He handed him a copy of the New Testament, and afterwards said, "Young man, if you want any better guide than the Holy Ghost has given, don't come to me." He was soon led to decision and action on this subject. He had previously commenced the study of law under his former pastor, but Eugenio forfeited his favor by becoming a Baptist; and soon after, he felt it his duty to pursue a course of study with reference to the ministry, and feeling deeply the condition of the heathen, so soon as he had graduated from Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution, he offered himself to the Baptist Board of Missions for service in Burmah. The way not being open for his reception at that time, he became pastor of the Baptist church at Galway, N. Y., and afterwards engaged as a missionary in the valley of the Susquehanna, and after that he was selected by the Baptist General Association of Pennsylvania, to preach the gospel and "travel as an exploring agent in several of the central counties of the State."

But although very useful in these labors, his soul was not at rest; the cry of the perishing heathen still sounded in his ears, and being at length accepted by the Baptist board of Foreign Missions, he with his wife sailed for Burmah in May, 1830. They arrived at Calcutta in September, and, embarking there for Maulmain, they arrived on Nov. 28th.

While acquiring the native language, Mr. K. occupied himself in preaching in English, and it pleased God so to bless this beginning of his labors on heathen soil, that more than a hundred, mostly British soldiers, were converted and baptized. It was not long before he began to be useful to the Karens likewise. But in the midst of his usefulness, trials came upon him. In a little over a year from the time of his arrival at Maulmain, his wife and child were removed by death within a few days of each other, and he was left with one remaining child, lonely, in a strange land.

In 1832, he removed to Rangoon, and at the close of that year married again; and notwithstanding severe persecution came upon the native converts, he continued his labors with

perseverance and success. Some, from the fear of persecution, did not publicly profess Christ, but prayed and served the true God in secret; but there were others who could say with *Moung Ioo-the*, who applied for baptism at this time, "I cannot deny Christ. Let them kill, I desire to follow Christ."

In 1833 Mr. Kincaid resolved to go up the Irrawaddy to Ava, the principal city of Burmah. On the way he had many interesting conversations with different persons, and learned with pleasure that the labors of Judson and others had not been in vain. Arrived at the royal city, he met with unexpected difficulties, arising from the opposition of the members of the government, and he was forbidden to preach or give books of any kind. But notwithstanding this, the people flocked to him daily, and many of them seemed anxious to learn something about the new religion. Sometimes as many as forty or fifty would come at once and as many as two hundred in a day. Some gave evidence of conversion, and were baptized, among whom was *Moung Kay*, who "had been acknowledged one of the most popular preachers of Boodhism in the royal city." And "many men of distinction, and officers of government, as well as persons of humbler capacity and station, came often to inquire after the truth, or to bear their simple and honest testimony to the experience of its power on their souls."

Having remained in Ava several years, he was desirous of carrying the gospel into regions beyond, and of going for this purpose through the north of Burmah, where no missionary had been before, and to extend his journey, if possible, to the borders of China, and the frontiers of Assam. For a time the government determinately opposed and forbade his going, but at length they yielded to his perseverance, and having obtained a permit, he started in January, 1837. He went up the Irrawaddy in a boat provided by the British Residents, visited numerous villages on its banks, gained much information, and conversed with and preached Christ to the people, and "after being twenty-two days on the way, and having travelled about three hundred and fifty miles from Ava," he reached Mogaung, the most northern city of Burmah. After spending some time here, making several excursions into the surrounding country,

gathering what information he could with reference to the extent and character of the population farther north, and being much encouraged with the prospect of doing extensive good to the people of Burma, he deemed the object of his journey accomplished, and concluded to set his face toward home. It was at this time he wrote:

"Eight years ago no one would have supposed it possible that a missionary could go to Ava, and for four years preach the gospel publicly, and baptize believers, and form them into a Christian church; that as a teacher of religion, he would be received kindly into the houses of nobles and gentlemen; and that he would be allowed to travel about in the neighboring towns and villages, giving books, and preaching to the people. All this has been done, in the most frank and open manner. Twenty have been baptized, and formed into a church. On the Lord's day they meet, and sing, and pray, and hear the gospel preached. Add to this a great multitude have heard of God, and of the Messiah, and have read more or less of the Holy Scriptures. This, too, has been done in weakness, and with very insufficient means. Now, the field is better known—the prejudices, vices, and habits of the people are better known. When all these facts are duly considered, there is much to inspire confidence in the use of those means which God has appointed for the conversion of the world. Obstacles there are, and will be as long as sin and idolatry exist, but they are not insurmountable, when encountered in the name and strength of Him who came to destroy the works of the devil."

Chapter X. contains an account of his journey homeward. It is entitled "Perils among robbers," and is the most thrilling in the book. It appears that at that time anarchy prevailed through the land, and that "large bodies of men, under a sort of military organization, were prowling about the country—robbing and burning cities and villages, thus rendering all travel exceedingly dangerous." Mr. K. was making a rapid passage down the river, when he fell in with one of these bands, who robbed him and his companions, taking even their clothes from off them, and they finally concluded to behead him at sundown. But after this, they reversed this decision, and left him and his men, while they went to plunder a neighboring village. This was too good an opportunity to be lost, and in

the darkness of the night, they took their boat, got it into the current of the river, and made their escape. But they were only delivered from one danger to fall into another, for at the dawn of day, as they approached a village, their ears were assailed with terrific yells, a number of boats were seen patting off from the shore, and they were again in the hands of robbers. These stripped Mr. Kincaid naked, and having taken him ashore, they made a ring in the sand around where he stood, and told him for his life's sake not to step beyond it, while an armed guard of from fifteen to twenty surrounded him. In this condition he remained six days and nights, with no other clothing than half of a waistcloth given him by one of his Burmans, and no other food or drink than he begged of the women who passed to the river for water, and not knowing from day to day what his fate would be. At length he so won upon one of his guards as to obtain a pair of pantaloons, and an old piece of sail cloth for a covering at night, and he now determined on making his escape. It was past midnight; he listened; and his guards were all quiet. He crept slowly and softly to where they lay; he passed outside them, then quickening his pace, he got beyond the precincts of the village, and reaching the skirts of the forest, he entered the jungle, and began to breathe more freely. His sufferings on his journey were great, he travelled one whole day without water, his food was rice which he begged, principally of the women he met with in the outskirts of villages, his limbs were so stiff and his feet so blistered and bleeding that to move was a painful task, and he sometimes felt as if he must give up, and lay down and die. Once he had to pass by a gang of robbers, who looked at him with a fiendish grin, but did not molest him. After being five days on his journey, he came out to the river about thirty-five or forty miles above Ava, and soon after this obtained a passage in a boat to that city.

On reaching Ava, he found that city suffering from civil war, and was soon obliged to leave with his family, and after going to Rangoon, and finding that the missionaries had been obliged to leave that city, he went into the Tenasserim prov-



ince, and after laboring there several years, he went to Arracan, where his efforts were much blessed.

In 1843, he visited this country, and travelled through nearly every State in the Union, giving information, and stirring up the missionary spirit. At length, the way seeming to be open for a return to Burmah, Mr. Kincaid and his family, accompanied by Dr. Dawson, a missionary physician, and his family, sailed from Boston in July, 1850. Arrived at Rangoon, they met with much opposition from the government there, but at length this suddenly abated, and soon after a royal message came from Ava, expressing a wish that the missionaries would remain in Burmah. After this, another message was received from the King, allowing them, if they chose, to visit the royal city; or, if they preferred, to remain at Rangoon—they were not to be molested. This turned the tide of affairs altogether in their favor, and those who had before treated them rudely, now behaved with respect. The scattered members of the Burman church began to gather round them, numerous cases of inquiry appeared, and a number of hopeful converts soon presented themselves for the ordinance of baptism. But just as they were preparing to go up to Ava, their labors were again interrupted by war. This, however, did not last long, and Mr. K. was soon at work again.

In 1853, Mr. Kincaid removed to Prome, about midway between Rangoon and Ava. He found that the way had been prepared by a native laborer, and his labors were much blessed. Commencing his public labors on January 22d, he baptized three persons on February 22d; in July the number had increased to thirty-eight, and soon after this the number was largely increased.

In 1854, [1855 is a typographical error,] he received a number of messages from the king, who had removed to Ummerapoora, inviting him to visit him, and in March, 1855, he and Dr. Dawson started on their journey thither. Arriving there, they found one Christian brother, whose faith and hope had remained unshaken for seventeen years, notwithstanding all the trials and struggles to which he had been exposed, and his ex-

ample and influence had been blessed to others. They were graciously received by the king, who invited them to bring their families to the city and reside there. In January, 1856, they went up with their families, but at the request of the king, Mr. Kincaid agreed to be the bearer of a royal letter to the President of the United States. He was the more willing to do this on account of the precarious state of Mrs. K.'s health, while the whole expenses of the journey were borne by the king. This mission enabled Mr. K. to be present at the annual meeting of the Missionary Union in Boston, in May, 1857.

Having received a letter in reply from the President to the King, and leaving his family in this country, he again set out for Burmah, in August, 1857. Taking Scotland and England on his way, he embarked at Southampton October 20th, for the overland route, landed in Calcutta, December 5th, and before the end of that month reached Rangoon. The narrative closes here with a chapter entitled, "Retrospect and Prospect." We have, however, heard from him several times during the last and present year through the Macedonian. He has been visiting the Burman churches, and the intelligence he sends, especially from Prome, where a number of native assistants have been raised up, is very cheering. We hope the royal favor may prove a help and not a hindrance to the real progress of the gospel.

From this brief sketch, our readers may form some idea of the character of the work, and we hope will procure and read it for themselves. It will enlarge their knowledge of missionary labors, and will convince them, if they yet need to be convinced, that such labors are abundantly owned and blessed of God.

## ART. VII.—NATURAL OR MORAL ABILITY.

The subject on which the following few thoughts and suggestions are presented, is that of natural or moral ability in man, to obey God—that is, has man, while in a state of nature, or prior to his regeneration, the ability to obey God?

There are three distinct views, or theories, on this subject, each of which has its advocates and followers.

The first theory is, that man, in consequence of the disobedience of Adam in Paradise, became unable to obey God. This inability man has inherited, and consists in moral depravity, or the sinfulness of his nature;—he is born a sinner, and utterly unable to obey God, before God regenerates his soul.

The second theory concedes that this is the deplorable condition of man; he is born a sinner; enmity to God and hatred to holiness are rankling in his bosom from birth; but this is original sin, by which he is affected or exercised, and this has been cancelled by the atonement of Christ; so that, by his intervention, and the aid of the Holy Spirit, man becomes graciously empowered to obey God.

The third theory is, that man has natural ability to obey God, that the atonement was not made to impart ability, but to satisfy public justice and constrain man by this exhibition of love in his behalf, and by the influence of the Holy Spirit, to use his ability in obedience to God.

We are aware that many passages of Scripture are adduced in support of these several views,—still, according to our apprehension, the first theory does not harmonize with reason, nor with the teachings of the Bible—that the assumption in this scheme comes in conflict with reason, is evident from the fact that it is the universal conviction of all in whom the idea of justice or moral government is developed, that there can be no moral obligation without the ability to comply with moral law.

The very child would feel it to be an act of cruelty and injustice to make demands of it which it had not the ability to meet, and then inflict punishment for non-performance. Just so

in every case where inability exists, no command can be of binding force; and it is perfectly immaterial how that inability is produced, whether by an act of providence, or by the act of the individual himself—inability exists, and all obligation ceases at this point. Neither God nor man can justly demand a moral impossibility; such demand may be in harmony with the edict of a tyrant, but it is in direct opposition to moral law. The universal conviction of man, be he learned or unlearned, saint or sinner, Christian or heathen, revolts at such an idea of justice.

And this theory does not only come in conflict with reason, but with the teachings of the Bible. Is it not evident that all the commands, all the invitations, and all the warnings in the Bible are based on the assumption that man can make them practical? When man is commanded to repent, to turn to God, to cease to do evil, can he not obey? When he is invited to come to the Saviour, to look and live, to give his heart to God, can he interpose the plea of inability? When God warns the sinner to flee the coming wrath, has he the ability to obey? If not, what becomes of the entire gospel plan of salvation? Will it thus mock and insult the sinner? Command, exhort, and warn him to obey, but tell him at the same time he can do nothing but sin,—entreat and warn the prisoner to leave his dungeon, but tell him he has not the ability to leave? Why add insult to injury? If he cannot obey, why entreat or command?

But does not this view of natural inability also destroy all the elements of moral agency? What are these elements without which there is not, nor can there be, moral agency?

1st. Ability to know ourselves, together with our relations.

2d. The actual perception of these relations.

3d. Ability to act, or refuse to act, in harmony with these relations.

Now, the advocates of this theory concede that man has the ability to know himself, and perceive his relations to God, so far, at least, as to feel in duty bound to obey God. But to act in harmony with this conviction of duty, he cannot, because he

is dead in sin, and therefore unable to obey. But how comes it to pass, that man is thus unable to do his duty, unable to obey God, unable to do anything but sin? Well, it comes to pass in this wise,—he lost his ability in his federal head, some six thousand years before he had a being! he sinned in Adam in some way, so that he is born a sinner, and all this without his knowledge or consent! It is said he is not only born a sinner, but even conceived in sin, and so sin is propagated by natural generation, and what now? An inquest is held by a jury of divines, and their verdict is, that he is morally dead, that he died some six thousand years before he had a being, and that it is neither murder, nor suicide, but a death by the visitation of God for Adam's disobedience, and that now he is under solemn obligations to obey, to love and serve God with his whole heart; but still is utterly unable so to do; and yet for not performing this impossibility, he shall be visited with an overwhelming and eternal weight of punishment.

To say that this cold and cheerless theory does violence to the first truths of reason and the teachings of the Bible, may appear very presumptuous, but if our reasoning is correct, these conclusions are inevitable.

But, says the advocate of the second theory—that of gracious ability—Man has ability to obey God, but this is gracious ability, for man is born a sinner, and cannot turn to God, nor do good without the grace of God assisting him; and this grace is procured for all, and extended to all through the atonement; so, notwithstanding all are sinners by nature, and unable to do good, yet by grace all are graciously empowered and can come and be saved.

This view appears plausible, because it gives the sinner a chance for life. What he lost in the first Adam, is made up to him in the second; there is more feeling in this than in the former; the door of mercy is open, and the sinner is invited to come in and be saved, and this invitation is not made to mock him, because he has ability to come, but it is gracious ability.

One objection to this view is, it makes the sin of Adam destroy all free agency. According to this, when Adam sinned,

he became a necessary agent; not free, because he could not cease to sin; and to say that a person is a free agent who has not the ability to choose otherwise than as he does, appears absurd, because it destroys the elements of moral agency; it takes away the ability to act, or refuses to act, in harmony with perceived relations; and when a moral agent loses this, his moral agency is gone, and he becomes a necessary agent, and can neither sin nor do holy acts; for a necessitated act can have no moral character; hence, if Adam lost the power to obey by his sinning, he lost the ability to sin; so then, had it not been for the atonement, but one sin could have occurred in the world, and that was the first sin Adam committed; since by that sin he lost his moral agency, and neither he nor his posterity could ever have sinned afterwards, as they lost their moral agency in him; but by means of this gracious ability their agency is restored, and now man can sin, or be holy, through the atonement.

But in view of such a conclusion, we say again, that the being who cannot obey moral law, cannot disobey it; his acts can have no moral character, because they are necessitated; hence we conclude the doctrine of gracious ability in this sense is not true.

Another objection to this doctrine is, there is no grace in it all, so far as the making able is concerned, for this is an act of justice and not of grace. The sinner, according to this dogma, has lost his ability, not by his own act or conduct, and now if God desires him to glorify and serve him, does not justice demand that he should first enable him to do so? Where, then, is the grace, or favor, in the bestowment of this ability? It is purely an act of justice, and not of grace.

For God to exact holiness, when there is no ability to render it, and then doom man to eternal death for not doing what he is unable to do, appears unjust; for if man has lost his ability in Adam, it seems evident that justice now requires that, before a command can be of binding force, come from what source it may, he should be made able to obey,—hence we conclude that the gracious ability of this scheme is a fallacy.

Now, in conclusion on these two theories, we venture to express an opinion in relation to their origin.

1st. It is believed that the Bible teaches the doctrine of inherent moral depravity. Upon this assumption is based the sinfulness of infants by the transmission of Adam's sin; as though, if Adam had stolen a horse, his posterity are guilty of the theft, and such like absurdities. Surely the Bible teaches no such doctrine.

2d. These theories have their origin in part in wrong views of moral law, and consequently of sin and holiness. The moral law is regarded as a rule for action, but is high above the attainments of moral subjects. There appears no point in theology so little inquired into as moral law—the fact that moral law can never exact an impossibility of its subjects, is not considered; if we cannot love God, it appears a perversion of the idea of moral law to think we are bound to love him. Moral law relates to the will, the intentions, the purposes of moral agents; these, and these only, give character to the acts of moral agents, consequently, there is no character in feelings and desires and inclinations, only so far as they are cherished by the will; sin, therefore, cannot lay back of, or be antecedent to, an intelligent and free will; nothing then can be more opposed to the teaching of the Bible, than to charge infants with sin. Let it be repeated, that it is always wrong to predicate moral character on the propensities, or involuntary feelings, however depraved these may be; they may occasion sin, by influencing the will, but in themselves are neither sin nor sinful. These theories have also in part, their origin in a wrong division of the mind, giving character to involuntary emotions.

The views entertained of the atonement are also objectionable; men hold not only to imputation of sin, but of righteousness. As Adam's sin was imputed to his posterity, so is the righteousness of Christ imputed to a part, or the whole, as the case may be, of that posterity. Here we have the doctrine of supererogation; as if Christ had a surplus of righteousness, and imputes or makes over part of it to those who believe. But may it not be asked in view of this, was not Christ under obligation

to love God with his whole heart? And if so, how impute of his righteousness?

But, finally, on these schemes, it is evident that both the doctrine of moral inability and gracious ability have been and are still maintained with no ordinary skill; but however plausible extraordinary talents may make them appear, the fate of the sophist awaits them, who, if his premises are false, finds the falsity fatal to his conclusions.

A few words on the last theory will close our discussion. Man came into being in the image of his Maker—having not only power to feel and think, but to will in harmony with the right, or to refuse thus to will. God revealed duty to him—this he felt under obligations to perform, and so long as he willed to walk in harmony with his intelligence, he was holy; but, by resolving to disobey, he sinned and fell. And did he lose his moral agency by sinning? By no means. Nor does the sinner now. Adam could repeat the sin, or refrain from sinning, and so with the sinner now. But how did this sin affect his posterity? It subjected it doubtless to pain, sickness, and death. Man became depraved in his appetites, his inclinations and desires; but, as has been stated, moral character cannot be predicated of these, as is evident by the definition of sin given by inspiration. James says, when lust or desire conceives, it brings forth sin; that is, when a depraved desire obtains the consent of the will, sin follows. One illustration on this point. Suppose the inebriate has a strong desire to drink, and that this is hereditary and involuntary. Is this *desire*, proceeding from a depraved appetite, *sin*? By no means. We all say it is his misfortune, and pity him—but now, when he cherishes this desire, and wills to gratify it, he sins against God and his own soul. So the *occasion* of sin may be in the depraved desires or propensities, but the *cause* of sin is in the *will*. Thus Adam became morally depraved, by willing to disobey, and thus his posterity became morally depraved, each one for himself by willing to disobey. We repeat it here, moral depravity does not and cannot lay back of the intelligent will, and notwithstanding man is thus morally depraved, yet has he the natural



ability to refrain from sinning any moment, as sin consists in choice, which must be free.

And now, if it be asked if any will cease to sin, and turn to God, without the atonement and influence of the Holy Spirit, we answer unhesitatingly *not one*. But if it be asked, whether man has the natural ability to obey God or keep the moral law, we as unhesitatingly answer, he has the ability. We conclude, then, the atonement was not made to impart ability—this man has by nature, or he is not accountable—but it was made to satisfy public justice and to make it possible for God to offer salvation to the penitent. Christ suffered not to give ability, but that the sinner might be persuaded by his matchless love to use the ability he has, in obedience to the voice of God, and be saved from utter ruin. “God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son that whoever believeth on him should not perish but have eternal life.”

Thus do we approach the sinner and endeavor to show him that the salvation of the gospel is that of grace, that the gospel part is prepared at God's expense; that all things are now ready and offered to him without money, without price, and that God does all he can, by the intervention of his son, by the influence of the Holy Spirit, by his word, by his ambassadors, by his providence, by the joys of heaven, by the sorrows of hell, to persuade man to be reconciled to God, to prevail on him to use his ability to glorify God. But if, in view of all these means and motives, he will not come, God cannot make him come, he cannot invade his freedom by the use of physical power for this end—if he goes to heaven he must will to love God, as the only condition. Should it be said, in view of the last theory, if moral ability is an attribute of moral agency, may not the redeemed spirits in heaven use this power to sin, and thus be lost? Angels are moral agents, and if they have the ability to disobey, may it not end in sinning? In fine, does not such a view destroy the idea of all permanency and stability in heaven? We answer, subjects are not held there by necessity, but remain by choice, and if they do possess the ability to disobey, it does not follow that there is either danger or liability that

this power will be used to sin. Man possesses the ability here to put his hands and feet in the fire and burn them off, or cut out his tongue, or put out his eyes; but does it follow that because he possesses this ability, that there is danger or liability that he will use it for this end? Surely not. If, then, there is no danger of a violation of the organic law in this case, how much less liability or danger of a violation of moral law by angels and redeemed spirits,—surely, then, the stability of heaven, so far as its subjects are concerned, does not depend on necessity or the want of ability, but on the choice of its subjects.

---

ART. VIII.—A MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND TIMES OF  
THE REV. ISAAC BACKUS.\*

In the earlier history of the New England Baptists, scarcely any name is more prominent than that of Rev. Isaac Backus. Though he had not a collegiate education, his good understanding, his efforts to remedy the evils of a defective literary culture, and his faithful use of the abilities with which he was endowed, made him a greater man and far more useful, than many others who greatly excelled him in educational advantages. He lived in a day when and among churches in which great errors were tolerated. Congregationalism was then the established religion of New England, but some of its characteristics were sadly below the Christian standard of duty, and probably in no part of the country was this the case more than in Connecticut, where Mr. Backus resided. Some of the elements of which the regular churches of that period were composed

\* A MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND TIMES OF THE REV. ISAAC BACKUS, A. M. By Alvah Hovey, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in Newton Theological Institution. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 59 Washington Street. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. 1858.

have since been separated from the body, so that the high religious standing of the Congregationalists of the present time is no indication of what was the state of the denomination a century ago. The language of the "Cambridge Platform" directly claimed that the civil power should afford the church of the standing order in New England the same support that is given to the Church of Rome by Popish Government. It was asserted that the "magistrate" should use "his coercive power as the matter shall require" in dealing with "schismatical" churches. By means of the "Half-way Covenant," which was then generally approved by churches of the standing order, men who were not renewed by the Spirit of God were readily admitted to the privileges and ordinances of the Christian church. Discipline was likewise sadly neglected as it was a *professed* rule with many ministers not to deal with any church member for his offences till after he was legally convicted of crime.

These practices were wholly at variance with Mr. Backus's views of the requirements of the gospel. On account of this state of things, he did not join the church for some months after his conversion, but a hope of reform in the churches and a desire to partake of the Lord's Supper finally overcame his hesitancy. As the causes of this hesitancy rather increased than diminished after he joined the church, he and many other members withdrew from it, and held meetings by themselves. This act was earnestly condemned by the adhering members by whom the seceders were publicly warned to renounce what were called their errors, and finally suspended from the communion, which resulted in a permanent separation. The separatists and their sympathizers at length became the majority and refused to pay the minister's rates, as they were earnestly and sincerely opposed to the union of church and state. For refusing to pay the tax, as many as forty men and women were imprisoned in one year. Such "coercive power," instead of restoring them to the communion of the church, only increased their alienation, and probably did much towards preparing the way for a new sect. About the same reasons which led Mr. Backus and his associates to establish a separate meeting,

led, within a few years, to the formation of a large body of Christians who were called Separates or New Lights.

As the title of this book indicates, the object of Dr. Hovey was to give some account of the Life and Times of Mr. Backus, and he seems to have succeeded well in the laudable attempt. The work is well written by an able hand. It contains an interesting and instructive history of a man who, though self-made, labored with an earnestness and success exceeded by but few, if any, of his contemporaries, in the great and noble work which resulted in the establishment of religious freedom, and other reforms of much importance. In perusing this part of the book, the reader will often see that which will remind him of the weakness of human nature, and of the power of a bigoted and intolerant spirit, which, when it has been in the ascendant, has never failed to induce the professed disciples of Jesus to persecute those whom they regarded as heretics and schismatics. It will painfully remind him of the erroneous views and unchristian practices of the churches of the standing order of the last century, and cause him to grieve that men, who no doubt thought they were doing God service, were so destitute of the spirit of Christ, and so greatly mistaken in their views of the requirements of the gospel. However much he may feel that he should deplore the errors and imperfections still remaining in the churches, he will feel that Christians should be thankful to God that the union of Church and State—the coercion of men in religious matters, are not among the evils of the present day in this country. The elements of wealth, intellect, and other forms of worldly greatness were pretty largely combined in the composition of the churches of the standing order in New England; but Dr. Hovey's book plainly shows that such churches may enjoy no spiritual prosperity while they may regard themselves as in a state of favor with God.

The object of Dr. Hovey necessarily led him to give an account of Mr. Backus' determined opposition to the religious oppression of his day. The perusal of the history will excite sympathy for the victims of religious intolerance, and if it does not awaken indignant feelings towards their persecutors, it

will cause a feeling of strong disapprobation of their conduct. It should also excite pity for their blindness. The account of the success of Mr. Backus and his associates in opposing religious coercion, will afford pleasure to the lovers of freedom of conscience in the matters of religion.

The parts of the book relating to the conversion of Mr. Backus, his ministerial labors, his becoming a Baptist, &c., contain much that is interesting to the lovers of the biographies of great and good men. Though it is a Baptist history of the life of a Baptist minister, and will therefore be especially prized by members of the Baptist denomination, its freedom from offensive sectarianism and the ability with which it is written will make it acceptable and useful to many other readers.

---

#### ART. IX.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

**HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF PHILIP THE SECOND, King of Spain.** By Wm. H. Prescott, &c. Vol. III. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1858.

It is with both gratitude and grief that we welcome this added volume in the noble series of historical works which Mr. Prescott has been so long engaged in preparing. As a writer of history, the verdict of two hemispheres has assigned him a position which only the fewest authors have attained. The rise and career of the Spanish power among the European principalities was a great and difficult theme, but it found a man worthy of the undertaking. Each successive volume has even more than met the high expectations awakened by its predecessors, and made us feel vastly richer in the literary treasure we are steadily accumulating. Under disadvantages so serious that most men would have despaired of doing anything, Mr. Prescott has reached a truly royal eminence, seeming to grow in modesty, simplicity, and fidelity, as he gathered up his power and made his reputation more majestic. But his work on earth is done. His indefatigable researches amid the twilight that was always around him are over, and his painful and labored writing is at an end. Death came to him amid his toil, and brought him a release, and while we waited for his glowing pictures of the past, the pencil dropped from his stiffened fingers. Though filled with gratitude for his large gifts to us, we cannot wholly avoid the sadness which comes while we think that his enriching service is over.

This volume is in no way inferior to those which have preceded it. The period covered by this part of his work is fourteen years, extending from 1566 to 1580, ending with the death of Anne of Austria, the last of the several wives who shared with Philip the honors and vicissitudes of Spanish royalty. The Moorish rebellion forms the subject of most of the volume, and the story is told in the same impartial, picturesque and genial way, that has been so striking a characteristic of all his writings. This is followed by an account of the war with the Turks, embracing one of the most remarkable naval engagements which the world had then witnessed. The narrative affords ample opportunity for the portraiture of Don John of Austria, the half brother of Philip, who figures conspicuously in the affairs of his time; and in treating of the domestic affairs of Spain the personal character and habits of the monarch are brought out into bold relief. Of the general qualities of Mr. Prescott's histories we have spoken so freely heretofore, that nothing now needs to be said on that subject. His works will long be classics, and can hardly be superseded or admit of revision for a long time to come.

It is a matter of satisfaction to learn that the two remaining volumes of this history are in such a state of forwardness, that his private secretary, long associated in the author's historical labors, is expected to be able to complete and issue them without any serious delay. We shall wait their appearance with deep interest.

**THE AUTOGRAPHS OF THE BREAKFAST-TABLE.** Every man his own Boswell. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1869.

This collection of papers, which first appeared in the "Atlantic Monthly," from the pen of Oliver Wendell Holmes, has a character of its own. They are brilliant in a high degree, fresh, spontaneous, and apparently written without fear of the critics; though the author has by no means shown himself insensible to public praise or censure. Now and then a deep and broad truth finds an utterance in language that clings long to the memory. It is altogether a fascinating volume, on its literary side, and will add not a little to the reputation of the author as a keen-sighted and genial *litterateur*. In the main, the moral tone of the papers is a healthy one; the blows at bigotry being well-directed, and the thrusts at cant being really provoked and merited; but occasionally there comes out an enunciation of a principle of pantheistic philosophy in lieu of a word of faith, and there is now and then a sneer at what the author's conscience and heart should have taught him to treat with charity and reverence. Literary brilliance will not atone for levity in the presence of holy things, and a witticism levelled at a Christian sentiment avails no law of God. With these slight abatements, we give this unique book a cordial welcome to our table, and anticipate pleasant companionship with it during many a half hour of mental relaxation.

**THE STATE OF THE IMPENITENT DEAD.** By Alvah Hay, D. D., &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, etc. 1869.

This little treatise, by Prof. Hay, discusses, in a clear, calm, manly way the question respecting the state of the impenitent dead, coming out from a

good in every form. Every new form meets the taste of some purchaser and whoever reads it, from whatever motive, may be benefited. There is no finer present than this edition for the young.

**THE HAND-BOOK OF STANDARD, OR AMERICAN PHONOGRAPHY.** In five parts. By Andrew J. Graham, conductor of the Phonetic Academy, New York; and author of "Brief-Longhand," "A System for the rapid expression of numbers," &c. New York. Andrew J. Graham. 1869.

The difficulty in our present mode of representing the sounds of our language has led many to hope that at length those who speak, read and write it, will accept the amelioration which a phonetic alphabet would bring. The first part of this work is an able treatise on this subject, and furnishes an alphabet by which to represent phonetically, all the sounds of our own language, as well as of several others. This alphabet may be of very great service to missionaries in reducing to a written language, the tongues of the various tribes among whom they labor. We are glad to learn that the missionaries at the Mendi Mission in Africa, are employing it with success.

This system furnishes, to both children and foreigners, the most rapid and easy way to learn to read and spell our language in the ordinary mode of representation.

This volume also furnishes the most complete Treatise on Phonography, that has ever appeared. Mr. Pitman's system is here thoroughly systematized, from its elements to the most abbreviated form of the reporting style. The author's long experience as a reporter, his patient study and his scientific taste and acquirements, have given him peculiar qualifications in this department of labor. His system, as here exhibited in the most minute details, gives a speed over that of the ordinary reporting style of from thirty to fifty words a minute.

It has another important advantage over other Phonetic and Phonographic works. It is by far the cheapest work on these subjects, while it is the best in its mechanical execution. Besides it is here presented in one complete system in a well-bound volume of between three and four hundred pages. 8vo.

**THE JUVENILE SPELLER, or Speller's New Manual:** containing Rules for spelling, with numerous examples to illustrate the application of each Rule; together with a large collection of the most difficult words in the English language, correctly spelled, pronounced, and defined. Arranged in easy lessons for Intermediate classes. By W. W. Smith, principal of Grammar school No. 1, New York; Author of "Juvenile Definer, and Definer's Manual." New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1868.

If one convicted of a capital crime should have his sentence commuted into that of learning to spell in English, he would feel that his case was growing worse instead of better. There is just one way to learn the English language, as to its spelling and pronunciation, and that the most difficult way possible, viz: to learn one word at a time. Any rule for learning to spell has so many exceptions that the work is about the same as learning word by word in most cases.

Such is the general conviction. Yet we think a little attention to this book will convince all that the case is not quite so hopeless. He may even have a ray of hope that the drudgery of coming generations in this department will be somewhat diminished, and in this department every man of sense is thankful for "small favors."

The author gives some twenty-five rules that will assist the young learner, whether they be made of service to others or not. But there are two valuable features of this work yet to notice. The pronunciation of the words is typographically represented and the part of speech indicated. Thus, "compromise (kom-pro-mize) n." Each word is also briefly defined. The other is "the false orthography." Thus, "malis, krisis, promis, letis, tortis, biznes, ekwete, relashun," &c.

**THE WORD AND WORKS OF GOD**, by John Gill, D. D. New York: H. Dayton. 1868.

This seems to be a well-condensed and cheap volume of a part of the eminent author's works. "Could Dr. Gill," says the advertisement, "revisit our earth and take up a copy of this book, he would probably wonder that his body of Divinity has shrunk so much that a third-part of that work can be compressed into the compass of the present volume. He would miss some words and phrases that were of unquestioned currency in his day, such as 'diplicency,' 'rightest,' 'make mention, &c.' But the language generally, with every sentiment, he would recognize as his own."

**THE NATIONAL READER; Containing a Treatise on Elocution; Exercises in Reading and Declamation; With Biographical Sketches, and copious Notes.** Adapted to the use of Students in English and American Literature. By Richard G. Parker, A. M., and J. Madison Watson. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1866.

There is no more important branch of education than reading and speaking, and yet there is no branch of education so generally neglected. This work is well designed to meet a great want on the subject. It begins at the right place, with the elements. Not only are the right utterances illustrated, but the general errors are presented in contrast. The print and whole mechanical part are attractive; the selections are copious. Most heartily we can commend this work to all who are engaged in educating others or wish the improvement of themselves in this department in private discipline.

The marginal notes give a brief biographical notice of every author of the selections, all the classic allusions are explained, and the pronunciation of the more difficult words are typographically illustrated. These notes are an important and useful department of the book.

**THE LIFE OF JOHN MILTON**; narrated in connection with the political, ecclesiastical and literary history of his time. By David Masson, M. A., Professor of English Literature in University College, London. With portraits and specimens of his hand writing. Vol. I. 1608-1639. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, &c. 1859. 8vo. pp. 668.

Biography has recently reached a new era. Lives are no longer regarded as mere isolated and independent phenomena, but as symbols and expositions of general history; as the reciprocal play of great moulding forces where the



individual and society are both the fountain and the reservoir, the teacher and the pupil. No man is known till his sphere is seen and understood, nor can the real lesson of a life be learned till we apprehend the schooling which fashioned its features, and hear the voices to whose tones it sent back an answer. And hence no important and widely related life can be fully and fairly set forth by a contemporaneous historian. The prejudice or the partiality of a near observer may render his view untrustworthy, and the real significance of a life can only be told when we know, not only how much seed was scattered, but how much of it sprang up, and what sort of results are reaped in the light of the harvest moon.

Milton's life illustrates this view. Few knew him while he lived, while a remote generation hold loving and grateful fellowship with the great bard and statesman. His publisher gave five pounds for the poem whose value nobody now seeks to estimate; and he was persecuted and sneered at for the political philosophy which is now a mine at which cabinets work and grow wealthy.

Mr. Masson has undertaken here no needless service; and he has entered upon it in a noble spirit, and with large promise. What is proposed on the title page, judging from the volume before us, is to be well and thoroughly done. With the very amplest materials at command, a patient, persevering spirit of research, an impartial spirit, with a loyal fidelity to the truth, and a sympathy with the great bard, made up largely of affection and reverence, he is bent on telling us of HIM whom he thoroughly appreciates, and of his TIMES which he thoroughly understands. Two other volumes are to follow this partial reprint of the London edition, and when the three bulky octaves are completed, we shall evidently have a life of Milton which will be a noble monument, and a grateful study. Covering, as the period does, one of the most strange and thrilling sections of English history, it has more than the interest of a romance. The closing portion of the reign of James I., the whole of the misgovernment of Charles I., till he paid the penalty with his head, the entire protectorate of Cromwell, and fourteen years of the profligate regime of Charles II.,—all these variable phases of life in the realm will pass under careful review.

We need say little in commendation of such a work as this. It is a rare undertaking, and promises to be as admirable in the execution as it is noble in the design. We hope soon to be able to greet the remaining volumes, and find the high expectations already awakened gratefully fulfilled.

**THE LAND AND THE BOOK; or Biblical Illustrations drawn from the manners and customs, the scenes and scenery of the Holy Land.** By W. M. Thompson, D. D., twenty-five years a missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. in Syria and Palestine. Maps, engravings, &c. In two volumes, 12mo. pp. 560, 614. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859.

Our literature descriptive of life in the "Holy Land," and intended to be illustrative of the Sacred Record, is becoming abundant and valuable. If now and then a hasty and superficial tourist tries our patience by the ignorance and dogmatism displayed in his ambitious sketchings, we find a grateful relief in turning to the reverent and solid discoursing of the eminent scholars, who have been as docile pupils as they are honored teachers. Robinson, Kitto,

Hackett, Stanly, Coleman, Barclay, and others, have spared neither time, toil nor expense to possess themselves of every item of information which can add to our real knowledge of the land and the life whose associations will render them forever interesting, and to be familiar with which is to possess a key to the deepest meaning of not a few of the most significant sentences of apostles and prophets, of the Psalmist and the Messiah. Research can have no nobler field than this, and the motives to fidelity are among the highest and purest that can act on the heart.

Dr. Thomson has undertaken no needless or presumptuous service in the work before us, and he has executed it in a manner as admirable as it is peculiar. His long residence in the country, and his relations to the people there, afforded him the amplest and the rarest opportunities for extended and critical observation; his careful study of all previous authors rendered his own survey careful and specific; his reverence for the Bible is most sincere and profound, and his study of it thoroughly earnest; while his enthusiasm as an explorer of "the land," in order to elucidate the teachings of "the book," seems to grow deeper every year of his life. His style is at once exact and yet animated, being largely and designedly colloquial, making the reader feel that the author has taken him into confidence, and is giving him instructive companionship. Scarcely one object of real interest in the whole land is overlooked; scarcely one passage of Scripture, whose elucidation can be rendered more thorough by oriental scenery or life, but secures attention; scarcely one vexed question in exegesis, capable of being illuminated in such a way, but is more easily disposed of after he has finished his discoursing. As a work for the general reader, we know nothing on the same subject that is nearly equal to it,—in the extent and arrangement of its information, in the vividness of its portraitures, or in the healthy stimulus it affords both to mind and heart. The maps and engravings add greatly to its value, and the whole mechanical features are in keeping with the contents of the volumes. We wish a copy might be frequently in the hands of every pastor and Sabbath school teacher in the land; and we shall be greatly disappointed if it does not bring a large patronage to the enterprising publishers, and a large gratitude to the instructive and genial author.

A MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND TIMES OF THE REV. ISAAC BACKUS, A. M. By Alvah Hovey, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859. 12mo. pp. 369.

THE NEW ENGLAND THEOCRACY. A History of the Congregationalists of New England to the Revivals of 1740. By H. F. Udden. With a Preface by the late Dr. Neander. Translated from the second German edition by H. C. Conant, etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1858. 12mo. pp. 303.

The relation of these two volumes to each other is very intimate, and their relations to the earlier ecclesiasticism of New England are very similar. Mr. Backus was a prominent clergyman among the distinguished men of New England during the last half of the last century, devoting his energies to ministerial labor at first among the Congregationalists, and afterward coming out, by successive steps, into sympathy with the Baptist theology and church polity, in behalf of whose interests he labored with rare fidelity and success. He earned a high reputation for ability and worth even

while he lived, and has long been held in high esteem by all Baptists. His life teaches an instructive lesson, considered merely as a piece of biography; but the chief charm and value of this volume spring from the fact that it portrays in so clear a way the ecclesiastical spirit and forms and struggles of the formative period of our religious life. Prof. Hovey shows himself master of his subject; and does justice both to those with whom he sympathizes and to those from whom he differs, while portraying both the faults and the virtues of the age which he is reproducing.

The work of Mr. Uhden is from the pen of a German, who undertook the task of preparing it at the suggestion of Dr. Neander, who commends it to the public attention and confidence in a brief and characteristic preface. The production is an admirable example of patient research, philosophic thought, and historic charity and fidelity. We doubt whether the representative of any American ecclesiastical party could have produced so admirable and impartial a treatise on this subject; much less could he have commanded the confidence of all classes of readers. The struggle is too recent, and the feeling engendered by it has been too largely transmitted to our time, to render it probable that American authorship is equal to such an achievement. The information of Mr. Uhden is full and accurate; and his appreciation of our earlier ecclesiastico-civil life intelligent and hearty in a high degree. He feels that there is a deep meaning underlying all the struggles and changes which our Theocracy revealed; and in a spirit at once docile, charitable and philosophic, he has here given us the results of his labor. It is a book to be commended with confidence, and studied with care.

**THE HISTORY OF THE RELIGIOUS MOVEMENT OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY, CALLED METHODISM: Considered in its different denominational forms, and its relations to British and American Protestantism. By Abel Stevens, LL. D. Vol. I. From the origin of Methodism to the death of Whitefield. New York: Carlton & Porter, etc. 12mo. pp. 490.**

No one can fail to perceive a deep significance in the origin and progress of Methodism who observes it even in its most outward and obvious aspects. There must be something in it answering to great and deep wants in the individual and public mind and heart, which goes far to explain its rise and spread and power and influence. Its ministers are found almost every where, and its monuments and fruits forever spring up along its track, arresting attention and often exciting wonder. What is the chief peculiarity of this religious movement? What circumstances called for it, sustained it, invigorated it, and helped it on to success? What is the nature and what the value of the work it accomplishes? How does it stand related to the highest spiritual culture of man, and to other forms of our religious life? Is its mission a permanent one, and is it unchanging or variable? What permanent results has it reaped, and what achievements await it in the future?

These are questions it is natural to ask, and desirable to have answered. Only a profoundly religious man, who unites keen observation with breadth of view, and combines a heroic piety with great catholicity of spirit, is fitted to unfold the philosophy and write the real history of Methodism. Only he

who has lived in and felt the warmth of its interior life, and yet who has never been stripped of his individuality by its organic magnetism, nor dazzled into partial blindness by its startling and rapid successes,—only such an one can give us a true and full representation of this Religious Movement in history.

It is therefore no small praise which we award Dr. Stevens when we say that this first volume of his history is an admirable beginning of what promises to be a really successful work. He has given many proofs of large and varied ability before now, and his position, both past and present, has afforded him rare advantages for prosecuting such a design as he is here unfolding. His strong sympathy with Methodism comes out, even unconsciously, on almost every page; but his catholicity of spirit abides with him always, tempering his own enthusiasm and taking captive his reader's heart. The style is unambitious and yet always glowing; he has a happy faculty in bringing out the salient points in a narrative, or the leading traits in a character by a few luminous sentences, and he makes the scenes of another century wear a living freshness to the mind's eye, through his vivid portraiture. The narrative has a constant charm in it, and the reader's interest is almost sure to deepen as he walks on in the pleasant and instructive companionship of the historian. It is not merely a book for Methodist readers, written to glorify their ecclesiastical system and canonize their great men; it is a most instructive piece of religious history, richly deserving to find a wide circulation and an attentive study among every body of Christians. We wait with not a little interest the appearance of the remaining volumes from the author's busy but efficient hands.

**HYMNS OF THE AGES.** Being Selections from *Lyra Catholica*, *Germanica Apostolica*, and other sources. With an introduction by Rev. F. D. Huntington, D. D. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1859. 1 Vol. 12mo. pp. 301.

The taste for sacred poetry is one that cannot very well die out. While there are Christian hearts, there must be love for Christian sentiment and literature; and certain phases of Christian sentiment find no other utterance so ample and so impressive as versification affords. The multiplication of Hymn Books within the few past years, shows a strong disposition to rectify what is deemed wrong in our sacred poetry, and to improve what is recognized as imperfect. There is evidently an increasing catholicity of spirit among compilers; for almost every modern hymn Book contains matter selected from the writers of almost every creed, and writers indeed, of whom we may say, it is doubtful whether they really have any creed at all. When true religious sentiment has found a really lyrical utterance, compilers are more and more disposed to take up the strain and repeat it, without stopping to ask whether the original singer held precisely to the Confession.

We do not see how this policy is to be harmful. If a thief were heard reciting the Ten Commandments, we should not think it a sufficient reason for tearing the twentieth chapter of Exodus out of the Bible; and we should not prize the Lord's Prayer less because an actor on the stage had quoted it to show the power of skilful elocution. A high thought is not soiled in being

uttered by unsanctified lips, and a word loses none of its force because somebody has dared to speak it insincerely.

Not a small part of these poetical pieces before us are taken from the Catholic Breviary; others are the fruit of the German mind, not wholly cured of its mystical and transcendental tendencies; while others still are picked up here and there where they have crystalized on the field of religious conflict or in the cloister of solitary meditation. Justifying the title, they are really "*Hymns of the Ages*;"—for every one is a real hymn, and they stretch from distant centuries to our own time. Not many of the pieces have been generally known till this book introduced them; but once known, they will not soon be allowed to be forgotten. It is a mine of great richness that has been here wrought, and the labor has been well rewarded. We can do no better, in our estimation, than to quote one or two of the hymns as specimens. Both the hymns below are from Faber; and though there may appear a little Romish proclivity in them, it is a rare thing to find a deeper piety or a smoother versification. Only a pure taste and a sanctified heart could produce stanzas like the following. We shall be pardoned for the liberal quotations:

### *Distractions in Prayer.*

" Ah! dearest Lord! I cannot pray;—  
My fancy is not free;  
Unmannerly distractions come,  
And force my thoughts from Thee.

The world that looks so dull all day  
Glow bright on me at prayer,  
And plans that ask no thought but then  
Wake up and meet me there.

All nature one full fountain seems  
Of dreamy sight and sound,  
Which, when I kneel, breaks up its deeps,  
And makes a deluge round.

Old voices murmur in my ear,  
New hopes start into life,  
And past and future gayly blend  
In one bewitching strife.

My very flesh has restless fits;  
My changeful limbs conspire  
With all these phantoms of the mind  
My inner self to tire.

I cannot pray; yet, Lord! Thou know'st  
The pain it is to me  
To have my vainly-struggling thoughts  
Thus torn away from Thee.

Prayer was not meant for luxury,  
Or selfish pastime sweet;  
It is the prostrate creature's place  
At his Creator's feet.

Had I, dear Lord ! no pleasure found  
But in the thought of Thee,  
Prayer would have come unsought, and been  
A truer liberty.

Yet Thou art oft most present, Lord !  
In weak distracted prayer ;  
A sinner out of heart with self  
Most often finds Thee there.

And prayer that humbles, sets the soul  
From all illusions free,  
And teaches it how utterly,  
Dear Lord ! it hangs on Thee.

The soul that on self-sacrifice  
Is dutifully bent,  
Will bless thy chastening hand that makes  
Its prayer its punishment.

Ah, Jesus ! why should I complain ?  
And why fear aught but sin ?  
Distractions are but outward things ;  
Thy peace dwells far within !

These surface troubles come and go,  
Like ruffings of the sea ;  
The deeper depth is out of reach  
To all, my God, but Thee !"

### *The Ascension.*

" Why is thy face so lit with smiles,  
Mother of Jesus, why ?  
And wherefore is thy beaming look  
So fixed upon the sky ?

From out thine overflowing eyes  
Bright lights of gladness part,  
As though some gushing fount of joy  
Had broken in thy heart.

Mother ! how canst thou smile to-day ?  
How can thine eyes be bright,  
When He, thy Life, thy Love, thine All,  
Hath vanished from thy sight ?

His rising form on Olivet  
A summer's shadow cast ;  
The branches of the hoary trees  
Droop'd as the shadow pass'd.

And as He rose with all the train  
Of righteous souls around,  
His blessing fell into their hearts,  
Like dew into the ground.

Down stooped a silver cloud from heaven,  
The Eternal Spirit's car,

And on the lessening vision went,  
Like some receding star.

The silver cloud hath sailed away,  
The skies are blue and free;  
The road that vision took is now  
Sunshine and vacancy.

The Feet which thou hast kissed so oft,  
Those living feet, are gone,  
Mother! thou canst but stoop and kiss  
Their print upon the stone.

Yes! He hath left thee, Mother dear!  
His throne is far above;  
How canst thou be so full of joy  
When thou hast lost thy Love?

O, surely earth's poor sunshine now  
To thee mere gloom appears,  
When he is gone who was its light  
For three-and-thirty years.

Why do not thy sweet hands detain  
His feet upon their way?  
O, why doth not the Mother speak  
And bid her son to stay?

Ah no! thy love is rightful love,  
From all self-seeking free;  
The change that is such gain to Him,  
Can be no loss to thee!

'Tis sweet to feel our Saviour's love,  
To feel his presence near;  
Yet loyal love his glory holds  
A thousand times more dear.

Who would have known the way to love  
Our Jesus as we ought,  
If thou in varied joy and woe  
Hadst not the lesson taught?

Ah! never is our love so pure  
As when refined by pain,  
Or when God's glory upon earth  
Finds in our loss its gain!

True love is worship: Mother dear!  
O gain for us the light  
To love, because the creature's love  
Is the Creator's right!"

THE

# FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

---

NO. XXVII.—JULY, 1859.

---

## ART. I.—THE FRENCH ULTRAMONTANISTS.

The recent state trial of Count Montalembert in France was an event of unusual significance. Montalembert has long been known, not only as one of the ablest of French statesmen, but as one of the most accomplished men in Europe, a noble birth and a learned culture having alike contributed to the splendor of his career. His ancestors were famous in the old monarchy under Louis XII. and Francis I., his father was one of the loyal emigrants who served under Condé during the storms of the revolution, and he himself has, for thirty years, as an orator and journalist, been a recognized leader of public opinion and public events in France. That such a man should venture to defy the despotism of Louis Napoleon, and in face of edicts restricting the press to publish an article eulogizing the comparatively free institutions of England, proves that the better class of Frenchmen have not yet lost that passion for liberty which has so often prompted them to futile revolutions. That Louis Napoleon should venture to prosecute so prominent a citizen for such an offence, and, though he appeared at the tribunal supported by the most illustrious representatives of the old nobility, to condemn him to fine and imprisonment, proves how strongly the adventurous nephew of Bonaparte has established his empire. The ambition of the peer may not perhaps be purer than that of the emperor; they may be a match for each other in subtle



policy and vigor of purpose; it is sufficient to say only that their ideas came into collision, and that the autocrat was enabled by the advantage of his position to crush the aristocrat. We can hardly realize so as to appreciate an event like Montalembert's condemnation, except by supposing what would be the state of things in England if the Derby administration should rid themselves of a formidable opposition member by committing Lord John Russell to the Tower, or in this country if President Buchanan should settle a portion of his difficulties by imprisoning the Senator from Illinois.

But the most remarkable feature in the case, and in the whole career of Montalembert is, that while he is liberal in politics, he is a devout Catholic in religion—progressive in the state, and retrograde in the church. At once a conservative and a radical, equally well convinced of the most opposite theories, a champion both of traditions and of hopes, like the double-headed Jaxas of old mythology, he presents the curious spectacle of a Romanist devotee and a political reformer combined in the same person. Strange as it may appear, this alliance of extreme Catholicism with democratic tendencies is, in Europe, a not unnatural one. The ultramontanist or hyper-Romanist party seeks only to exalt the Papal See above every civil government, to realize the ideal of ecclesiastical supremacy, and to make the sway of the Pope absolute throughout Christendom. In its efforts to this end it has, in every age, met the strongest resistance from the kings and emperors. The state, as well as the church, has its ideal of authority and is ambitious of supremacy, and thus the temporal and the spiritual powers clash, and their rival interests and purposes produce an instinctive antagonism. No other single cause has been so prolific of European wars as the efforts of the Pope to subject the monarchs, and of the monarchs to chain the Pope. When, therefore, the Roman Catholic thinkers of the 19th century, aspiring, as their predecessors had vainly done for ages, to make the Roman pontiff the sovereign of all the sovereigns of the earth, looked about them for some new means to this end, they hit upon a thoroughly Jesuitic device. They had found themselves unable to rule the kings, and they determined

therefore to undermine the royal power; monarchy resisted them, therefore they would have democracy; and Europe was surprised by finding that some of the most cunning and cultivated leaders of the church, the champions of the strictest tenets of ecclesiastical authority, had suddenly entered the political arena as friends of the people and as supporters of popular rights against civil power. It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that a love for the populace and a respect for liberty lay at the root of their conduct. Political enfranchisement was as little a part of their purpose as religious freedom, and they strove against temporal authority only that they might bind mankind more firmly and tightly in spiritual chains.

Yet though the ecclesiastical theories of Montalembert lead him to the doctrine of Papal absolutism, usually styled ultramontaniam, he on the other hand sets strict boundaries to his approaches to republicanism. He inclines not to popular freedom, but to a sort of baronial and feudal independence. The spiritual arm may be despotic, according to him, since it is the infallible embodiment of Divine authority, but the temporal monarch should hardly rise in dignity above a bevy of powerful lords, among whom the lands of the kingdom should be divided, and to whom the populace should be directly subject. Thus he seeks to revive the political and religious system of Europe as it was in the tenth century, for the church was then almost supreme over the ideas, the schemes, and even the manners of men, and the feudal barons had civil matters pretty much in their own way. In resisting, therefore, the absolutism of Louis Napoleon, he is contending primarily for the counter-absolutism of Pope Pius IX., and secondarily for the lordly privileges of an aristocratic class; and he cares as little for popular freedom, in any enlarged sense of the phrase, as the Emperor himself. His ideal is not a republic, but a revival of the middle ages. There is much that is admirable in his speculations. He is the champion of knightly loyalty and implicit faith against rationalism, coldness, and doubt. "We are the sons of the crusaders," he exclaims in one of his speeches, "and we shall not fall back before the sons of

Voltaire." The mind, he believes, is less important than the heart, and this element of truth enters into his most perverse theories. A romantic view even of religion, in his opinion, is preferable to sheer logical statements, be they never so true; heroism is best when it is wildest and most intense; poetry is infinitely more precious than science; a naive simplicity and warmth of temper is better than a passionless, calculating character, though the latter be as wise as Aristotle and as correct as the pure mathematics; and all the hallucinations of the dark ages, clothed, as they were, with the tributes of human feeling, are more valuable than all the naked and shivering intellectual results of modern learning.

The party of the ultramontanists is at present the most vital and aggressive body in the Roman Catholic church, and it is under the banner of ultramontanism that the most effective and sincere Catholic thinkers of recent times have labored. It may be well to premise to the reader that the brief review of the history and force of this doctrine, designed in this article, will exhibit Romanism in some of its best features and best men.

The reformatory tendencies of the 18th century, which culminated in the French revolution, imperilled the old institutions and fashions alike in church and state, and diverted ardent young minds from all the traditions of loyalty and faith. During the violence of the revolution, the Christian religion was formally abolished in France by a decree of the convention, and under the bright banners of liberty and reason the horrors of the reign of terror were perpetrated. For six years there was no Sabbath in France; an elegant gayety usurped the place of religion; and the heathenistic and dishevelled bacchanal of the *sans-culottides* supplanted the great festivals of the church. It is easy in our day to condemn the resolute and highly-gifted men who were then the leaders of the public mind; we may wonder how a brilliant and chivalric people were made to go nearly blind by excess of light; yet the events of that unparalleled period were impelled by the same principles which now animate the vanguard of civilization; and no careful student will deny that there was a sort of fascinating power

in the conceptions that were entertained of a new social state. The fickle Parisians, quickly charmed by an idea, and who are doubtless the best modern representatives of the character of the ancient Athenians, did not hesitate to adopt the new modes of thinking and acting, and to rejoice in them; but the simple peasants of Vendée could not so easily renounce all the reminiscences of religion, and they fought through a long war against the principles of the revolution.

At length, the current turned. The effort to incarnate the pure reason on earth had failed. Napoleon, after he had won the battle of Marengo as by a miracle of strategy, prompted by a reverential as well as political motive, went in solemn state to the cathedral of Milan, and listened to the chant of the *Te Deum*. Thus Christianity was brought back from its exile, and soon the witty atheists of the capital were following the new fashion of appearing Christians. With the fall of Napoleon and the final close of the revolutionary struggle, began a strong reaction in favor both of political legitimacy and ecclesiastical authority. Religion and the fallen hierarchy were restored to honor. After governmental chaos, the tendency was to revive all "theories, dominations, principedoms, powers;" and among these there was no other of so much dignity and so venerable from its antiquity as the Catholic church. The revolution, with its train of confusions, was regarded as the result of the frivolous and indifferent spirit of the 18th century, which had contemned everything most hallowed, and which ought no longer to be the character of Frenchmen. The Pope had twice been brought captive to France by Napoleon, where he could more easily be managed by the imperial will; but he was now firmly enthroned on the pontifical See, and a penitential people, weary alike of wars and of paganism, turned to him with reverence, and obeyed a natural prompting to worship the God of their fathers. Such was the revival of Catholicism in France. As every country on the continent had been conquered or endangered as well by French ideas as French arms, and had faced for nearly a score of years a possible overthrow of religion and society, so there was, throughout Catholic Europe,

the same tendency, in various degrees of strength, in favor of the Papacy.

Ultramontanism sprang from this reaction. The poetically religious enthusiasm of Chateaubriand, the loyally religious enthusiasm of Bonald, were the first steps toward it. De Maistre, though not an enthusiast, was the first who advanced a magnificent system of social unity, the Pope being the head and all other magistrates and persons only members. Though he proposed his scheme only as a theory, looking for its ultimate but not urging its present adoption, and was philosophically assured that time would not fail to bring its realization, yet it was very natural that he offended the prejudices of his countrymen. In every age, from the time of saint Irenæus, the Gallican or French church has claimed a sort of independence of Rome, and has held certain privileges which were not accorded to the rest of Catholic christendom. The Gallican chant and mass in the time of Charlemagne were different from the Gregorian chant and mass as celebrated at Rome. Not even Hildebrand was able successfully to interfere in the secular affairs of France. For nearly a century France maintained a duplicate papacy at Avignon in defending her peculiar rights; three of the general councils of the church were chiefly occupied with the vexed question of "Gallican liberties;" and it was finally settled by the council of Constance in 1682, under the guidance of Bossuet, that Saint Peter and his successors had received the power of God only in spiritual things, and that the civil constitution and customs of the kingdom were inviolable by any ecclesiastical authority. Thus ultramontanism, as mildly proposed by De Maistre, and as boldly announced by Montalembert, is opposed to principles which France throughout her history has striven to maintain. It is a renunciation of the long-cherished traditions of a degree of Gallican independence. The loyalty to the throne Montalembert would transform into loyalty to the Papal See, and his religion differs from that of his ancestors by being purely ecclesiastic and ultramontane, while theirs had a spark of patriotism in it. Religiously it has the strength which always

comes from devotion to a single idea, for it reduces the social system to a sort of scientific unity, but politically it extinguishes one of the historic glories of the French nation.

Every grand idea, be it true or false, almost always has its martyr as well as its prophet. The prophet and the martyr of ultramontanism were combined in the person of Lamennais. Félicité Robert de Lamennais, the most brilliant French writer of the present century, was of humble birth, and achieved his education by unassisted and undirected studies. A student without a guide gathers poisonous as well as healing flowers, and does not avoid the quagmires that occur in the meadows of learning. While a boy, during the great events of the revolution, he read in solitude the works of Bayle, Spinoza, Voltaire, and Jean Jacques Rousseau, and it is strange that from such a school he graduated an example of almost seraphic piety. He entered the priesthood meditating profoundly on his way, step by step, and one of his first publications was a war-cry against the indifference and carelessness which had crept into the church from the reigning philosophy of the time. This was his first exhibition of that passionate energy and scimitar-like intellect, of that unbounded faith in ideas, which made him through life the opponent of all means and the advocate of the brightest extremes. He was constantly starting systems from simple ideas, which he developed, till they took in the universe in their consequences. Expending his brilliant enthusiasm on religion, he saw no place to stop till he had made the papal government omnipotent, and he published a work in 1812 in which he disputed the whole doctrine of the Gallican liberties, and declared that not even a bishop could be legally elected without the sanction of the supreme pontiff. At the age of thirty-five, he produced his famous essay on indifference in matters of religion, the effect of which was prodigious, and resounded throughout Europe. The Catholic church raised her head, and believed that her golden mediæval age was to return again; for not since Bossuet had so magnificent and solemn words been spoken in her behalf. Even at Rome the rejoicing was great, and the sacred college was jubilant in having found a cham-

pion who was more mighty than their adversaries. Political schemers hoped anew for the revival of society, when there was so much energy left against incredulity; and men of the world read the book with a kind of tragical interest, fascinated by its power and its art. Its audacity and impetuosity are as remarkable as its mild and mystical pathos, and it was equally admired by those who accepted its conclusions and by those who regarded it only as a happy outburst of fanaticism. Montalembert was one of the many young men who rallied around the new prophet of social reorganization on the basis of religion. Yet how different was he from his master! Lamennais was sincere, and soon found himself obliged to leave the papacy and to pass the rest of his life braving the thunders of the Vatican. Montalembert was politic, and with Jesuitical skill has not only remained within the church, but has made himself the subtle exponent in France of the ultramontane policy.

We may trace the steps of Lamennais. It was his earthly misfortune to be as great a man as he was. A particle less of honesty, a spark less of intellectual clearness,—and he would doubtless have ere now been enrolled among the saints in the calendar. Rome would have followed him in all his eccentricities of genius, provided he had been even more a Romanist than he was a genius. She applauded him while he exalted her power, and she would have patronized him while he sought to elevate the people, provided he had acted from a spirit of coquetry rather than true love. But when he proved himself a philosopher as well as a papist, when he announced his theory of the general consent of men as the test of religious truth and declared the fundamental articles of Christianity to be native to the bosom of humanity, and when he thus made mankind an authoritative member of the religious state presided over by the Pope—when he thus maintained that there were original rights in the race which could be violated not even by the vicegerent of heaven—he was proclaiming principles which might be inconsistent with Papal policy. It was well to speak to the people of their religious rights against civil aggression, but it was dangerous to declare these rights absolute, and thus

to exclude even the Papal jurisdiction from the realm of the individual conscience. Ultramontanism itself might then sometime be checked, and find in enlightened humanity a foe more mighty than kings and emperors.

Lamennais answered the objection by declaring that the instincts of the race tended naturally to uphold the Roman ecclesiastical system, which was the chain that bound man to his Maker. He dreamed of the return of all the peoples of Christendom to the Catholic church, and of the foundation of a gigantic democracy, governed by the Pope as the lieutenant of the Almighty. There was, according to him, a kind of preëstablished harmony which would prevent the sovereignty of the people from conflicting with Roman sovereignty; and the schemes of Gregory VII. and of Robespierre would thus be realized side by side, and, like the lion and the lamb, lie down together. "God and liberty," became the watchword of his school of thinkers, and was the motto of a journal supported by him and a few younger enthusiasts, among whom was Montalembert.

Rome, however, would not accept even undisputed supremacy on the terms offered by Lamennais. It would dislocate the back-bone of Papal history at every joint to admit that Divine authority resided in the mind of man as well as in the chair of St. Peter. The council of the Vatican hesitated but a moment whether to sacrifice their most illustrious defender or to adopt the people as co-heirs of Divine knowledge; and in 1832 the Pope fulminated an encyclical letter containing the severest condemnation of the "fatal, detestable, delirious, and altogether absurd teachings" of the Abbé de Lamennais.

Straightway Montalembert and several of his associates submitted to the decision without reserve or objection, and Lamennais found himself the only unflinching representative of the alliance of liberal and Catholic ideas. He himself, in ironical and bitter language, declared himself satisfied, and then retired to obscurity in the country for meditation.

The prophet of ultramontanism was now to become its



martyr. The most powerful defender of Catholicism in the nineteenth century, the man upon whom the mantle of Bossuet was said to have fallen, passed a year in solitary and gloomy mental conflict. Should he renounce principles which were the golden results of his life's thoughts? Or should he turn against that religious communion to the revival of which he had devoted almost superhuman efforts? The question was a hard one, but it was at length decided. Lamennais determined to engage in mortal duel with Catholicism. His previous democratic writings had outraged the civil government; he was now to outrage the ecclesiastical government; and he would thus have all the powers of the world against him. After two years of silence, he took a step worthy of his genius, and published the most terrible revolutionary book of modern times, *Les paroles d'un Croyant*, a sort of melodious chant, extraordinary for its gracefulness, its violence, its melancholy, its imaginative brilliancy, and its unrelenting bitterness and fury. It is at once a charming book, an echo of the "Imitation of Christ," and a hideous book, an imitation of the ferocious brochures of the revolution. Kings and popes are represented on one side, lugubrious phantoms, the envoys of satan, the sons of the serpent, crowned spectres, seated on thrones of human bones, devouring the innocent, like vultures in pursuit of doves, like tigers which rend the living, like hyenas and jackals which gorge on the dead. On the other side appears humanity, a pale, venerable, and emaciated old man, not daring to search for the truth which God has put in his reach, suffering from hunger and cold, and bending beneath the irons which are welded around all his bones.

From this time Lamennais was an outcast, but he was the oracle of thinking and progressive men throughout Europe. More than one hundred thousand copies of his work were sold within a year. The thrones and the Vatican trembled with rage and fear, as if expecting to be engulfed in a revolutionary torrent, or to be thrown to the winds by some sudden explosion. The Pope fulminated a letter to the faithful against a book "whose size was small, but whose mischief was immense." Only the revolutionary party declared in his favor,

and welcomed to their ranks one who seemed to be armed with thunderbolts, and pronounced him "courageous, great, sublime, the only priest in Europe."

Let the subsequent career of this strange and fascinating man be briefly stated. He had undertaken a task to which even his mighty intellect and daring resolution were unequal. Seldom or never does a great reformer live to see the realization of his reform. It requires both the life and the death of a new thinker to move the world. The name of Lamennais may be significant in future systems of thought, but at present it represents the failure of a brilliant spirit to reorganize mankind extemporaneously. Cardinals, Jesuits, legitimists, and diplomatic agents all wrought against him, and all at the same time honored, feared, and hated him. Only the highest of the archangels, it was said, could, when fallen, become the devil himself—thus alluding to his leading position as a young man in the van of the church. Yet how highly Lamennais was esteemed by the populace was proved in 1848, when a republic was proclaimed, and universal suffrage instituted. He was then elected a representative to the constituent assembly by a larger number of votes than were thrown for any other member. The expectation that he would play a brilliant part was, however, disappointed. He was powerful only with the pen, and the mildness and modesty for which he was personally distinguished forbade him to lead in debate. Even at the time when he was shaking all the foundations of Europe, and attacking kings and popes with a voice terrific as thunder, he trembled with timidity whenever he received company, and was thrown into embarrassment by a visit even from the obscurest stranger. He was a man of study and meditation, not of action, and he passed his last years in retirement, translating Dante, and visited by his most intimate friends. The apostle of a new social organization, vitalized by the omnipresence of religion, still looked to the future for the realization of his ideas as he lay in his last illness.

When attacked by a fatal malady, the most eminent priests of France, and ladies of the highest rank, besieged his door, trying to gain admittance to induce him to be reconciled to the

church. But his proud genius remained to him ; not one priest was admitted to his chamber ; and the last solemn thoughts of the author both of the ablest defences of the Papacy and of the ablest attacks on it in the present century are unknown. After battling so long across the grain of the world, his gentle spirit seems to have tired of all religion as it existed among men ; and in accordance with his will, no religious ceremonies were performed at his funeral, and no Christian symbol marks his grave. The troops were under arms to repress any violence by the citizens, who, with uncovered heads and in profound silence, looked upon the *cortège* which bore to the tomb their favorite author, who for thirty years had been the object of their admiration, enigma as he was to them.

As yet the life and thoughts of Lamennais have probably exerted more influence in furtherance of ultramontanism than in any other direction, and to a large party of Frenchmen he still appears as a young man fighting in new armor for an advanced position of the church. Catholicism in France, as in the other countries of Europe, is now ultramontane, and is reducing itself to order, that it may be able more successfully to wage its warfare with Protestantism. It thus concentrates itself, and has the power which always belongs to despotism, united with the marvellous, serpent's wisdom which no historian can deny to the conclave at Rome. A great and final contest between Catholicism and Protestantism, between the two tendencies represented by these two organizations in ideas and in policy, is unavoidable, and may not be remote. If Protestantism would win the victory, it must be as faithful to its own ideas as its opponents are to the opposite ideas. It must arm itself with the weapon of spiritual and religious freedom. Under the banner of "Truth and Progress," it is invincible. But in the matters of hierarchical oppression, limitations of faith, and Jesuitical manœuvring, it has its superior and master in Catholicism.

## ART. II.—SENTIMENT AND PRINCIPLE.

To one looking upon the activity of the world, who can read the human heart and mind and analyze character, there is presented before him a vast difference in the motives and causes of action which govern mankind. Some are propelled by zeal alone. They are zealous in everything. Some are moved only by selfishness. They are selfish in everything. Some are governed by their judgment. They reason on all things. And some are whirled about here and there seemingly by no law. They are attracted to all substances, like feathers floating in the air. Their lives are filled with strange inconsistencies. To-day they are one thing, and to-morrow its antipode. Such persons are governed by sentiment rather than by principle. Principle in man is like a rock in the ocean, unmoved in its position. Sentiment is like the frothy foam that beats against that rock. In calm seas you see but little of it, but in storm it rages fearfully. In the present article we shall endeavor to elucidate the difference between acting from sentiment and principle.

The course of Nathan to David and David's condemnation of the petty transgression feigned by the prophet, well illustrates this difference.

It has been a cause of wonder to many persons, while reading the account of Nathan's reproof to the King of Israel, that David, a man who had been but a short time before guilty of two of the most heinous sins in the whole catalogue of human crimes, who was obliged to condescend to betray his depravity to his Chief Captain, and whose heart must have been writhing often from the stings of an injured conscience, urged on by the sense of the ungrateful return he had made to one of his most faithful servants, should, under such a weight of moral corruption, have been so indignant at the comparatively small transgression of the law of right which the prophet feigned to have transpired. But there is nothing unnatural in it at all. It illustrates the difference between acting from principle and sentiment.

David was ruler over a great people; anointed king by the prophet of God, from whom he had received many direct communications as the man after his own heart. He was the author, too, of those sweet psalms which, for their poetic beauty, have been the admiration of all nations and tongues who have since listened to their sublime sentiments; and which have cheered many a weary, way-worn Christian on his toilsome pilgrimage to the Celestial City, by the soothing consolations which they contain. There was not one in the whole world could vie with him in his wealth. He had gold and silver; precious stones and spices; horses and chariots; mighty armies; great generals; the fairest daughters of the kings of all lands for his wives. He had read in the books of Moses and the prophets the authentic history of the world's creation; the transgression of Adam and Eve, and its consequences; the fraternal guilt of Jacob's eleven sons, and their after-confusion in the presence of Joseph; the descent into Egypt and the oppression of the Hebrews by Pharaoh; God's miraculous interposition in delivering his ancestors from their bondage, and enveloping their masters in the waves of the Red Sea. He had read the law delivered by the mouth of the Almighty amidst the thunders of Sinai, and he professed to make it his rule of action. He had associated with those in the humblest walks of life, and with those in the highest. He had visited other lands and learned wisdom from the councils of foreign nations. Moses had taught him that no injustice could go unpunished, and he had witnessed its truth time and again in his eventful life, and would have been convinced of it, had he never read of the fearful sentence passed upon the parents of the world on account of their first disobedience; or the wickedness of the antediluvians, and the consequent submergence of mankind by the flood; of the fiery destruction of Sodom, and the many afflictions endured by the Israelites as punishments for their rebellious spirit and evil deeds. But notwithstanding all these things; his position as king; his great intellectual powers of mind, with their high cultivation; his frequent communings with God; David was an imperfect, fallible man, with too much of impulse in his character and too little real principle. His sense of justice

extended to the meanest subject in his whole kingdom, provided that he himself was not an interested party. And then he was capable of committing the greatest enormities; the most revolting crimes without, seemingly for a moment, being sensible of their magnitude; without once mistrusting that evil done by himself appeared to others in just as odious, cruel aspect as did their offences to him.

But do not suppose that David was the only man guilty of such inconsistencies. He was not. Neither was he the last of those who are governed rather by sentiment than principle. There is nothing more common in the world than to see men acting in just this way. The most desperate outlaw; the most depraved villain; the most abandoned wretch, chained in solitary confinement in the felon's cell, awaiting his executioner as the next one to spring back the rusty bolt of his dungeon door, is not so depraved, so lost to all feelings of humanity, but what his indignation will rise; his heart overflow, and his eyes drop tears of pity at the recital of some unvarnished tale of suffering, where might has overcome right, and, disregarding the laws of justice, has forced the weaker to submit, it may be, to some petty outrage.

Thus it was with Cortez in his conquest of Mexico. He could practice the most shameful treachery, and wade through rivers of blood to attain his purpose; but the moment one of his followers, or one of the poor deluded natives deviated from the law of right he had established, though ever so little, in intercourse with each other, he had an ear for the least whisper of complaint, and a hand that never withheld punishment.

So it was with the Roman Emperor Nero. Under his despotic sway, the man who could claim to be a Roman citizen was safe from every wrong the whole world over, save in the immediate presence of the tyrant. Nero could carry on his wholesale butcheries to such an extent that when he condemned to death his victim in the Senate hall of Rome, he watched the countenances of his sympathizing friends, and if one sign of sorrow was visible; if the least pallor overspread the features of the son as he saw his father led to execution, that was sufficient to seal his own doom; and yet no Roman citizen in the

most distant provinces could appeal to this monster of crimes, and state the least grievance he had received at the hand of another, but his appeal was heard and the affair investigated.

There is something in the bare recital of a wrong or an outrage which powerfully elicits the sympathies. The feelings are wrought up to a higher degree by the narration than by witnessing the facts, or more especially, than by being a party therein. We read of a shipwreck or a steamboat disaster, and we feel a hundred-fold more for the sufferers than if we had been accustomed daily to be witnesses of such scenes. The newspaper details of the evils of slavery affect him who has never beheld the reality very differently indeed from what it does the slave master. His imagination at once is busy. He pictures to his mind the anguish of the husband and wife as they take the farewell embrace, to be driven away to more Southern plantations; as they look upon their children for the last time, ere the voice of the auctioneer has consigned them to their several destinations; or as they feel the lash of the driver lacerating still more their bleeding limbs. The eye of imagination sees a thousand things which never come before the real eye. We do not mean to say in this case that it sees imaginary things, but it paints the reality in such glowing colors that it attracts the attention of the mind. The man who has spent all his life in a slaveholding country, has become so accustomed to sighs of breaking hearts; to tears of sorrow; to groans of hopeless suffering, and all its scenes of woe, that it disturbs him not, provided it is all among the slaves; but let one of their masters or their families receive the least wrong, and his heart is all alive with sympathy; with feelings of vengeance. But he is not impelled by principle. His feelings originate not because it has become a principle with him to love justice and hate oppression. If they did, it would matter not whether he saw wronged a white or a black man; whether the sufferer were rich or poor; whether he himself had been the aggressor or some other one. In either case principle would compel him to condemn it; condemn it boldly and unshrinkingly, let the consequences be what they might.

When the Hungarian war was raging, and it was fearful which way it might terminate; and also after its close, when Kossuth and his fellow-patriots had landed upon our shores, the whole nation sympathized with them. Senators were bold as lions in their denunciations against Russia and Austria. Cabinet men did not fear to write high-toned letters to the court of Vienna, and there was not a slaveholder in the land who did not feel indignant at the sufferings of the down-trodden Magyars. And yet many of those warm sympathizers were personally riveting chains on the limbs of the black men on their own plantations, a thousand times more galling than Austria ever dreamed of forging. So it is over the whole world. One is crying out against the sin of another, while the second, wrapping himself up in his robes of self-righteousness, is quite as loud in his abhorrence of some peculiar faults of the first. Each holds up the mirror to the other, but sees not himself. In order to be good, really so—free from sin and inconsistencies—we must act from principle, and not impulse. The smallest act, as well as the largest, must be judged of by this criterion. Nothing that it is necessary for us to do is too minute to be determined in this way; and no undertaking is too extensive to be subject to its decision.

We should not be governed by, nor should we indulge in, that kind of sentimental feeling which weeps over scenes created by the novelist, and is deaf to the cry of suffering humanity, rising around us like the voice of many waters up to the God of mercy for his assistance. And yet how many there are whose hearts are melted into tenderness over a novel, and whose tears flow forth unrestrained over fictitious sorrow, who would almost, if not quite, permit their neighbors, nay, even their own relatives, to die of starvation, if they happened to be ignorant, unlearned, and of low descent, instead of being of aristocratic birth, and, now in their poverty, clothed in faded silks and satins, the wrecks of what they once wore—according to the style of the novelist's heroes. Poverty, to be sympathized with by such persons, must be genteel. It must have been induced by a cruel father's anger against an angelic daughter, who eloped with her beau ideal of manly perfection, because,



forsooth, the father being superannuated, or prejudiced, did not perceive all his attractions and attributes of goodness. Or, it must have been caused by some unexpected disaster; some sudden turn of fortune's wheel, whereby those brought up in affluence, who have never known a care or a wish ungratified, find themselves all at once reduced to a state of absolute want. Then sympathy flows. Then charity is not backward with her aid.

Now, we have not a word to say against sympathy and aid in these cases. It is just as it should be. The unfortunate have claims upon us, whether their misfortunes were caused with or without their own agency. But if we are governed by principle and not sentiment, are not those who are born poor, whose fathers and forefathers for generations back, were in indigent circumstances, and who, in consequence, are uneducated, ignorant of many things which would be for their own good to understand; not cleanly in their habits, and never have been able to elevate themselves from their degraded position;—are not such, when suffering, just as worthy of our charities and sympathies as the others? Let us be not too hasty in condemning any class of our fellow beings. The eternal future will reveal the sighs and tears and struggles of many a one to educate and elevate himself from the humble position he occupies by birth, whom poverty has fettered hand and foot.

“ Full many a gem of purest ray serene  
 The dark, unfathomed caves of ocean bear;  
 Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,  
 And waste its sweetness in the desert air.”

The humble youth, clad, it may be, in the tattered garments of beggary, that the man of high position meets as he walks the street, may have immortal longings in his breast to make himself an educated man that shall yet be respected. And he may accomplish it. He will then remember the contemptuous look he received as he passed the worldly great. But, if he fail, he will add only one more to the millions, male and female, whose intellects have been held in the vise of poverty from expanding, and who are thus consigned to oblivion till God, in

another state of existence, shall do them justice. Talents, great minds, are not confined alone to costly mansions, whose inmates fare sumptuously, and are clothed in purple and fine linen. Neither are they found only in the opposite extreme. They are common to all grades of society. The accomplished gentleman, whose splendid equipage rolls through the streets, and who stands high in his country's favor, may pass the humble coalman whose intellectual powers are far superior to his. They may never hold their true positions in this world, but there is a day coming in another life, when they may; and in that day a cup of cold water given to one in the past, will have just as great a reward as though given to the other. If, therefore, we are governed by principle, we shall acknowledge worth wherever we see it. We shall call wrong wrong, and right right, without respect to the one who does it. We shall be just as ready to administer aid, so far as they have claims upon us, to the needy inmates of the most wretched hovel, who hardly know their right hand from their left, as to any other class of sufferers.

We must divest ourselves of all prejudice, and learn to look at things just as they are; to feel that wherever we see a human countenance, there is an immortal soul, and that that soul, however unseemly may be the casket which contains it, is a jewel equally beautiful, equally beloved by God with every other soul, provided it is as free from stains. David, to refer to him again, forgot this. A humble shepherd boy, in early life, he knew from his own experience that the hearts of the poor have feelings; that their rights are just as dear to them as those of the opposite class, and yet when he became king, surrounded by his nobles, his courtiers, and mighty men of power, we see him invading those very rights which he, as a ruler, was bound by every consideration to have preserved inviolate. This shows us the necessity of acting from principle and not sentiment, and also the necessity of watching our own hearts; and to beware of self-deception, lest, when we think we are living holy, godly lives; acting from principle, and not impulsive feeling alone; all devoted to the service of our Master; rendering to every one his just dues, and omitting no known duty, we are

entirely mistaken in ourselves, being selfish, prejudiced in our judgments, gratifying our sensual propensities, and doing much to our own condemnation and the injury of others.

This suggests the thought of our duties to our brethren. They are fearfully great. They extend not only to giving them their just weight and measure; the real worth of their money or labor in dealing with them, but to the manner, also, in which we conduct ourselves before them; our conversation, habits of life, and the very spirit we carry about us and manifest before them. If we are better educated, or are occupying higher stations than some with whom we associate, they are looking to us for an example; and our influence over them cannot be computed. Neither party are aware of its magnitude. They may affect to be independent in their motives of action, but it is not so. We mutually influence each other, and our actions are as often the result of another's influence over us as from our own free wills. None is too low, none too high to exert this reciprocal power.

Said an aged servant of God, in a conference and prayer room, "A lady once made the confession that she owed her conversion to the manner she saw a professed Christian and his wife walk up the aisle of the church to seat themselves in their pew for the worship of God. There was something so meek, so assured, so Christ-like in their countenances and the way they walked, that the difference between the condition of her heart and theirs was forced upon her with such power that she could not repel the thought that at the judgment day they would walk thus calm up to the bar of God, and hear the welcome reception, 'Well done, good and faithful servants; enter into the joy of your Lord,' while she must take up her abode in the regions of lamentation and despair; and she never found peace till she found it at the foot of the cross, by the regeneration of her heart."

Now, those two Christians lived and died entirely ignorant that they were the means of that woman's salvation; unconscious that they had won a soul to Heaven. They simply did their duty—acted from principle. What an unexpected glory awaited them in the world above! There will be, undoubtedly,

many such a surprise to the humble, faithful man, who, in this world, scarcely dare hope that he himself shall be admitted into the pure society of heaven, and who is looked upon as hardly possessing any influence whatever over others. But if this is true, is not the opposite true also? Will not eternity reveal to us many souls that have been corrupted through the evil examples of others?—examples, it may be, set when it was not realized that any witnessed them. We should ever live, therefore, so that no one in the great future can reproach us with leading him astray. But, if we have acted from sentiment contrary to principle, if we have been partial, or shown respect to persons in this life; if we have in any way unnecessarily offended the conscience of a single disciple of our Lord; if in the daily life, the actions have not corresponded with sacred professions, whereby some have been driven, as it were, from the kingdom of heaven, fearful indeed will be the accusations with which we shall be greeted as we enter the world of spirits. Is there, then, not the greatest need that everything be done—the least as well as the greatest—when it is thought we are observed, and when it is thought we are not, from principle—principle founded upon the truth itself? That there be no trusting to the feelings as a guide, which are ever variable; changing with every change in the atmosphere; depressed or elevated, according to the state of health or worldly prosperity?

Religion founded upon sentiment—feeling alone—is worth but little. The person governed by it is truly unstable in all his ways. In times when there are revivals, he is upon the top of the mount of rejoicing; filled with glory—all carried away with the joy he feels; shouting, leaping, and praising God. He cannot be humble, prayerful, active, happy enough. No duty has a cross. It is easy going to the house of worship, easy staying there, and sweet to add his word of testimony for his Master. His benevolence embraces the whole world. He gives liberally for the spread of Christianity at home and abroad; and longs for the time to come when the millennium shall be ushered in with all the latter-day glory. But when the excitement has passed away, he quickly descends into the valley of

He has suffered, at one time, more acute pain and apparently been nearer death; but he has also enjoyed better health; he has known what it was to be perfectly well, to have all his physical powers in full exercise, with a robust constitution for nearly the whole time, his days of sickness being only as exceptions. So it was with David. He sinned with a high hand; but it was not a daily practice with him. As often as he erred he repented, and his sorrow and contrition were in proportion to the magnitude of his guilt.

Let no one, then, excuse his faults by saying they are no worse than David's, till he has first imitated his virtues; first proved himself a man after God's own heart, by his almost constant fidelity and truth in his services. And not then, unless he is willing to bear David's punishment—his shame before the prophet of God—his disgrace before his people, and his glory tarnished in all ages.

But from the consideration of this subject, we may not only learn our own fallibility, and that the way alone to avoid inconsistencies in life is, to act from principle in all cases; we may also learn that from principle and not sentiment we should be charitable to the erring, lest, in our denunciations of them, ere we are aware, we condemn ourselves. David's reply to Nathan's account of supposed wrong was, "As the Lord liveth the man that hath done this thing shall surely die." And he passed sentence upon himself. In principle, too, Nero and Cortez often passed sentence upon themselves. And those around them knew it. And the world has ever condemned their inconsistency. So do many now, when governed by excited feelings; oftener, too, than they are aware, in their wholesale condemnation of an erring brother or sister, effectually cut off themselves from all hope of mercy. The great lesson of the age for mankind to learn is, to divest themselves of bigotry; of this spirit, which says, "Stand aside, for I am more holy than thou;" of this feeling of self-righteousness which passes judgment upon a fallen brother, upon the spur of the moment, ere he has been heard in his defence, and that would annihilate every one who does not come up to the standard of right and wrong in precisely just the same way as they do who possess

it—stumbling where they stumble, and finding no temptations except such as they have found. Nothing is farther from the spirit and principles which governed Christ. People are all constituted differently, with different thoughts, feelings, passions and powers; under different circumstances; in different pursuits; moving in different circles socially; subject to different temptations within and without, with different strength of resistance. Now, what else could be expected but that one would fall where another would stand, and that what would be a temptation to the latter would possess no power over the former. What right then has one to judge another? How can he tell but what he would have done the same placed in similar circumstances? But how loth we are to admit that anything can palliate the guilt of the erring! Has a neighbor, led away by vicious associates, occasionally yielded to his appetites and become intoxicated, instead of taking him by the hand, as true men are bound to do, and kindly entreating him to beware of the evils of intemperance, how natural it is to point the finger of scorn at him behind his back, and to cry out that he should be shunned by all claiming respectability, and that he is on the broad road to ruin. Truly, if anything will drive him upon that road, it is when, all decent people having set their faces against him, he is forced to seek his companions among the profligate.

If another, an enterprising man, ventures in his business affairs a little too far and is finally obliged to assign his property for the benefit of his creditors, paying, it may be, but a small dividend; how quick do we hear it said, and perhaps too by one who is too indolent to take the same course, or even by one who will eventually be forced by circumstances to the same results, or by another, who, with his thousands at interest, cannot appreciate the motives which urge on the poor man to gain a competency—"he has been dishonest, extravagant in his expenditures, unskilful in business; he has concealed a fortune upon which to retire;" when it may be the man has done the best he could, or if he has not, the others may be guilty of errors equally heinous when judged by the Divine law. But let this be as it may, there is no reason why the whole community

should commence at once a grand tirade of abuse against him. Let one do ever so badly, the only brotherly course to pursue with him is to inquire into the circumstances in as kind a manner as possible; learn how strong were his temptations, and whether he would be glad, for the future, to live a respectable life; and not create an impassable gulf which shall at once shut him out from all social and business intercourse with the moral part of community, that shall shun him as it would the pestilence.

We would not be understood to advocate the no-punishment system of administering government. Let every man who has violated the just laws knowingly, suffer the penalty annexed. But when once that has been done, and he gives evidence of thorough repentance and reformation, then his fellow brethren are bound to sympathize with him, to forgive his trespasses and to receive him the same as before; and they will if they are governed by principle and not by a morbid sentiment. There is no more effectual way of driving the unfortunate individual, who has deviated from the path of rectitude, to live an abandoned life, than this same bigoted zeal for virtue which, acting not from principle, but an unhealthy sentimentality, spurns him as a dog, an outcast forever. Shut out by one fault from the society of all good men, he cannot live alone, and of necessity associates with the vile till he becomes one of them. Never so condemn and ostracise any man till the struggles to resist temptation; the nights of weeping; the days of sadness; the sufferings both of body and mind can all be brought into the account. Let each one ask himself the question, why he is not equally guilty before the world; and will not the candid answer be, that often public sentiment, not the abhorrence of the evil, has prevented him from committing it? Or that he has done other things which, though not looked upon by man as equally bad, yet in principle he fears there is no difference? And he is willing to acknowledge that when a brother or sister has erred, there has often been an effort made to resist the temptation, which, had it been presented to those who boast themselves of their integrity, and how firmly they are established in virtue, they would frequently have yielded with one-

half the inducement? And it is true that no one knows the strength of his principles till they have been besieged. Visit the prisons and penitentiaries. Do you believe that their inmates are sinners above all others? The man who is governed by principle and not sentiment, as he gazes upon the victims of evil immured within their walls, will drop the sympathetic tear and inwardly thank his God that he has not been surrounded by like circumstances, fearing if he had that he too would be even as they are. It seems to him a very easy thing, as he looks upon the convicts before him and recalls the crimes of which they are guilty, to say how he would have avoided them; how he would have acted under the circumstances, resisting his evil desires; how virtuous he would have been; and how such a small temptation could not have been any inducement; but yet, when his mind turns upon himself, and he looks back upon the past and reviews the many times he has yielded to temptations infinitely smaller when he had determined he would not, he feels his own littleness; his weakness; that he has no reason to boast of his goodness or denounce those who have been more unfortunate than himself. This is judging by principle and not sentiment. And if each one looks thus closely to himself, scans his own motives of conduct; what has caused him to do one thing and restrained him from doing another; why he has not yielded to this or that temptation; and recollects that he is to give an account for every deed, every word, and even every idle thought he cherishes, and every spirit manifested; when he thus considers his case, he will not find so much goodness in himself as he might at first suppose. By such an examination all would see the need and feel it too, of crying out, "God be merciful to us sinners—miserable offenders!" It is enough for us to know that our own calling, our own election is sure. The fact is, many a one who stands fair before the world knows that he is guilty in his heart; knows that his imagination has often presented forbidden scenes in such alluring colors, so tempting that he has suffered himself unrestrained to partake of the pleasure she has conjured up before him. Now, all he wanted to induce him to yield openly, was that the reality should present itself under the same fascinating forms. And



if that has never been done, if his Heavenly Father has been merciful to him and not suffered him to be tempted above what he could bear, is it any virtue in him? Anything that should cause him to glory in his own strength and despise the weakness of others? It does not become the murderer to condemn to death the man guilty of some petty offence. And yet there are many in every vicinity who are ready to accuse their brother of having a mote in his eye without regarding the beam in their own eye, because they are governed by sentiment and not principle. We do not mean, we would say once more, to speak one syllable against the punishment of criminals to the fullest extent of their transgressions. But we would have that punishment not only protective to society, but we would have it corrective also—tending to their reformation and not degradation. We would have it administered on the severest principles, and not on changing sentiment. The condemned should not feel that when they enter the prison walls they are forever shut out from all intercourse and sympathy with the world. But in giving them the assurance of our sympathy we need not lose sight of the distinction between virtue and vice. Neither should it be the only passport of a man to our respect that he has once fallen from his integrity. There is a golden mean to follow, and it should always be pursued. Finally, God acts from principle and not sentiment towards his children. He has no respect of persons; the faults of one man, be he king or peasant, are just as hateful in his sight as those of another. It matters not what are one's circumstances, what his wisdom, whether he be one of the humblest of the sons of earth, unheard of as many rods from his dwelling as he has numbered years in life; or whether he be the heir of wealth, nurtured in the lap of affluence and cradled in luxury; no place is obscure enough to hide him; no station is exalted enough to ensure his safety; no power is able to defend him; there is no charm, no opiate that can render him invulnerable if he pursues wrong, or to cause God to act towards him contrary to fixed principle. If he is a violator of the Divine law of right, while he is resting in the greatest apparent security, and flattering himself that he shall prove an exception and escape a merited punishment,

and is thus lulling himself to sleep in his supposed safety, he will find that Fate in the mythology of the ancients never was surer to pursue to the last, one of its victims, than is the penalty of wrong doing to follow him. And when everything around him points its finger towards him, and like a peal of thunder exclaims, "Thou art the man," all disguise is at an end, all struggles against the fulfilment of the sentence are useless. He must stand forth and meet the penalty due to his errors. Many a transgressor of the right has thus been awakened to his real danger, while he was heart and soul absorbed in his unprincipled course, deceiving one, defrauding another, and heaping up the treasures of earth by dishonestly and oppressively grinding down the face of the poor in the dust, till his coffers overflowed; then indulging his sensual appetites and passions with the most unrestrained license, he has gone on drinking his fill of the cup of pleasure, deaf to the cry of want around him; unheeding the pains and sufferings he is causing for his selfish gratifications; unmoved when the angel of death cuts down this or that fellow being; thus he has gone on in his selfish wickedness, governed entirely by feeling instead of principle, as though the world and all the inhabitants thereof were made solely to minister to his indulgence. But when his revels are the longest, his mirth the most boisterous, when his blasphemies are the loudest, when wealth flows in the fastest, physical enjoyment the sweetest, health apparently the most certain, when he seems about to consummate all his sensuous desires, then, sudden as an earthquake in a guilty city, he is made aware that he is dealing with a God of principle, undazzled by his success unmoved by his social position, and that he must drain the dregs of that cup he has been so sweetly quaffing. Fascinated by his brilliant success, men generally, acting by the impulse of excited feeling, write the errors of the evil doer in sand, and in time forget all his crimes. But God never acts from feeling, in the sense we have used it, but always from principle. Many a one with a heart filled with enthusiasm as he has recalled the dazzling exploits of Napoleon has wished that he might have conquered at Waterloo; and forgetting all the selfishness and crimes of the self-made emperor, has said it was too bad

that he should be banished to the lonely island of St. Helena. But God is moved by no such sentimentalism. With him principle always governs. Time heals no wounds in his breast. True, he is merciful, but his mercy never causes him to be unjust.

Here we close. We have endeavored in this short article to illustrate the difference between acting from principle and sentiment. We would not have men crucify their feelings; we would not have them become unimpassioned and cold; we would not have them so restrain the exercise of these feelings that they should lose any of their sympathy with their fellow brethren, or any of their zeal; but we would have all governed by fixed principles, and never violate them by yielding to any impulse of feeling, or by indulging in any sentimentalism. Christ was not without feeling most surely, as his weeping at the grave of Lazarus and his oft-shown compassion upon the suffering poor will abundantly attest; and yet in no one case did he ever violate principle, or teach others to do so. And no enthusiasm for a good cause should hurry one on to do the least wrong—nay, not if he believed that he could win scores of souls to Christ by so doing, for he would, by so acting, be doing evil that good might come, "whose condemnation is just." There are many things in the Divine government over this world that we cannot understand in our present state. But surely he is far from a wise or safe man who on this account throws aside principle and leaps blindly into the eddying current of human activity to float about as drift-wood wherever a chance feeling may carry him. If he has easy sailing for awhile, it will not be long before he will be likely to be sent most violently upon the breakers, which he might have avoided by the exercise of judgment.

### ART. III.—THE RELIGIOUS BEARINGS OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM.

Spiritualism is a word which has recently come to have a new meaning. It does not now denote, as it has done, simply the attribute of a single nature or of a small class of minds, but it stands for a philosophy which is beginning to exhibit definite features, and for a power in society which candid observers cannot well help recognizing.

Spiritualists are a sect;—we hardly know whether we ought to say a *religious* sect or not; for, while many spiritualists claim that, in becoming such, they have at length reached the pith and marrow and kernel of religion, many others, held in excellent fellowship, avow that they find in the new philosophy a weapon as formidable against the dogmas of all church creeds and ideas and symbols, as the ancient jaw-bone was in the hands of the Jewish giant when he lifted it against the Philistines. The openly avowed adherents of the new faith are numerous, and it is claimed that the ranks are still rapidly filling up; and the number of secret sympathizers or semi-believers, who are kept from open avowal by prudential considerations, is declared to be greater still. Men of large ability and equal attainments, of sound judgment and blameless life, of social standing and commanding influence, are counted among its advocates. It has developed a considerable literature. Notwithstanding it insists so much on spontaneity and declaims against set forms, it has organized its forces and gone to work systematically. It has a large and increasing corps of public speakers, who freely itinerate or frequently exchange, some of whom speak by premeditation and others by impulse—to-day with their eyes open and to-morrow with them shut,—here declaring their own thoughts, and there avowing themselves as only the indispensable media—or "*mediums*"—through whom departed and supermundane beings unfold their thoughts to men. It has its established meetings on the Sabbath, and its "circles" during the week. It claims to be the Moses of the nineteenth century, set to lead Israel out of bondage; or the

pillar of cloud and fire moving on to the land of promise as the angel of God's presence. It offers itself as the prophet of nature and the interpreter of the Bible. Its claims are ample enough, whatever it may lack in authority; and however small its performances may appear, no one can complain that it does not promise sufficiently.

Not a little is said by the avowed adherents of this system of the duty and value of investigation; and not a little complaint is made that Christians, and especially Christian ministers, refuse to go into the circles, and hear the lectures, and read the papers, and study the books, and converse with the prophets, and watch the phenomena, and listen to the experiences, and wait for and woo the rappings and impressions, which, it is said, are calculated to convince the candid, convert the skeptics, and satisfy and enlighten the world generally. But this obligation to investigate has its limitations. Nobody can be required to investigate everything to every extent, and in every combination of circumstances. Two or three points settled will have an important bearing on the question of one's duty in that direction.

1st. Is there time that can properly be spared from other more practical and imperative duties? To most people this is a busy world; and to those who see in life great practical concerns to be taken care of, it is not always easy, nor does it seem consistent, to command the leisure for such extensive and protracted and long-continued efforts at investigation as most spiritualists find and declare necessary.

2d. Is there evidently capacity to criticize and weigh evidence, classify and properly interpret the phenomena which are to be studied? It may be a little self-denying to confess our inability, but the truth may require it, and there may be as much modesty and more self-respect and wisdom in admitting that we are not probably philosophers enough to reduce the admitted chaos of the manifestations to order. Leverrier wrought out the proof that there must be a planet in our system, revolving in an orbit beyond that of Uranus, from a few elements which his astronomical observations had furnished him; he indicated the locality where the yet unseen world was

pursuing its mighty journey; and when a semi-luminous point came into the telescopic field, he declared that the planet was discovered. Was it every common man's duty to investigate that subject for himself, and satisfy his own mind by independent observation and research? to review the mathematical processes of the astronomer and see whether the conclusions were valid and inevitable? Not many men in a thousand were competent to conduct such an investigation with any real profit, and to attempt it would have been an egotistic pretence, or a farce too ridiculous to be solemn to anybody but the experimenter. And the implied assumption that the mass of the people are capable of conducting a real investigation of the phenomena of the "circles," or properly classifying and rightly interpreting what is witnessed there, suggests more presumption than discretion. They may get their verdicts ready very soon, and render them without the slightest misgiving, but are they proper persons to put on the jury? The answer to that question must limit the obligation to investigate.

3d. What moral profit—what real profit of any sort—has obviously resulted from the investigation and experience of others? That, too, is a question which has a bearing on one's duty in this direction. Not every pursuit is allowable in any rational or serious view of life. It may excite or gratify our curiosity; it may give us many new facts and experiences; it may yield a pleasant stimulus to emotion; and still it may be disallowed by duty. The pursuit of all sorts of knowledge is not a duty for everybody. A large pile of new facts at the end of a long exploration may add nothing to the real mental wealth of the explorer. Not everything justifies our tedious search because it is true, nor because it is connected with an important subject. Utility, understood in the broad sense, is the only proper end of investigation. Somebody has taken the pains to count the number of letters in the Bible. We cherish the Bible as the most excellent of books; but the time taken to investigate this point we think would have been better spent in setting type for Robinson Crusoe, or putting covers on Don Quixote or the Arabian Nights. Our mother's grave is a very sacred spot; but our heart, and the memory of her earnest

practical Christian life would rebuke the least of her children who should stop to count the spires of grass that wave above her dust in the summer wind. It may be a "fact" that there are just 12,347 paving stones on the street between the cross-walk that lies under our study-window and the "What Cheer" building in Market Square where it terminates, but we don't think it worth the while to defy the sun and rain, to dodge the omnibuses and provoke the pedestrians, to weary our spine into a curvature and fret our conscience and our family that call for practical and profitable work, into open rebellion, by going into an "investigation" of that matter. We cannot see the profit of such work. We never heard that the man who counted the Bible letters grew to be a better Christian, or a broader philosopher, or a higher social economist, or a more genial neighbor, as the result of that service. The patience, and the tact in dealing with figures, implied by this task, might have found a nobler field. And it is a legitimate question to ask whether the natural and obvious practical results appearing in the case of those who have devoted themselves to spiritualism, justify and call for our copying their course.

And it must be remembered that every other earnest theorizer, every advocate of any other system to which he is devoted is just as likely to claim that as the chief and important matter to be investigated, as the spiritualist to claim investigation for his specialty. And he has just as good a right to insist upon our attention and study, to accuse us of selfishness, prejudice and fear of the light in case of refusal, as our modern prophet who comes to discourse to us about the secrets of the other world. And if, during our active, busy, practical, serious human life, duty requires the performance of this multiform work, we should need the longevity of Methuselah in order to finish up our tasks in any decent season and way, and get the approval—"Well done, good and faithful servants."

It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss this subject of spiritualism in all its aspects and bearings. We purpose to speak of it only in its relations to religion. We do not now inquire about its science, but about its theology. Our development and discussion must both be brief, and will doubtless

be imperfect, for a few pages are hardly sufficient for a thorough dealing with such a topic. And first, we will state the main positions of the spiritualists as fairly as possible, drawing the items from various sources which are generally accepted as authority. We cannot stop to designate the various sources from whence our information is drawn, but shall endeavor to avoid incorrectness of statement, and even the slightest misrepresentation. We take the expositions of its friends and teachers. They have a right to be heard in explanation, and to them we turn. We cannot tell every thing they hold, but we shall seek to set forth the essential points of their system fairly.

We may say now, as well as at any time, that they who set down all the phenomena of spiritualism to sheer and deliberate and unprincipled imposture, seem to us to be wanting in discrimination, uncharitable in their judgment, and unconsciously rejecting the very principles of historic criticism and the rules of evidence which are depended on to justify our faith in the genuineness of the New Testament, and the reality of the Christian miracles. We are by no means saying that the argument for the *truth of spiritualism as a system* is equal to the argument for the truth of Christianity; but that the same grounds on which one pronounces all the *phenomena* of spiritualism the result of deliberate imposture, require a rejection of the testimony in view of which we yield our belief to the statements of the Evangelists when they deal with the facts of Christianity.

And they who take some extravagant statement of one of its ignorant devotees, or some vicious act of one of its vicious hangers-on, as a fair exponent of the whole scheme and the whole spirit of the new brotherhood, are neither wise nor just in their method. No cause, not even the best and holiest, could afford to be so treated and disposed of. What, then, are the principal points claimed to be correct by spiritualists, and which make up the main items in their Confession of Faith? We answer,

1. It is claimed that there is direct communication carried on between human beings on earth, and the beings who inhabit



the spirit world; that this commerce of minds in the two realms is no new thing; that a belief in it has prevailed in almost all ages and among almost all nations; that it has tinged all human history and modified all human life; that it is clearly taught in the Bible, and is essential to the very idea of revealed religion.

2. It is claimed that this intercourse is chiefly carried on by or through "mediums"—the orders of beings whence the revelations come to us do not usually speak directly to the mass of men, but employ a medium who "is in close contact with them on the one side, and in contact with us on the other. That this method has always been the usual if not the invariable one in such commerce, and that it is necessary to effective and varied communications.

3. It is claimed that these "mediums" are chiefly, if not exclusively, human beings. So it has always been; and there is a propriety if not a necessity for selecting them as the chief instruments in the work. So, in accordance with this, the Scripture has its prophets, its sacred audience chamber, and its spirit of inspiration; while mythology and history have their deified heroes who become patrons of the city or the people or the pursuit; their oracles and auguries, their frenzied priestesses and tell-tale ghosts.

4. It is claimed that these mediums are persons of peculiar qualities, which fit them for this mediumistic service; that these qualities are partly physical and partly moral, partly constitutional and partly acquired. To a certain extent they are conditional to all, though by no means to the same extent. The highest mediumship is said to follow certain modes of life; so that a medium, constitutionally a good one, is dependent for any large increase of the peculiar power upon the spirit that is cherished and the life that is lived. And this is said to have been the law prevailing in the prophetic periods of Scripture history, and was recognized and is still recognized among all pagan nations.

5. It is claimed that the beings who directly communicate with or through these "mediums" are those who have been inhabitants of this earth as we are, but who have at length laid

down the perishable material body, and now are living and acting amid the new circumstances and under the new conditions of the spirit world and the spirit-life.

6. It is claimed that the proof that such communications are received is found in the facts,—in the manifestations that are offered to us,—manifestations to the senses and manifestations to the mind. These manifestations are said to be various, and appear generally only to those who put themselves in the way of witnessing and receiving them. They consist of rappings, tipping of tables and other objects, movings, singular impressions on the nervous system or on the mind; in trance speaking, writing, &c. It is said these facts are well authenticated, as well as any other facts of that class are or can be; that they are not explicable in any other theory than that adopted by spiritualists.

7. It is claimed that these manifestations are always accompanied by intelligence of a higher or lower degree, and by the evident exercise of personal will. It is not the mere working of physical forces, the mere setting loose of physical and irresponsible powers, but a rational mind seems ever apparent and present and active whenever these manifestations appear.

8. It is claimed that the mediums are mostly passive when these influences are at work on and through them, sometimes conversing with others while the strange work goes on, and, after ceasing to be thus specially influenced, frequently to tell very little or even nothing of what has been transpiring, and of their own part in the operations. This foreign influence often comes to them unsought, and unexpectedly,—sometimes, indeed, in spite of their objections and opposition, and the more forcibly as their objections and opposition are exercised;—though the general law seems to be that a calm, passive, acquiescent, or actively coöperating state of mind is essential to the largest reception and most marked development of this foreign influence. It is said that the “spirits” are always waiting in an anxiety to communicate, and when they find a person whose organization is such as to afford an avenue of approach to men, they sometimes use him as a medium to carry out their purposes, without so much as saying to him, “*By your leave, sir.*”

9. It is claimed that, when this intelligence which accompanies the manifestations is questioned respecting its origin and relations, it always declares itself to come from disembodied human spirits now in the spirit-world; and usually declares itself to be some natural relative or friend or acquaintance either of the medium, or of some member or members of the company present, or of some other party or parties to whom it wishes a message sent. It is said, therefore, that we are not left to simple inference in order to identify the source of this intelligence, but the intelligence itself always describes itself in a uniform way, adding its positive testimony to our own opinions, or contradicting them by it.

10. It is claimed that the evidence going to show that the sources of these manifestations and of this intelligence are really disembodied human spirits, as they claim to be, is quite sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind. The identity is declared to be thoroughly and satisfactorily made out; and it is added that reasonable and honest skepticism appears impossible to one who has adequately studied the phenomena with intelligence and candor.

11. It is claimed that the actual state of things in the other world may be and is quite fully ascertained, even in its details, by means of these communications. The spirits are said to know how they are situated and occupied in the other world, that they have at length found themselves capable of imparting their knowledge to us, that they are interested and anxious to do it, that they are constantly occupied in doing it, and that, in their statements, we have that realm more or less fully portrayed as it is portrayed nowhere else.

12. It is claimed that, by means of this source of intelligence thus open to us, a new and higher element of strength and culture is offered to our spiritual life. It is said that we have new means of acquiring spiritual knowledge, of getting rid of our errors that weigh us down, and so of rising to a higher and better plane of spiritual existence. *Light* is said to come to us amid the darkness where we have heretofore groped; it is said to be *additional* light, *new* light, *higher* light,—the which whoever spurns suffers, if he does not sin. Different degrees

of importance are attached to this newly-opened source of instruction by different expounders of the new faith. Some claim that these communications are really opening upon us a new and august dispensation. Others insist rather that it is, in some high sense, a restoration of that ancient and better time when heaven and earth held fellowship in the charming infancy of human life, the legends of which have always been kept and told;—told alike in the storied incantations of Hinduism, in the admission of mortals to the councils of the gods in Grecian Olympus, and in the picture of Eden wherewith Moses opens his panorama of human history. Some ardent and hopeful natures look for our churches to become great spiritualistic circles, where the talk with the other world is to be carried on with added advantage and success, and expect our pulpits to be places where the highest and best developed trance speakers will spend their Sundays in telling the reverent multitude their visions or unfolding their philosophy. Others there are who insist that our churches, and all that appertains to them, are to be swept out of the way as so much rubbish, to give room for the erection of the new and glorious temple of whose pattern they catch glimpses in the visions that visit them. They insist that there must be a thorough demolition of that which is, as essential to prepare the way for that which shall be.

13. It is claimed that the general reception of this new system, in theory and practice, would make the world rapidly better, and that a large improvement promises to come in no other way. It is said that we have got on about as far as we can go without taking this new guidance; that we have exhausted the old resources and methods, and so must turn to these new and better ones; that the old forces and philosophy and religion did very well in our earlier stages of progress, but are inadequate to meet the wants of this time on which we have fallen; that the new prophets of progress must lead us out of the Egypt whose life we have outgrown, and whose fetters we must now throw off. We are assured that we must tarry in the midst of darkness if we cling to the traditions and teaching of

the past, but are certain to walk out and on into increasing light if we but accept the new guidance.

These are the main points claimed by spiritualists in all quarters, and of every grade. So far, certainly, there is agreement, if agreement can be affirmed of them in respect to any definite points. Some other things may now very properly be put down under the head of concessions or admissions which are made by nearly all intelligent and candid spiritualists, so far as we have been able to ascertain. Some are quite forward to make them in the form of gratuitous statements, as an integral part of the facts or the philosophy of the system; others seem inclined to keep them out of sight so far as is practicable, discovering a disposition, or at least a tendency, to evade them and their inferences, and a few others may discover what seems an inclination to deny them; but it is perfectly safe to put them down as so many concessions, which must enter into any adequate statement of the alleged facts and theory of spiritualism.

1. It is conceded that these communications usually express simply the knowledge or opinions of the disembodied human spirits who make them to us. The "spirits" do not claim infallibility, nor insist that they are always setting forth the real mind of God. They do not say, "Thus saith the Lord," but "Thus saith Tom, or Dick, or Harry, or Kate, or Susan, or Dorcas." Or, listening to the utterances of the higher circles, it is, "Thus saith Aristotle, or Plato, or Pythagoras; Thus saith Bacon, or Swedenborg, or Layola; Thus saith Burke, or Shakspeare, or Franklin. It is only the human spirit that speaks, or claims to speak, and it claims to draw only on its facts or its suppositions for its materials.

2. It is conceded that they who thus communicate to us may be ignorant or mistaken respecting the matter or matters about which they are speaking, and, in consequence, may be more or less incorrect in their representations, even when intending to tell only the plain and simple truth. While it is claimed that they are all progressing, it is admitted that none are infallible and perfect.

3. It is conceded that more or less of these spirits that communicate do frequently and deliberately and intentionally lie in their converse with mortals; either because they have not been cured of that propensity which they had and indulged here, or because they have learned to deceive in the school where they are taught the method of life in the other realm. The fact that they do tell falsehoods, and repeat them, is well authenticated.

4. It is conceded that these deceiving and lying spirits more or less attempt to personate good and truthful ones; and that they do not unfrequently succeed in palming themselves off upon the medium or circle for somebody else, and in palming off their falsehoods for facts,—so skilful are they in their masked operations. They defy all the tests which are applied, and furnish all the required evidences of genuineness,—going through their examination far better than the old magicians of Egypt did.

5. It is conceded that the nature of the communications received depends very largely upon the character, spirit, and state of the medium—the message usually being not greatly above the medium's true character in its moral tone, nor often greatly above the medium's mental capacity in its thought, whoever may be imparting the message. If the medium be an imperfect one (and all are held to be imperfect), the message is always liable to be tinged or colored, slightly modified or radically changed, diminished or increased in quantity and meaning, by passing through such a channel. The medium's own thoughts, or feelings, or prejudices, or affections, are always liable to mingle with the original communication, so that it fails to reach us as it set out;—just as certain as soils through which a stream of spring water passes may flavor it by the mingling elements, till it is no longer recognizable as the pure stream which gushed sparkling from the side of the mountain. And this mediumistic influence may be so great and so decided as to give the leading characteristics to the messages that are sent us. And this may be true even though the medium is involuntary and unconscious in the work that is done.

creeds, and they seek progress through change. A principle may be avowed, defended and cherished in Boston, which at the same time is repudiated and condemned in Philadelphia; and a month hence the treatment of it may be reversed. All this suggests the difficulty of drawing out anything like a systematic and detailed statement of the real principles of the scheme. It changes color like the chameleon while one is describing its hues, and before a point can be thoroughly examined by a critic, it may be annihilated by a denial from some trance speaker, or rapped into discredit by some new manifestation. In what shall hereafter be stated touching the views and principles and developments of spiritualists, we shall carefully confine ourselves to those points which are generally admitted by them, or are proved to be a part of their philosophy and practice by abundant and competent testimony.

We do not, by any means, deny the existence of the phenomena which lie at the foundation of spiritualism, nor intimate that the whole scheme has its basis in imposture and credulity. That there is a good deal of deception is plain. Not a few skilful men, recognized long and widely as mediums of remarkable power, have at length been detected in the cheats they were practising, or, weary of the monotonous and unprincipled game, they have at length confessed their impositions and explained their legerdemain. And not a few who begin in honesty proceed to trickery. Not being able to feed the marvellousness of the circle sufficiently with the manifestations which appear, they invent fresh ones. When the spirits do not work wonders enough to meet the demands, they work them themselves, either with or without foreign aid. And the members of the magnetized and excited circle often seem to see and hear more than actually takes place. They honestly report their impressions, but these impressions are frequently exaggerated and distorted representations of the actual facts. As a frightened boy sees a ghost in a fluttering window curtain, or a crouching bear in a charred stump, so the wondering company gathered about a table in twilight or darkness sometimes transforms simple phenomena into marvels that are scarcely less than miracles. But, after making all proper allowance for

all these drawbacks, there remain a great number and variety of well authenticated facts which are remarkable and difficult of explanation on any scientific theory yet propounded. And while we frankly and cheerfully admit their existence, we as frankly and cheerfully say that we have no adequate explanation to offer. We may go farther and say that we doubt whether any theory yet propounded is fully adequate. Valuable hints are thrown out, and an approach is being made to a thorough classification of the facts, and a scientific development of the conditions and laws of the manifestations; but that work is not yet apparently done.

Nor do we mean, in anything we shall say, to sit in severe judgment on the motives and character of those who give in their adhesion to the new faith. The good or the evil tendencies of a system do not always fully appear in the spirit and life of those who accept it; for a thousand influences may check or counteract them. There are many persons a great deal better, and others who are a great deal worse, than their creeds or their philosophy. Bad men sometimes confess and defend the highest truths, and good men sometimes endorse the lowest lies. There are unquestionably good and pure men and women in spiritualist circles, and there are false and corrupt ones within orthodox enclosures. We deal with spiritualism as a system, and we deal with it on general grounds.

We only propose, in addition, to present a few objections to spiritualism, as already developed in its claims and concessions, from a religious stand-point; or, in other words, we wish to state a few reasons why, being a Christian, we cannot yet become a spiritualist. The points shall be stated as briefly and as clearly as possible.

1. Admitting the existence of varied and remarkable phenomena, and having no scientific theory of our own to propose, we cannot find sufficient evidence that disembodied human spirits have any agency in producing the phenomena. It is sometimes possible and rational to affirm what a thing is not, if we cannot assert what it is. The burden of proof lies in this case upon the spiritualist who claims this supernatural agency. And, to our mind, the strong probability is against his theory. His



facts seem to us inadequate as proof, and not a few of them seem to lend their influence against the theory.

The phenomena are not by any means wholly new, and the same thing may be said respecting the dogmas and the philosophy which are drawn from the phenomena, or which have become associated with them. The laborious author of "*The Apocatastasis*," issued in 1854, has found almost every species of these phenomena accurately and fully described in the works of ancient authors who unfold the experiences of men in Greece, Egypt, and the Orient; and the catalogue of manifestations which he makes out would naturally suggest that it might have been a recent compilation of Judge Edmonds or Dr. Hare. The visitation of ghosts, and the developments known as modern witchcraft, are generally claimed by spiritualists as illustrations of the very "spirit-power" which is now revealing itself. And almost every dogma propounded in the name of the new faith has already had a history. And this all throws discredit at once on the favorite view of many spiritualists, viz.: that the human race has only recently reached the point of progress where spirits could commune with men, and teach them the elements of that higher philosophy which is destined to supplant all the prevalent and popular theology. The *new* manifestations are found *old* enough to be musty and largely forgotten; and the "progress" which at length has rendered them possible, is shown to have been made more than two thousand years ago! If spirit intercourse has just become possible, then the phenomena now attributed to it appeared long since without its agency; and if they could appear once without it, they may appear again.

Many persons succeed in producing nearly the whole of the phenomena without calling in the aid of spirit agency;—they unfold the conditions and explain the method; and if human power is adequate in one case, why may it not be in others?

The method of the manifestations, and the communications professedly made, suggest a serious ground of doubt. If spirits are able to impress minds and bodies so powerfully, if their control of us is so complete, then it is plain they have a choice between many various methods. Indeed, it is claimed that

they adopt various methods. And we confess to a great and serious difficulty in believing that serious-minded persons, such as many of our acquaintances were, would voluntarily choose such places or methods of dealing with their brethren in the flesh; that they would endorse such sentiments as are taught in their name, or be generally occupied in retailing such trash and nonsense and twaddle as specimens of the modes of thought and forms of pursuit prevalent in the other world. If it be they who speak to us thus, they have very greatly changed, and we fear not at all for the better, by their dropping off the body.

So far as revelations from the other world are proved to have been really given in the past, there has been some natural correspondence between the seriousness of the object and the dignity of the method and the message. The tipping of tables and the dancing of stoves and chairs, the slamming of doors and the overturning of beds, the inflation of egotists and the inspiration of dunces, are not the methods of communicating which our celestial friends would be likely to choose, from what we know of their character, nor the methods actually chosen when heaven has really spoken to the earth in bygone times. We think of but one marked exception; and that occurred when Balaam's beast opened its mouth to rebuke the madness of its master. We yield up that case as an exception and a precedent; but we recall no other which may seem as a prototype.

And then, while it is true that, in many instances, questions are replied to with great accuracy, in others, no correct information can be got respecting matters concerning which we know the spirit purporting to be present was perfectly familiar. False replies are given and persisted in, when the means of knowing the truth are the very amplest. If the spirit has increased in knowledge, why is it so ignorant in such cases? And if ignorant, why does it not confess its ignorance, instead of falsifying and sticking to the falsification?

And if, as is admitted, the state of the medium's mind often determines the character of the message, how can it be proved there is any message coming from beyond that mind?

And the statements made in the name of the spirits are full

of contradictions. To-day the assertion contradicts that of yesterday, though made perhaps in the same place, through the same medium, to the same circle, and professedly and apparently by the same spirit.

And the same spirit sometimes announces itself present at two different places at the same time, converses on different subjects, makes contrary statements, and expresses contradictory opinions—facts which would seem to require omnipresence and duality in order to an explanation.

And still more. In not a few instances communications have been repeatedly received as from persons in the spirit-world, running through periods of months and years, bearing every mark of genuineness, and heralded as remarkable proofs of intercourse with the other realm—when suddenly and unexpectedly the persons in question have appeared in the body which they had never laid down! Having been long absent from the circle of home, they were supposed to be dead; and, after being held in high repute as revealers of the life beyond this, they return to gladden the circle they had left, and to brand all the revelations promulged in their name, as folly. And if so many of the striking manifestations of the circles may take place without the presence of the spirit to whom they are attributed, why may not all the rest of them occur under similar conditions? If the strongest and clearest proofs of spirit-presence in so many instances are found to be worthless, on what rational ground can any of them be confided in? To talk at the celestial realm when there is so much room for doubt whether there is any real colloquist or listener there, is folly for the intellect and sacrilege for the heart.

2. But, even admitting the presence of spirit agency and spirit revelation, there is, according to the concessions already made, *an utter want of authority* in the messages. Enough is admitted and proved to show that not a single spirit can be positively identified, and not a single statement received can be unhesitatingly confided in, unless we can verify it by our own proper human knowledge. We cannot be certain that we get the truth in a single case, when "the spirits" speak on the only subject on which we care to hear them, viz.: the mode and the

experiences of life in the spiritual realm. It is in view of what they are supposed to know and communicate on that subject that the multitudes throng to the lectures, seek admission to the circles, woo the rappings, listen to the marvels, read the books and papers, and frame their questions. And what is obtained? We answer, positively nothing in which any rational mind can calmly confide, according to the admissions of spiritualists themselves. They confess that these "spirits" speak only in their own name, and utter only their own opinions or impressions; that they frequently do not know what the truth is; that they contradict each other and contradict themselves; that more or less of them deliberately and wilfully lie when they speak; that they falsely personate other spirits in order to deceive; that the medium or the circle often colors or changes or determines the character of the message received without being conscious of their influence; that the want of spiritual development in us prevents our apprehending the real import of the message when it is received; and that it is left entirely to our judgment, or knowledge, or common sense, to decide whether any message received is deserving of confidence, and is invested with credibility. There can then be neither authority nor certainty attaching to any message coming to us by spirit-revelation, when the subject matter of that revelation lies outside of the realm of our present knowledge. We must still decide by the exercise of our common sense whether a thing is likely to be true, for there is no other test. And this common sense is possessed before one goes into the circles or listens to the rhapsodies of the trance-speaker; and we hope it may not be uncharitable to add that most persons seem to us to carry quite as much common sense there as they bring away.

The revelations of the "spirits" touching the affairs of this life are comparatively few and valueless. No sane man would think of committing himself to their direction in the management of his worldly affairs. And, from some cause, they are rather close-mouthed in respect to matters here, where we can readily investigate the subjects of which they would treat. Interested as they claim to be in human welfare, they are chary of practical counsels, and have almost wholly ceased to under-

take to guide men to true present prosperity. There is a great deal of doubtful rhetoric expended in attempted portraiture of the other world; but one searches in vain for any plain, practical code, which is to show us how to make the highest use of this. We do not remember that a single discovery in science or art has been made or aided by the revelations of all the masters of thought, who, it is claimed, have been speaking to us in their most instructive way for nearly half a score of years. Instead of discoursing on the topics which claimed their special attention here, and which might have served us largely, they, too, have fallen into the common habit of declaiming about "spheres" and "affinities," "progressions" and "inspirations," "potentialities" and "celestialities," "vivifications" and "harmonies," etc., etc., etc. And one of the strangest, saddest and weakest of all the "manifestations" which we have witnessed, is the disposition to glorify these uncertain and unauthoritative developments as the advanced teaching of the nineteenth century, which compares with the old Bible as a Roman candle with a common taper, as the noonday sun with the pale glimmering of the Pleiades. It may be that some minds prefer to be sent adrift on the ocean of conjecture with no impulse or guide but the capricious winds, with only meteors and lightning-gleams instead of stars, supplanting observations by guesses, and taking counsel of sagacity instead of the chart; but we prefer the old landmarks of the Omniscient, and the sleepless watch and tireless service of the Great Pilot. In the long and perilous pilgrimage of life, leave to us God's pillar of cloud and fire, rather than commit us to the guidance of prophets who hold no heavenly commission, and the pointings of whose finger change like the wheeling of the weathervane.

3. The character of the teachings promulgated in the name of "the spirits," presents another difficulty in the way of giving our confidence to the system. We have already spoken of the contradictory character of the statements and dogmas which make up the literature of spiritualism, and on that there is no need we should dwell.

With what frivolous matters most of the messages are concerned! A large part of the intercourse attributed to spirits

does not morally average above the level of country or neighborhood gossip. The best minds and the worst, the philosophers and the ignoramuses, the old residents and the new occupiers of the spiritual realm, the dwellers in the lower spheres and the higher ones—all these alike enter into this gossiping style of speech with what appears to be zest and enthusiasm. Their old earthly gravity has given way to jollity, their serious and weighty thought to a superficiality that is unrelieved by wit or wisdom. Nine-tenths of all the communications which we have met, have revealed the lowest intellectual vigor, the smallest dignity and the poorest taste. They suggest little of the intelligence, the dignity, the seriousness, the moral and social elevation, the yearning for spiritual light and power, which we are wont to suppose attaches to the life and speech of eternity. Instead of progress they seem to imply retrogression. The movement of minds would seem to be downward rather than upward.

And then the dogmas and the philosophy usually taught in the name of spiritualism (so far as it is possible to draw dogmas and philosophy from such a chaos) are nearly all earth-born and old. They have sprung up along the track of life—some of them more than once—flourished for a time, and then have died through neglect, or wilted because the soil could give them no more nutriment, or been torn up violently by hands that were impatient of their presence. The philosophy of spiritualism is an uncouth mosaic, made up chiefly of fragments of the dross thrown out from an hundred crucibles where old systems were put through the ordeal of human thought and criticism. So far as the philosophy has reference to the material universe, a large part of it is found false and absurd. The truth it contains is generally familiar; its false principles in some form were exploded long ago.

A single word may be said, in this connection, respecting the style of speech prevailing in the spiritualistic literature. There is a great deal of sameness—not to say wearisome monotony—in it. It often suggests rhetoric on stilts, and oratory soaring in a well inflated balloon with too little ballast and an unskilful manager. It makes little difference who is the purported

speaker,—Butler or Chalmers, Young or Quarles, Cicero or Napoleon, Franklin or Swedenborg, Locke or Shakspeare;—there is no perceptible difference in the style of thought or speech. The same oracular pomposity of tone, the same succession of polysyllables and sonorous sentences, the same diarrhœa of words and costiveness of thought, appears everywhere. “Poor Richard” has evidently not only forgotten his old maxims, but has forgotten how to frame them, if he has not actually come to hate them. If “one star differeth from another star in glory” in that realm, it is almost impossible for us to take note of the differences, for each appears in turn streaming like the train of a comet, or coruscating like the Aurora Borealis.

Lest our readers may not have seen specimens of this literature, and so think our prejudices lead us to exaggerate, we insert a brief paragraph or two, taken at random from the first work coming from this quarter on which we happen to lay our hand. It came to us through a spiritualist friend, who doubtless sent it for our and the public edification. It is entitled, “The Providences of God in History. A Lecture, delivered through and by S. Judd Pardee, at the Melodeon, Boston, Sunday morning, July 25, 1858. Revised.” Spiritualists being judges, it is rather a superior production of its class. And so far as we can judge, the peculiar characteristics of which we have spoken, are not more prominent in it than in their literature generally. And the extracts we make are only fair samples of the whole production from which they are taken. Thus discourses the teacher referred to. We copy exactly, italics and all:

“Love is legislative and a *sufferer*; Wisdom is Judicial, a *conciliator*, and an officer of peace; but Truth is a *ruler* not to be disputed, the right-hand sword of God, the executive arm of Divinity. Unto whomsoever, then, man or woman, it shall come from on high to externalize that trinity, (Truth and Love and Wisdom,) will be bestowed the *organizing* power, the consummating and perfecting of this divine work. . . . As in the past were twelve apostles, so in the dawning age twelve teachers of the Harmonial Philosophy, teaching from the stand-point of its Celestial Wisdom—unfolding, shall arise and point to the peoples the opening day. They are living now. They shall be

among the first divinely individualized. Rationalities individualize, spiritualities subjectivize; a divine individualism comes forth from their union—and such so worked upon by the processes of spiritualization, as if by the manipulating fingers of God, and unfolded, become *Celestialists*. In them Science and Religion—the front and top and back brain are harmonially blended.”

“Does not, too, a divine *nomination*, conferring internal or spiritual appellation and a sphere of use shows even already? Men and women have been psychometized by angel-introvisors, and so gauged and measured. Signs and seals, so to speak, are upon their brows,—upon the brows of young men and old, maidens and the married, and upon them rocked by mothers in the cradle! All this I think the signs of the times indicate, and a vast deal more. Besides, as it is the age of Love and Wisdom conjugally conjoined, enducing Truth or Use, so shall at last woman come to her rights, so long lost through denial, and help, giving indispensable help to save and perfect and beautify the race. For who are the ablest, most eloquent, most influential band of Evangelists and Promulgators in our midst? I tell you just measure must be yielded and given for this long-prevailing defalcation, and absolute admission of the right to *herself*. The Conjugal spheres o'erbrood, and send invisible showers of purification and the gospel of Nature, so *divine*, to all the marriages.”

We suspect that will do for once. We trust nobody will think of asking us what it all means, for we confess we are not more than half enough “developed” to appreciate or understand it. It is certainly obscure enough to be profound, and bombastic and sonorous enough to be wise; but obscurity may be occasioned by muddiness, and the noisiest echoes sometimes come of emptiness. And we are asked to take such teaching as the highest and best of all the teaching that comes to us,—to accept it as the divinest utterance of the spheres above us, intent on perfecting our hearts and lives!

4. We find another difficulty in the way of becoming a spiritualist; and it is found in the fact that what is now known as spiritualism is closely allied to, if it be not identified with, Universalism. We cannot now stop to deal with the theories of this latter system. It is sufficient to state at present that it appears to us wanting in a philosophical basis, and is testified against by the plain letter of Scripture. But the correspond-



ence between the two systems is obvious. Most confirmed spiritualists avow Universalist opinions, either frankly or covertly, whatever may have been their previous opinions. The doctrine of spheres or circles, rising one above the other in the next life, and the constant and progressive march of the departed from the lower to the higher, until all are glorified, involves the very idea of necessary salvation. Moreover, Universalists claim, through their pulpits and their presses, that the whole mass of spiritualists are their theological allies, and point to them as an illustration of the prevalence of their doctrines; and we do not remember to have seen or heard the claim disputed, or the allegation objected against.

5. Still another difficulty is the estimate which it puts upon sin and its correlated topics, and the exposition it seeks to give of the nature and ministry of sin. In this new theology, sin is simply weakness, non-development, mistake,—not responsible wrong-doing which incurs guilt and deserves punishment. Human life is generally set forth as regulated by a sort of fatality, and the movement of it is spoken of as though it were a sort of material machine. God is largely stripped of his personality, and stands for the laws of creation, the principle of order and progress, or as the aggregate intelligence and power of humanity, after the manner set forth by the continental pantheists. Duty is yielding to purified and spiritualized desire; rigid, practical, stern self-denial, which implies real waywardness of heart, and sets about its subdual, is often branded as weakness and superstition—implying the bondage of the flesh as opposed to the freedom of the spirit. We cannot accept this theory, because it evidently does not present God's view, as he unfolds it in his word, illustrates it in providence, and applies it in life.

There is a fair application of this lax and liberal theory by spiritualists, *on one side*, and at the same time a striking disregard of it, *on the other*. If "the spirits," who were wise and truthful when here on earth, seem to talk nonsense; make appointments and fail to keep them; promise a message at a given time, and when it arrives, remain doggedly silent; if they falsify in such a transparent way, and without apparent motive,

that even unprincipled deceivers in this world would be shocked at the thought of copying them ; if they show themselves ignorant of the simplest matters about which they are questioned ; if they make the most strange and unreasonable demands upon the circle that caprice could suggest ;—still they are very apt to be laughed at instead of being lectured, and an hundred apologies are made for their course—apologies as weak as their course is wicked. If a medium be found practicing a cheat, time after time, and so abusing human confidence in the most sacred sphere, and committing sacrilege upon the very holiest affections, the discipline administered is apt to be of the very mildest sort. We are likely to be told that it will not do to try the actions of the spirits by our earthly standards, nor judge the mediums as such by those rules which may apply when the foreign impulse has ceased to operate. Acting under this high inspiration, we are assured that men are amenable to new laws, and that it is gross injustice to try them before the old tribunals, and let uninspired men have a place in the jury boxes. The charity does “cover a multitude of sins,” without doubt, though it may be doubted whether it is done exactly in the scriptural way.

But this spirit of toleration, which is not a little praised, professed and boasted over,—this pleading for free inquiry, and this protest against dogmatism and authority,—all this is in great danger of being forgotten whenever unbelievers in the new scheme are the subjects of criticism. They who doubt, disbelieve, deny, oppose, argue against or expose what seem to them the errors, follies, and evil tendencies of spiritualism, are not likely to be dealt with in any such merciful way. The story of the unruly ox finds a new application. Complaint, indignation and ridicule may all be called into service ; and such epithets as “ignorant,” “prejudiced,” “bigoted,” “conservative,” “cowardly,” are very apt to be mustered into battle array. They send a stern judge, like Jeffrey, to the assizes in the realm of doubt ; while the bench is filled by as lenient souls as figure in the New York courts, all over the empire of faith.

6. And this leads to the remark that the treatment which the Bible gets in spiritualist circles and spiritualist literature,

presents another difficulty in the way of our endorsement. We cannot stop to argue the authority of the Bible here, for our present purpose is answered, and our position indicated by assuming it. The estimate put upon the Bible is not always precisely the same among the adherents of the new faith. There is not perfect agreement in fixing its sphere and determining its functions. Some regard it as made up of the teaching of "the spirits," in ages when they had progressed less, and the mediums were less developed, and the world less capable of comprehending celestial speech than now; and hence, of course, somewhat inferior to the more modern revelations; and so to be accepted or rejected, as its statements shall commend themselves to our judgment or contravene it,—as they shall correspond to or contradict the more recent and loftier and clearer revelations. Others openly reject the Bible, as claiming an authority which only falsehood would assert and tyranny insist on;—an authority to admit which is folly, and to yield to which is vassalage. They count the Bible in among the chief foes of progress,—which with them is synonymous with spiritualism. Its statements settle nothing. Or it is so interpreted as to rob it of all its highest meaning, so that it ceases to be the exponent of divine truth, or the adequate guide of human feet. Why, it is asked, should we go back to a series of messages from two thousand to four thousand years old, for needed and sacred instruction, when a fresh one may be got at any moment of at least equal authority, and a great deal more agreeable to the seeker than anything in Paul's epistles or Christ's sermon?

7. The tendencies and effects of a devotion to spiritualism, as they appear in many of those who give themselves to its study, and become identified with its operations, present another difficulty in the way of becoming a practical convert to its doctrines or its methods. We would not charge upon spiritualism, as a system, all the follies and faults developed and committed by its devotees and exponents. Foolish men will be foolish in any sphere, and vicious characters carry their vices with them wherever they go. No cause should be held responsible for all the sorry developments of life that are made in its

name or under its banner. And we would not do injustice to the new faith by charging any results to its account which it has no legitimate agency in producing. We put down only what seem to us the natural tendencies and the actual consequences of the system, as we have studied it and observed its working. It may be well enough to preface this work by considering the advantages which are alleged to grow out of spiritualism, considered as a practical agency in society.

It is claimed that skeptics, long doubting or disbelieving man's immortality, have been convinced of the being of a personal God, and the fact of a future life by means of the phenomena of the circles, or the manifestations made to themselves, after all the ordinary arguments had been exhausted upon them in vain; and so it is claimed that spiritualism brings a new baptism of moral power, far higher than the old and ordinary appliances of religion possess.

Our reply is this. If a man has really looked the old arguments for immortality in the face; if he can say,—“I have studied nature, made myself familiar with history, inspected the mechanism of the world, surveyed the plans and observed the movements of Providence, marked the nice and wonderful adjustments in the creation; I have sought unto the Bible, weighed carefully the evidences which support its authenticity, and proclaim its inspiration, heard its prophecies, and looked upon its miracles, practiced its high precepts, and hung over its great promises, followed its varied career and sought to measure and explain its masterly influence, watched the transformations in character and life which it produces, and yet have found nothing in all this to satisfy my intellect or relieve my heart,—nothing to prove that there is a God sitting calmly above us and working all things,—nothing which assures me there is any existence for man beyond the gloomy grave into which he is stumbling;—but I have visited a circle, heard strange raps, and other noises, seen chairs leap and tables dance, heard stupid tongues discourse sonorously and glibly and strangely, listened to the rhapsodies of an entranced medium, who talked without knowing it, and prayed to her own surprise,—and then my long continued and obstinate doubts gave way at once and forever,

faith displaced my skepticism, and I believed and felt that the very air was full of spirits ready to resume the old intercourse or begin a new one;"—we say if a man can gravely and solemnly tell us all this, we are compelled to question his sanity or pity his mental weakness. We should as soon think of quoting the confession of the Catholic zealot, who had been cured of palsy, and converted to Christianity by looking at the Holy Coat of Treves, in support of the religion of the New Testament, as of summoning forward such a witness to certify to the redeeming work of a spiritualist circle. There must be more than one screw loose in the mental mechanism of such a man as that. He must be an interesting subject for the manipulations of a phrenologist. The next weaker and simpler *ism* that should come along would probably take him captive. The influence of no conversion would probably strike very deep in him. And the practical value of a conversion to such a view of God and the future life as the theology of spiritualism presents, is very questionable. Judging from what we have seen, this class of converts come up through a somewhat shallow repentance to a somewhat incomplete regeneration. Humility does not usually destroy their phariseeism,—the prayer of the publican is not often on their lips, nor does Paul's glorying in the cross become the most prominent feature in their lives.

It is alleged again that the teachings of spiritualism solace the hearts of the believers, and especially the hearts of bereaved believers. It assures them of the existence, progress and certain happiness of their friends, and grants them the privilege of continued and almost constant intercourse with them while occupying different realms of being.

We reply thus: If others can joy over the account of such a future life as spiritualism unfolds, and find satisfaction in such messages as are usually received, holding them to embody the real thought and spirit of departed friends, their taste differs widely from ours. If we supposed our cherished ones were really going into such a sphere, and to be occupied with such matters, to develop themselves in such forms, to retail such platitudes, and call them wisdom, and scream out such bombast, and call it the most inspired prophecy, we should

mourn their departure and sorrow over their lot. And we should look forward to our own dissolution as the turning-point where the mind's whole movement was likely to be only in the direction of idiocy. We should feel as though the old patriarchal custom of making a great lamentation for forty days at each opening of the sepulchre, was hardly an excess, and be inclined, in the desperation of desire, to go in for the physiological enterprises that propose to bring back the longevity of the antediluvians. We should associate the memory of Methuselah with all the beatitudes, and bewail the fate of Elijah as carried off to a sadder state before his time.

Under the stimulus or the soothing of spiritualistic influence, it is said that glorious visions are granted to us, fears are allayed, patience and hope are nurtured, anticipation is as full of heaven as our brightest dreams can make it, and the heart is crowded with almost an ecstatic happiness. Perhaps so. But there are other methods—cheaper and more simple—of producing such experiences. Eat opium, take a decoction of mandrake, inhale exhilarating gas, and all these effects are likely to appear. Brain fever often brings as brilliant fancies, and induces as high an activity of mind. But is the stimulant or the narcotic healthy? Are the visions symbolic of realities? Is the quietude that comes the repose of the soul after the hard work of duty, or the calm pillowing of its head on the promise of God? Are the hopes such as mature into fruit? Is it a real talk with heaven which the soul carries on, or are they simply the echoes of its own presumptuous speech which break on its ear? There is a joy born of madness; and the most fearful convulsions often follow a calm so deep that all voices seemed joining in the lullaby.

The injurious tendencies of spiritualism, in and upon the mind of him who becomes thoroughly identified with and devoted to it, seem to us legitimate on philosophical grounds, and apparent in the obvious facts which have appeared. For the sake of comprehensiveness and classification, we specify the two following:—First, it operates against the individuality and independence, and discernment of the intellect; and, secondly, it diminishes the healthy activity of the moral and religious

powers. We must content ourselves with a few words on each point.

To be an effective medium, or a member of an effective circle, it is almost invariably required that the person shall put himself, as far as possible, in an acquiescent, passive, receptive mental attitude. He must yield himself without opposition to the influences which are present, or may come. He must largely sink his own personal will, and assume a coöperative mood. He must not be specially inquisitive or critical; he must repress his doubts, and must not be forward to challenge, even if he is somewhat dissatisfied. He must woo the influence, and offer himself an instrument to its hands, without stopping to demand its credentials or insisting upon scanning its record, or subjecting its character to analysis. In this mood the influence finds and acts on him. Its nature, as all parties admit, is of the nature of mental magnetism—precisely like that which a mesmerist employs to acquire and keep control over the subject. And as the mesmeric subject becomes increasingly susceptible to this influence thus wielded, so that, by-and-by, almost any person can control him,—so the members of the circle become the more complete instruments of the subtle but powerful forces which act upon them there. The result, too, is the same. The yielded will parts gradually with its power to resist, the susceptibility increases, the maintenance of a complete individuality becomes a still more difficult thing, and the mind is half a vassal before it feels the fretting of its silken fetters. This is the rational view, and facts prove its correctness. Testimonies are on every hand, and they are ample. Let a single example suffice.

Dr. Randolph,—a lineal descendant of him of Roanoke—one of the most prominent, efficient and influential of all the mediums, in a discourse delivered a few months since in New York, in which he took occasion to renounce his faith in spiritualism, stated some most interesting and important facts, bearing on this subject, drawn from his own personal experience. He says he has been in what is called the trance-state some fifteen hundred times, and that, after having been in that condition frequently, he became able to induce it by an effort of a few

minutes at his pleasure. For a considerable period he regarded himself as really acted on by departed spirits, and supposed they were really communicating to him and through him. Subsequently he became satisfied that there was no spirit-agency concerned in the case, and at length avowed his carefully formed conclusions with the grounds of them, and openly renounced the theory. The power of trance-speaking, &c., remains with him as fully as ever. But the specific fact, developed in his statement, to which we wish to call attention, is the following. While fully believing that he was the medium of spirit-agency, he was so fully conscious of the loss of independence and the power of personal will, as a result of acting in the capacity of medium, that, as he says, he even felt ashamed of and loathed himself for his voluntary vassalage. Accustomed to careful introspection, he could and did readily discover the effect of this unhappy influence in the direction already indicated. Sometimes, as he states, he would not once be fully emancipated from this strange and weakening spell in the course of three successive months. After avoiding the circles for a time, his mind would regain its natural vigor, and he would then almost resolve never to put himself under the influence again; but the solicitation of friends would induce him to yield for once, and the effect was like that of one glass of strong drink on the half-reformed inebriate. He had lost his self-reliance, his purpose and his strength all at once; and while despising his vassalage, he was yet consenting to the forging of fresh chains. This testimony, from such a source, is significant, but it by no means stands alone. If the subject is not always conscious of his mental loss, it is apparent to other observers.

Now it hardly needs to be said that such a loss of independent and vigorous purpose is a most serious thing. All high manhood and all real Christian character spring from this vigorous action of an independent will. The loss of that makes a man the sport of caprice, the plaything of circumstances, a straw in the currents of the strong life around him, a weather-vane marking the direction of the strongest winds. There is no high manhood, no lofty living, and no heroic work, where this granite formation does not underlie a human life. What-



ever impairs its stability is a calamity; for nothing can be given us in exchange for this quality without leaving us poorer. And this is the first evil tendency developed by spiritualistic influences, acting freely in every circle.

The second tendency referred to has more special reference to the moral and religious character. We speak plainly, expressing our own convictions without reserve, when we say that spiritualism tends to interfere most seriously with the growth and activity of what are usually regarded as elements of a genuine Christian life. The confidence in the authority of the Bible is greatly weakened; the interest in Christian worship in the usual methods grows less; the labors of the Sabbath school come to be lightly esteemed; the prayer meeting and prayer itself lose their interest; church life and obligations are deemed of minor consequence; the ministry of the gospel becomes more a subject of complaint than of sympathy; and the truths which two thousand years have held as vital, are questioned or quarrelled with, as failing altogether to meet the wants of this advanced generation. The influence of religious truth grows less and less, and the amount of earnest Christian work done becomes continually smaller. It is a rare thing that an active, warm-hearted Christian runs into spiritualism, for him the soul has a more precious resting-place, and feasts on heavenly manna. It is still rarer that such a Christian abides within such circles, and remains wedded to such modes of thought and life, even if circumstances draw him in for a time; and it is the rarest thing of all to find a Christian who does remain there, preserving the earnestness and fidelity which he took with him.

We know perfectly well what is alleged in reply. We are told that the religious life does of necessity undergo a change in such cases, but it is the change from weakness to strength, from childhood to maturity, from the monotony and incompleteness of the old and common experience to the new and progressive and better state. It may seem so to the mesmerized and enthusiastic subject himself, but to us it is like exchanging the sun for gas-light—like bartering healthy vigor for the treacherous strength of spasms—like giving up the well-spread board of the father's house for the husks which waywardness

gathers up in the distant field, fit to be eaten only when seasoned with repentance.

On those who lack Christian principle and character the tendency is specially unfortunate. With them spiritualism is usually a substituted religion, with which they pacify their uneasy consciences, ward off the pleas of faithfulness, and neutralize the pathos of Christian love. They claim to have a better and higher religion than is offered them in the name of Christ, and so reject the gospel with a comparative inward quiet, induced by the self-complacency which the new scheme has begotten in their hearts. Nay, they not unfrequently count the Christian teachers who plead with them the Pharisees of this century, and themselves as the Messiah's new apostles set to expose their false pretensions and rebuke them into shame. In their eyes churches are usurpers, while they themselves are the saints who are the rightful heirs to the spiritual kingdom. They parade their spiritualism and call it piety, and insist that their irreverence and irreligion are needed and proper protests against the wrongs of a surrounding Christianity. Few publicans are heard of going up to spiritualist temples with breast-smitings and prayer for mercy; few gathered companies interrupt the discourse of a trance-speaker, demanding to know what they shall do to be saved; few Magdalens kneel weeping out their penitence at the Saviour's feet; few souls are smitten down by the luminous visions of the other world, and rise up resolving to know nothing more among men than Jesus Christ and him crucified. No! Instead of multiplying such facts as these, spiritualism is learning its worldly votaries how to sneer at them. They boast of having found a highway to heaven along which the Slough of Despond, the Hill of Difficulty, the Valley of Humiliation, the fight with Apollyon, and the perils of Vanity Fair, are heard of only as ancient legends, recalled chiefly to amuse the modern traveller, and beguile him of his weariness. These are its obvious tendencies; and however they may be tolerated or welcomed by others, they promise only a sad ministry to us, and forbid our acceptance of the system from which they legitimately spring.

8. And this leads us to say, finally, that the fact that spirit-

ualism attracts to itself so naturally, so generally and so strongly, the men and women who have been well known as skeptics, pantheists, comeouters, infidels, backslidden professors of religion, and perverts from such a profession, suggests a strong reason for distrusting and rejecting it. The fact alleged here is an obvious one, and admitted by spiritualists themselves. By some of them it is stated and proclaimed with exultation; by others it is sought to be explained, or apologized for. By the fruits we are to know the moral character of any system; and we may judge of the nature of the fruits by observing who they are that go to pluck and eat them. If these classes of men referred to were converted before they were drawn to spiritualism, or even converted and purified *after* they were drawn there, the case would stand somewhat differently. But few claim such results, and facts do not show them. The characters remain as they were,—saving perhaps that, in not a few instances, the bitterness against Christianity seems to deepen, the self-complacency to increase, and the quarrel with good men and good institutions to become more open. Some of them are frank enough to avow that they freely use spiritualism as a newly offered weapon with which to fight religion and the churches and the Bible, and that their estimate of its value is determined by the amount of this sort of service which they can make it perform. The fact that such men are so generally drawn into sympathy with spiritualism, and become its prophets, oracles and leaders, shows that there is something in it far removed from the spirit of true religion; for in proportion as the one is hated the other is likely to be sought unto. The hastening of these bitter-spirited classes to the new faith suggests that there is gall in its heart; as the crowding of shameless women to the theatre foretells the character of the play—as the darkening of heaven with vultures' wings proclaims that putrid flesh is somewhere not far distant.

We have intended to write plainly, to state things fairly, to reason logically, to do no injustice to any parties, and maintain, so far as the subject would allow it, a serious spirit. It is not always easy to be very grave; but we hope we shall not be accused of undue levity. We are sure we have not substituted

impressions for facts, nor ridicule for argument. Only one branch of the subject has been dealt with, but it is that branch which is most practical and most important. The article is long, but we have not seen the way in which it could properly be made shorter. If we were asked to state in a few words our deliberate estimate of spiritualism, considered as a philosophy and a theology, we should answer thus:—

There are undoubtedly remarkable and varied phenomena developed in the circles and elsewhere, deserving the attention of intelligent and scientific men, who have the leisure and the ability to prosecute their investigations to definite and final results; but they are phenomena almost certain to be misinterpreted and misapplied by the would-be philosophers, the aspirants for notoriety, the seekers after novelty, and the boasters of independence, who are so largely occupied in this work. We have visited the circles in former times, witnessed and studied the phenomena, observed the workings and the effects of the new scheme, until satisfied that it was likely to prove barren of good results and fruitful in bad ones, and satisfied also of our unfitness to prosecute investigations of a scientific sort, with any real success; and then we turned away to other pursuits that encouraged us with better promises and higher rewards.

As a source of instruction, we do not know of one new and important truth that it has developed, while it has revived many old errors which bygone centuries had deliberately discarded, because they were ashamed to hold them any longer. Half its assumed facts were never proved and are never likely to be, and half its theories are foolish dreams.

As a system of religious truth, it is utterly lacking in consistency, authority or certainty; and to the recipient is generally worse than worthless;—as a source of truth, it only cheats those who apply to it, giving them chaff for bread, and egotism for knowledge.

As a school for social and moral culture—while more or less who go into its circles freely may seem to preserve their excellencies of character—the general tendency is pernicious, and the general results lamentable.

And they who chase after its marvels with an eager and gap-

ing and impulsive curiosity, to the neglect of the sober and serious work of life: they who parade its pompous but trashy words and sentences as if they had as much sense as sound; and they who labor to diffuse it as though it were some new and greater Messiah, and they themselves were chosen apostles to spread its light and hasten its triumph,—all these, it seems to us, are most unfortunate victims of a modern mania, naturally suggesting the inquiry whether there is not a soft spot somewhere in the brain, or a foul spot somewhere in the heart.

---

#### ART. IV.—CHRIST CRUCIFIED.

The advent of Christ into this world was unquestionably the greatest event in its history. Compared with this, the discovery of continents, the founding of empires, the greatest achievements in art, science, and war, dwindle into insignificance. Before the power of the cross, kingdoms melt away like wax, idolatry and superstition vanish before its presence, while the most degraded and barbarous of nations spring forward with a bound at its touch to take the lead among the powers of earth in all that is ennobling to man or honorable to God.

When we remember that scarcely four centuries have passed away since America was inhabited by savage beasts and their scarcely less savage devourers; that scarcely two thousand years have gone by since France was divided among barbarous tribes, England so deeply degraded as to be unfit for Roman slaves, Germany so low in the scale of humanity as to be considered not worth the conquering, and Russia an unexplored region; when now we see these nations at the head of civilization, we ask ourselves with pride, What has caused this great change? We look for an answer to the civilization of the times referred to, and, instead of finding the elements of aggression, we perceive only weakness and decay;—the very barbarians on the other hand possess the inherent ability to sweep

away from the world all the civilization that it possesses. Whence, then, do we look for this wonder working power ?

There is a despised people living along the eastern coast of the Mediterranean sea. In the midst of this people there has arisen, from her most obscure village, an humble man, of poor parentage, and indigent circumstances, who, for his novel views of human relationship, and boldness in sustaining them, is condemned to meet a felon's doom ; and behold amid a multitude of men and women, we see him nailed fast to the implement of torture. Gaze there on the man ! He it is that hath wrought the wonders to which we have referred, and he it is who is still performing works which, when accomplished, will cause even these, in comparison with others yet to be, to seem as though they had not been done.

But it is not the triumphs of the cross that now claim our attention, but the cross itself, CHRIST CRUCIFIED.

The great apostle to the gentiles determined to know nothing save Christ and him crucified ; he would preach nothing but salvation through Christ ; he would glory in nothing but the cross of Christ his Lord. Nor was his field of labor as limited as many would have us suppose. This event seems to have entered into the counsels of the All-Knowing from the beginning. Christ was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. He was the burden of all prophesy, the seed of the woman that should bruise the serpent's head, the Lawgiver that was to arise from the house of Judah, the Prophet that the Lord our God was to raise up from amidst the children of Israel, the one concerning whom all the prophets spake from Moses until John. He was the great Antitype of all sacrifices, whether Jewish or Pagan ; the key that unlocks all the mysteries of this world's history, the great corner stone of all revelation, upon which all the attributes, perfections, and glories of the Father are build-ed together ; constituting the dwelling of his people in all generations.

With Christ in our hearts let us read history, both sacred and profane. Under the very gates of Paradise Abel brings a lamb for a burnt offering. Cain is envious, and Abel is also of-

ferred up. Here both he that offered the lamb and the sacrifice set forth Him, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered up himself to God. Abraham, warned of God, makes every preparation for sacrificing his dearly beloved son. So, likewise, God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believeth in him might not perish but have everlasting life. Samson was a man of great courage and might to deliver his people. A Nazarite who foiled his enemies while living, and delivered Israel in his death. In this behold the power of the Crucified One, who, though he died, is omnipotent to save. David is persecuted by his own people until there is but a step between him and death; and yet from this he raises himself by the will of God to sit upon his throne, as also Christ hath risen triumphant over his foes to reign upon his throne. Solomon builds a temple for a dwelling place for God, to be overthrown and rebuilt, as also Jesus of Nazareth was the temple of the living, destroyed and raised up again the third day. The disobedient Jonah lodges in the whale's belly until the third day, when he rises in the power of God to move a nation to repentance. Likewise the Son of man enters the gates of death to give life to the sleeping millions of earth.

Nor are our illustrations of this subject confined to individuals. Nations also have shared in this work. Egypt, watered by the mysterious Nile, soon rose to greatness and power. Here Christ appeared in the person of Joseph to feed the thousands with bread, and deliver the people from death; and here was he persecuted in the persons of his children, when their oppressors, after withholding straw from them, required an equal number of bricks; when his children were murdered before his eyes, or sold into slavery.

But there was also a resurrection from slavery, from the wilderness, from death. But woe unto Egypt! Her earthly labor is done,—she can never be great again among the nations; the Nile may bathe her feet, but they are the feet of slaves; her pyramids may lift their lofty heads and lean them against the sky, but they only tell the tale of the shameful deeds by which she fell. Christ crucified! Nineveh, Babylon and Chaldea all

conspired together to do the same deed of shame, and behold it was done when Jerusalem lay in ruins, her walls broken down, her temple desecrated, her children either slain or carried away captives and sold into slavery. The deed was at its consummation when the golden vessels from the house of the Lord were desecrated at a drunken revel. When lo! the finger of God writes, "*It is finished.*" How soon after this there is found no more place for Babylon! How soon do owls seek a lodging in her towers, and jackals in her palaces.

But it remained for Rome to do to Christ in person what others had only done to his representatives. Why did the heathen rage? Why the people imagine a vain thing? Why so many and great nations broken to pieces over this rock? Alas! "though thou bray a fool in a mortar, with a pestle among the wheat, yet will not his foolishness depart from him." And thus has it happened unto the wise and mighty of earth. The deed is done. Jerusalem first sinks with this millstone hanging about her neck. Deep gathering clouds threaten Rome; the storm bursts upon her; struggling, floundering, she sinks beneath the waves to rise no more. Once her name was a terror to the world; now none so poor as to do her reverence.

Could we turn to modern history and read a different story, we might well, as Noah's sons did, cast over our shoulders the mantle of oblivion, and walking backwards bury the shame of bygone ages from the face of men. But alas! it is not so. We still need the example of the past to warn us for the future. Mohammed arose in the east like an avenging angel to crush out from the earth her hideous idolatry; but not content with his mission he raises his sword against God's elect, and from thence his power begins to wane, until now nought sustains the throne of the false prophet but the prayers of those whom he once essayed to destroy.

What shall we say of Spain, that blessed the world with her discoveries, and stood so like a strong bulwark when the foes of God and Christianity threatened Europe? Search in her dungeons, read the deeds of her inquisition, and say if she did not with one hand crucify her Lord, while with the other she fought his foes? For this, one province after another has fall-



en from her grasp, until now she sits as a lone widow, mourning the loss of her children. France has paid the debt of her cruelty to Christ, by revolution after revolution. England, we trust, has in a measure repented, and shown mercy to the poor. Russia is lending a helping hand to the downtrodden. O when shall America also repent and escape the fearful visitation of the Lord! For justice has not yet left the habitations of the Almighty, nor judgment the dwelling place of the Most High.

The notion of sacrifice entered into the religions of all the nations of antiquity; and it is still the corner stone on which all religions must rest to satisfy the demands of the conscience of mankind. Wide as the notion of God has spread, there has also spread the notion of an atoning sacrifice. It seems to have been appointed by God himself. How else could the custom have been so early spread over so wide a space. The immediate descendants of Adam offer their slain victims. Heroditus speaks of a custom in ancient Egypt, practiced by persons exposed to calamities in consequence of sins. They selected an appropriate animal, confessed their sins upon its head, and sacrificed it; the beast was then considered unclean and unfit to be eaten. Balaam seems to have been familiar with this form of worship, together with all the heathen in and around Palestine in the days of Moses and Joshua. And before them, when Abraham visited this country, he found Melchisedec, a priest of the Most High God.

The ancient Greeks and Romans were very zealous in their sacrifices. Sometimes under great calamities they would offer human victims. The aborigines of Gaul, Britain, and America abounded in their sacrifices. The Druids are said to have offered numerous human beings; and when the temple was dedicated to the sun in Mexico, an incredible number of human beings are said to have been offered as a burnt offering. Revolting as all this seems to enlightened minds, it nevertheless shows how deeply this notion is implanted in the human mind. All these victims, all these rivers of blood which have flown since the world began, are but types and shadows of the great Victim slain on Calvary, and the precious blood there shed. Thus has the world ever testified to its own lost condition,

and has ever been looking after some means of redemption.

While considering the cross of Christ, his true character should always be borne in mind. If we forget his manhood, we can form no conception of his suffering;—at best we can only conceive of his seeming to suffer. If, on the other hand, we forget his divinity, we behold only a martyr; and the death of Socrates, Stephen, or Paul has as much interest to us as that of Christ, so far as our sins are concerned. It was Christ, in his proper character of God manifest in the flesh, that suffered. If indeed Jesus was a man in the true sense of the word, having like passions, like temptations, like sorrows as other men, how keenly must he have suffered.

Death, under its most alleviating circumstances, is a thing to be dreaded. And it is under such circumstances that most men contemplate their exit from this world. We look forward to the event as something that may happen in old age, when the infirmity of the flesh has taken away the sweetness of life, with kind friends to stand around our dying bed, to soothe, to comfort and to administer to our wants. Not so was the death of the sinner's Friend. Snatched from the field of his usefulness, in the very midday of life, in the full possession of his mental and bodily powers, without one friend to comfort or soothe him, he is nailed to the cross as a felon, and doomed to hang all day,—the object of universal scorn. We have so long contemplated the cross as a thing to be gloried in, that we can scarcely conceive of its shame. Truth crushed to the earth will rise again; but while it lay bleeding in the dust it felt all the bitterness of the hour. So with Christ, all the waves and billows of sorrow passed over that pure One's soul.

Again; his executioners added sorrow to the event. One of his own chosen band had delivered him up for a paltry sum; one had denied him with cursings; the rest had forsaken him and fled. The Jews, God's chosen people, sat in judgment upon him; the acknowledged representatives of the Court of Heaven gave judgment against him. He had come to his own and his own had not only rejected him, but had conspired together to render him infamous. The Romans, the representa-

tives of civilization, the men of law and order, were his crucifiers; men who had spent their lives in executing criminals led him to death and parted his garments among themselves.

Once more. The event was foreknown. God in his infinite mercy has wisely concealed the future from us. But Christ knew from the beginning all the woes that fell upon him at Calvary;—for this very cause came he into the world that he might suffer to redeem it. How many Gethsemanes earth had for him! How many Calvaries did he find on the mountain's brow and in the desert's waste! Yet, nevertheless, when the time was come for him to be delivered up, he steadfastly set his face to go up to Jerusalem. He eagerly trod the path, warning his disciples, as he went, of what awaited him at that feast of the passover. He eats the lamb for the last time with his disciples. Then taking the bread and the wine, he talks of his mangled body and flowing life-blood with all the calmness and serenity with which a man speaks of a pleasing journey. While his very flesh is tearing from his bones in agony, how nobly that mind bears up under the load of a sin-crushed world.

Shall we add yet another aggravation? The mode of his death. The Cross! Christ was crucified!! Many are the inventions of man as to the most cruel mode by which his enemies may be put to death. To remove them from earth seems not enough; they must be made to suffer ere they depart. And the most cruel of all must be reserved for man's best friend! Nails must be driven into hands which had ever been extended to lift up the poor and needy, to feed the hungry, to heal the sick and raise the dead. Spikes must also hold fast his feet to the rugged wood; feet that had ever been swift to bring relief to the suffering. We see him even now, as, sad and grief-worn he toils up Calvary, so weak, by reason of his stripes and loss of blood, that he faints beneath the cross, and yet so strong as to be able to bear up under the imputed guilt of the whole world. We wonder not that the affections of the early disciples were so closely riveted to the cross. We wonder not that this held so large a place in all their writings; we could only wish the same for Christians of this our day.

Christ indeed was born for suffering, as to his humanity. But he was all powerful to save in his divine character. All the prophets viewed him in this light. Their united testimony is epitomized in Isaiah, 9: 6, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Matthew tells us his name shall be called Immanuel, God with us; John says the Word was made flesh; and Paul says, all the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth in him bodily. So wonderful a being is he, and so closely is he related to the Father, that whosoever would honor the Father must honor the Son also; whosoever would have his prayers answered, must present them in his name; and whosoever would enjoy everlasting life at God's right hand, must seek it in and through the all-prevailing name of Jesus Christ. Here, then, is a being weak and frail like a man, yet strong and mighty as God. As man he sleeps on the tempest-tossed bosom of lake Gennesaret, unconscious of his peril, as God he rises, rebukes the winds and the waves, and the sea obeys his voice. As man he weeps at the grave of Lazarus; as God he summons the spirit from the eternal world, and the decaying body is brought to life. As man he prays in Gethsemane,—“If it be possible, let this cup pass;” as God he bursts the bars of death, and ascends to his Father's throne. It is in consequence of his equality with the Father that he is able to make intercessions with him for man; in consequence of his manhood, that he can appeal to man to obey and follow his example. It is in consequence of being the son of God and the son of man, that he has authority to teach, and power to save. It was in this character that he came calmly to the cross, endured its shame, and expired to save lost men.

Not only is the world filled with illustrations of Christ's crucifixion, but we may add there is not a doctrine that pertains to the Christian religion, that does not derive its power from the cross of Christ. As time would fail to speak of all, let us mention a few. Depravity has abundant illustrations spread around the life and death of Jesus. How cruel the heart of

Herod that could slay a whole village of children, that he might secure the death of the Holy Babe! Judas, the intimate companion of the Saviour, is so blinded by the love of money as to sell his Lord for gain. Annas and Caiaphas cannot endure so pure a life and so true a gospel. Pilate, through desire to gain favor with the great, violates his own conscience and delivers up a just man to death. A fickle rabble, who but yesterday shouted "Hosanna in the highest," to-day cry "Crucify him! crucify him!" Such is the character of the human heart;—well might the prophet say, "It is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." If indeed the world was not sunk deep in hopeless misery, why such a sacrifice to redeem it? The arm of man was powerless to save, his philosophy had reached its loftiest summit when it discovered its helpless condition. Angels could not redeem, else they had been sent. So lost, so hopeless was man's condition, that nothing but infinite power could bring him back to happiness and eternal life! "There is no other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved;"—and why no other? Simply because there is ability to save in no other. From the sole of the foot to the crown of the head there was no soundness in man, but he was full of wounds and bruises and putrefying sores, that had not been bound up, neither mollified with ointment.

Here is Justice. The decree has gone forth, "The soul that sinneth it shall die." And yet God earnestly asserts, "As I live I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked." To grant a universal pardon to all men unconditionally, would be to set at naught all human governments and offer a premium to the evil doer. To pardon one man and not another, would be partial and unlike to God; to execute his law upon the heads of all men who transgress, would be to consign all men to everlasting ruin; for there is none that doeth good and sinneth not. Where, then, shall we turn for salvation, since God is just? To Christ, to his atoning sacrifice. His death does not pay the debt for all or for one, and yet it opens the way equally to all men. The lamb that was slain on the Jewish altar did not bear the sin of every man that brought it, but only of such as were of a broken and contrite heart; so also Christ died

for all men, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. Not every one that was bitten by the serpent in the wilderness, was saved; but such as looked upon the brazen serpent that Moses had raised upon a pole; so of men; all are not saved, although all may be, but such as receive pardon through the name of Jesus. The death of Christ is an all-sufficient atonement for the sins of the whole world; but as man lost his original purity by disobedience, God has determined to save only such as shall become obedient through the name of his Son. If, then, such was God's abhorrence to sin that he would suffer his only-begotten son to die before he would suffer one soul that had sinned to enter heaven, how shall we who have often sinned expect to regain those blissful seats without complying with his most holy requirements? Why should we shrink at the justice of God? This has been the solace of the poor and the needy in all generations; it has been the stronghold of the enslaved of every nation; this was the sanctuary view that saved David from infidelity. Alas for that man, or that nation, when their safety depends on the abrogation of this attribute of the Almighty!

Mercy is also illustrated on the cross of Christ. Man is undeserving of God's favor. He has, the rather, become deserving of his displeasure;—he deserves to suffer the demerit of his crimes. Each generation seems eager not only to commit the crimes of their fathers, but also to add others of their own. And now that malice can go no farther, and depravity can become no more depraved, since all have conspired to crucify the Son of God, what could man expect but to hear his doom? The heavens are black, the earth trembles in her strong foundations, and the graves of dead men are opened. Man has crucified his Redeemer!—But where sin did abound, grace did much more abound;—all this malice but opens up a fountain in the house of David for sin and uncleanness. God is love. The Old Testament may show the holiness of God, and expound his law; but it is the crowning glory of the New, to set forth his love. God is a Spirit, all-pervading; but wheresoever that Spirit extends, his love also extends. He bathes the world in an ocean of love. He paints the flowers of Spring,

its dignity. No finite arm can chain or control it. It snaps the fetters which presumption lays upon it, as Samson sundered the withes of Philistine tyranny. It pays as little heed to despotic dictates as the waves of the Hellespont did to the mandates of Xerxes. To incarcerate the body may only plume it for bolder and higher flights. The world had probably lost that spiritual tragedy, the "Pilgrim's Progress," had no ecclesiastical intolerance attempted, by imprisonment, to seal up the lips of the preaching tinker. To Milton's sightlessness, perhaps, we owe the poem which has wreathed the brow of his memory with amaranth. The loss of his outer, did but quicken his inner, vision. When the eye ceased to address him from the world of fact, then conception hastened to him with the choicest things from the world of fancy. The gentle and brilliant Laura Bridgman is forever telling us how the mind will seek out avenues to intercourse and to joy, though the doors of sense be barred and bolted against it. When the tenement which holds it is crumbling in final decay, the spirit often rises up in a strength and freshness which seem beyond its own. On the rack of the Inquisition the soul has been firmest and calmest in its integrity; and the martyr has sent up his last breath amid the flame which consumed him, in a song of joy.

And what homage has been paid to mind, in the provisions which have been furnished it! For it, preëminently, was the whole material fabric fashioned. Systems, suns, stars and planets, would be mysteries, if mind were wanting. The whole scheme of Providence would be an enigma beyond the power of human solution. The tiniest flower would enfold a riddle no Solomon could guess. To the mind the body is given as a servant. For its instruction there is constantly opened before it the book of natural wisdom. For its development and guidance the earth has been trodden by the feet of an angel ministry. To inspire and lift it up the harp of prophecy has been strung, and its strings swept by the breath of God. And radiant with heavenly light, an Infinite Teacher has come down from the heights of knowledge, to lend His powerful aid in training and perfecting it.

Its capacity for progress is another indication of its value and majesty. How few are the years which intervene between the cradle and the grave, and yet what wonders are crowded into them! Consciousness and emotive susceptibility, seem at first to be the chief if not the only elements of mental existence in the child; but how rapidly does the expanding spirit hasten up the steps of advancement! How soon does it learn to people worlds with its imagination,—to construct beautiful theories from prosy facts,—and delve into Philosophy for the causes and laws of phenomena! With memory it can summon every age of the past to its side; to its comprehensive eye the whole present stands revealed; and then, with nothing but the staff of deduction on which to lean, it plunges boldly into the future. Beneath its gaze the mazes of human feeling become regular and beaten paths, and the shifting stars own their distant wanderings. Bacon and Newton and Kepler and Locke were once children, and amused and satisfied like others with a pebble or a toy. Behold in them the progressive capacity of mind!

Add to these its immortality, and the chain of testimony to its dignity is ample. It alone is exempt from decay. The mind, as we have moulded it, as we have enriched and blessed, or impoverished and cursed it, is the only legacy of time. How conclusive a proof that for its sake all else is bestowed; and how does it show the folly of taking no thought for its interests! And its power of advancement shall go with it on its endless life-journey, multiplied and multiplying as it goes. New heavens are in the future to bend over it, new worlds to invite its study, new beings to court its fellowship, new trophies that wait its winning.

With this wondrous and majestic nature we are all endowed. The few who *would* in their selfishness, may not monopolize it. It comes to every class like the rain and the sunshine, from the same great Goodness, and with the same universality. It can neither be bought nor bartered, the hand of the thief may not reach it, nor the sheriff's warrant wrest it away. It is *ours*, and ours only, to be developed, nurtured, perfected.

We cannot fail to see a reason, in these considerations, for making Thought an element, and a prominent one, in our sys-



tem of training. For, unless this nature be provided for by teaching it to think as it ought, the objects of its bestowment can never be gained. And wherever mind is found, there exists the obligation thus to train it. We should disabuse ourselves and others of the impression that mental training is a work of supererogation, or that it belongs chiefly to the noble, the opulent and the unoccupied. Every man is noble and opulent in his spiritual nature and possessions; and no man is innocently indolent. Thought, and its consequent discipline, is not the mere privilege and distinction of the few, but the sacred duty of the whole. Fidelity to the outward life, proves the accomplishment of but half of any man's task. To feed the body is his appropriate duty; but not to seek so to feed it as to starve the mind. Care for the one may be just, but the neglect of the other is certainly cruel.

We anticipate the objection which tells us that it is easy to theorize respecting the duty of the poor and laborious, but not so easy to fulfil the duty. We shall be told of the prostration which labor brings, of many and sickly children, of high rent and prices, the want of books and the need of relaxation. We admit the force of the plea. Such circumstances must lower the general standard of intellectual attainment, as that phrase is generally understood. But they, by no means, justify a practical indifference to mental training. Because we *cannot* do *all*, it does not follow that we *need* do *nothing*. Because literary advantages are not multiplied to us, is no reason why we should trample under foot the few we possess. And none of us are wholly destitute. Reflection, and the world with its varied tongues, adapted to every capacity, are always at our command. And, with these aids alone, the strong desire for enlargement of thought will bring it; the thirst for knowledge will be itself a smiting-rod, making the waters gush out wherever it falls. No harder social lots will ever be endured, than were some of those from which the mightiest of our race have broken away and gone up to mental distinction. They prove that time and means for improvement may be created by the voice of strong desire, and the arm of energetic purpose.

We have said that our training needs to be such as would

nurture Thought in its subjects. And we mean by this, (if we may digress a moment,) that the mind should be trained to think for itself. It should not merely think over others' thoughts, but be occupied with its own. It should have no fetters imposed upon its reasoning powers. It should be asked to subscribe to no creed, however sacred we hold it, until it is embodied in its own deductions. It must be tied by no leading-strings, lest it should step beyond the path beaten by the feet of antiquity. It should be taught to shun no topic which is linked with its welfare. It should know that its mission is the pursuit of truth; its duty to receive, maintain, and apply it.

It should learn self-reliance. It should be early told that perils beset its path which no other arm will ward off, from which no instinct will preserve it, and that for safety it must look to its own acquired energy. It should know that the only foes which can really harm, are error and selfish undutifulness. In a single word it should be taught to think earnestly, deeply, independently, comprehensively, and faithfully. Such thought would dignify mind, by moulding both an elevated intellectual and moral character. The consequent intellectual attainments would make the scholar, and the resulting moral affections would generally constitute the Christian. How far the distorted views and the one-sided logic, whose progeny appear in the thousand forms of skepticism and superstition, are owing to the neglect of training minds to think thus, we cannot certainly know, but we would not willingly place our shoulders beneath its share. At any rate, such a mental training is the only obvious cure for destructive heresies, the only antidote to the evils of a false philosophy. Such are the claims of Thought upon our regard, and such is the thought which those claims exact.

We have spoken of the claims of Thought. But Action has also its claims. We have said that Thought is the proof of existence. So is Action the proof of life *beyond ourselves*, as Thought is the proof of life *within ourselves*. Action too gives life its charm. The monotony of continual repose is painful. It is never welcome except as the counterpart to over activity. The unstimulating quiet of Nature is delightful only when it suc-

until both were weary, and then both have gone away protesting against the prejudice which blinds the eye to foreign merit. Indeed, both have claimed the same trophies; each declaring they were bought with its wealth, won by its diligence. Now Thought has loved to sneer and mock at Action; and then Action, exasperated by insult, has risen up in a fierce and deadly crusade against Thought. Thought has branded Action with baseness; and Action has shouted back the taunt of indolence. Thought has affected to pity Action; and Action has loved to show its contempt of Thought. Thought has called Action sensual; and Action has call Thought ethereal. Thought has prophesied of its coming triumphs in the hearing of Action; and, in the very face of Thought, Action has shaken the banner under which it was preparing to march for conquest, on which was inscribed, "Down with the lazy Dreamers!" We speak figuratively, but truly, of the contest long carried on between the scholar and the peasant, who have represented (perhaps it were better to say *misrepresented*) Thought and Action respectively. It has sometimes been only a smothered feeling, and sometimes a torrent of curses; sometimes a secret purpose of vengeance, and sometimes a deadly affray.

One principal cause of this hostility, where it has existed, has been the sentiment, or rather the *impression*, (for it has probably never assumed the definiteness that would entitle it to the name of a sentiment,) that labor is degrading. We hardly know where or how such an impression was received, but it has existed, and does exist. Sad as it is to own it; it seems to be mostly a product of civilization. There, where labor wins the greatest laurels, where multiplying monuments forever proclaim its efficiency, where beauty and grace and a thousand forms own their dependence upon it, where the eye is feasted with the splendor it creates, and the ear ravished with the melody it provides, where life itself revels amid the luxuries it has multiplied; it is strange that its dignity is not seen, its rights respected, and its value acknowledged. But so it is. It is the great life-struggle with multitudes to rise above the necessity for labor, and the equal struggle with other multitudes to remain there. It is hard to tell what merit there is in indolence,

and still harder to tell what advantages flow from it. If it have both merit and advantage, then it may be supposed that the tropical negro, who sleeps all day in the shade of his Tamba-Tree,—now waking just enough to feed himself with the scattered fruit, is the best and happiest of men. How far idleness may lift its devotee in the scale of social merit, we know not; but we know that Solomon sent the sluggard to the ant as a pupil, a fact which seems to show that indolence is not particularly distinguished for wisdom. No! Labor is no less dignifying to wealth than it is necessary to poverty; no less an honorable distinction for station than it is the appropriate badge of obscurity; no less the honest boast of refinement than it is the fitted task of vulgarity.

This impression has found one of its most secure asylums in the schools. The *literati*, and especially the tyros who have affected to be such, have somehow come to feel that the masses, who toil to gain a subsistence, by constant physical labor, are a low and sensual and inferior class of beings. And they have not been backward in showing their feeling of superiority, in the most reprehensible forms. They have ridiculed their plain, uncouth dialect, aped their awkward manners, written satires on their intercourse, and withdrawn from all their confidential fellowship. Of course, there have been many and high exceptions to this general description, and there are still. But it has been the study of a large proportion of those who are ranked among the scholars, to pass through life free from the sweat and dust of common labor. They could descend to a thousand pitiful artifices, rather than lay their intellectual respectability on the altar of a common handicraft.

The consequences of this impression, so strongly entrenched and so often appearing, may be readily inferred. Prejudice and proud neglect on the one hand have awakened prejudice and envy and hatred on the other. A social gulf has thus been created between the learned and the laboring, over which kind sympathies and generous deeds could scarcely pass. The cords of heathen caste have hardly been drawn closer and tighter than those which have divided the realm of Thought from the realm of Action. Learning, or what has passed for it, has de-

and awe-struck before the madness of our sweeping rivers; now, with the veriest ease, they are subdued and chained as servants to the wheels of enterprise. Once, locomotion was slow and wearisome; now it vies with the winds in speed, while its ease is such as scarcely to disturb the gentlest slumber. Once, to publish and circulate a book through a kingdom, required the labor of a multitude of the most literary men for years; now, he who brings his manuscript from his study to-day, may find, ere a week has passed, his production in the hands of a thousand distant families; and the principal agents shall be but a few boys, scarcely passed the centre of their teens. Once, to send a message a thousand miles and get an answer, was a task few had the faith to undertake, and they who did were forced to live on through the long fever of hope deferred; now, we may sit in our easy-chair and whisper to a friend in New Orleans, and while we are getting ready to listen, lo! his back speeding answer has reached us. And whence all this added power? Less muscles are employed than anciently, and men have no added physical strength. Indeed, the children of Anak have well nigh disappeared, and given place to what are Lilliputians in physical comparison. Whence then this added power? Why, Thought has risen up from its inventive musing, and taught Action how to make more of its resources, how to appropriate its energy, how to adjust its levers.

Action is the inspiration of Thought. It is the busy stirring world of life that appeals to, and rouses up, the spirit of inquiry within us. The world's activity is an endless round of varying tragedies, and the deeds which are daily done are the single acts, exciting the desire to trace out and unravel the whole.—It is when Thought dwells with Action, sees its wretchedness, hears its sighs, learns its wants, listens to its tale of hardship, catches its prayer for a better lot, perceives the littleness of its rewards; it is then that it is roused up to devise the means of its relief. Thought *did* come from the study to tell Action how to multiply its power, but it went to the study from a communion with action, with the story of its griefs still sounding in its ears, and urging it to effort. It is a significant fact that nearly every mechanical invention has been brought out by

practical mechanics. In the midst of mechanical action, the development of a mechanical principle has suggested an improved mode of application, and the severity of their own toil has urged them to make the discovery practical. And he who embodies a conception with his labor, and reaps the reward of it, will find that reward just so much fuel to feed the enthusiasm of his thought. An ancient proverb saith, "There is that scattereth and yet increaseth," and of nothing is it truer than of Thought scattering its gifts in Action. The response to its benefactions will be like that which the generous stream receives, when the grateful ocean greets its flowings with the returning tide.

The world sadly needs the conjoined influence of these two educative elements. The multitudes who live a life but little above the brute need the elevating influence of Thought, to give efficiency to their labor and aspiration to their hearts. Through it alone can they be taught the value of mind, of spiritual strength, of immortality, and that, in germs, they lie imbedded in their own ignoble being. And the honest, but starving poor,—starving in body and soul,—how do they need the fruit of beneficent Action! Let not Thought withhold its labors of mind or body. Let it bend down and utter a reviving word, or, if need be, grasp the implement of labor and earn bread for the sufferer. The toils of Thought are needed that the toils of Action may be lessened, so that it too may blend study and reflection with its labor. Thought shall thus smile upon Action and bless its deeds, and Action shall look up in confidence, seeking and rejoicing in the fellowship of Thought; and then both shall sit down together in the bosom of human existence, and wonder at their past estrangement.

The results of such a blending of Thought and Action in human discipline, we can only briefly and partially indicate.

1. It would do much toward equalizing the condition of the various classes of society.

Perfect equality in social condition is neither possible nor desirable. There is very little justice, and still less philosophy in the "Community Systems" which would annihilate all the social distinctions which exist. They are as natural as

the elevations and depressions in a varied landscape. And if it could be done, it would be as thankless a task to destroy all the former, as to make a monotonous plain of the latter. He who possesses greater inherent energy, forms stronger purposes, and displays a higher fidelity than his fellows, will inevitably acquire a distinction and multiply attainments to which, and to the results of which, he is entitled beyond the masses who never strive for them, or know how to employ them. But though perfect equality is not to be sought, we are not to infer that all disparities are either consistent or just. And we cannot but wish the actual disparities in human condition lessened. We would see honest poverty fed and clothed and favored with a competence. We would see the great mass of mind, now debased and untutored,—ministering only to passionate gratification,—instructed, lifted up, filled with higher aspirations, and purified. We would see the means of physical comfort and mental progress furnished to the race. And such a training would do much to make us realize such a state. Thought would aid the multitudinous poor, both by teaching them to make their labors more efficient, and by inspiring the resolve to rise up into a better state. And the active service which the intellectual would render, would take away from labor the idea of degradation, create an intercourse and sympathy between the two classes that would tend to place them in a common mental position, and add so much to the productive energy and capacity of the community. To those, if such there be, who see in the multitude nought but stepping-stones, by the aid of which they may rise to distinction,—who forget that the meanest beggar is an immortal man, and the titled millionaire no more than that,—there may seem little to welcome in this result; but to every manly heart, it will seem like a prophetic sketch of a Millennial era. We forget almost that Greece could have the least basis for pride, when we remember that the great mass of her population were Helots, brutalized by the tyranny of the few. The glory of England is overshadowed by the shame of her deep-dyed injustice to the mighty masses who buy her greatness with tears and agony and blood. What though she has had a Shakspeare, when a million dwarfed and

shrivelled minds are set over against him. What though in architecture she can point to her St. Paul's, and Yorkminster, and Westminster Abby, when a thousand wretched human hovels are clustered as counterparts, telling the cost of such a splendor. It has been our boast that such extremes do not meet here, that for the masses there is a good provision. May this union of Thought and Action make it a higher and truer boast.

2. It would render life more real and rational.

There is in civilized life not a little of romance and artificiality. The fact that the public maw constantly disposes of so much novel trash in the form of Light Literature, is of no small significance. The multitudes who create it, live in a world of romance, and from thence they bring their ill-shapen characters. And the larger multitudes who read, hasten wherever they may, to the same land of enchantment. With life as it is, they are dissatisfied, except as it approaches their distorted and ridiculous ideal. And so, too, since respectability turns so much on outward appendages, there are multitudes who, wanting the golden substance, make up for its absence with tinsel and galvanic gilding. Poverty affects wealth and labor feigns indolence, obscurity assumes familiarity with station, and thick-headed ignorance struts on the stilts of pedantry. Let Thought and Action become blended in our discipline, and in our conception of a noble life, and the dreaming of romancers would soon be broken, and reflection would be turned into channels of utility. When to act earnestly for the good of the race becomes the only price at which human homage can be bought,—when reputation and perceived duty point out the same path,—we may hope that the constrained, artificial existence of multitudes will cease, and life become frank, true, sympathetic, useful, rational. Society will fling off the worse than steel corsets with which fashion has been pressing out its vitality, and yield itself up to a higher and truer training. We may retain the Drama, but facts shall furnish its subjects, and they will be thrilling beyond all that fancy has wrought out. We may have our Epics, but when some master-hand shall sweep the harp that breathes the inspiring numbers, it shall reveal to



us a soul, rising from darkness and debasement, through infinite peril, to its sunlit home of purity; and it shall stir us as Homer and Milton have never done, for our hearts will answer to all its truthfulness. We shall not want for Poetry; for long overlooked realities will sing to us with an unheard sweetness; and new revelations from our inner life, shall inspire more hopeful prophecies than her lips have ever yet uttered. Existence will unfold its beautiful and its terrible mysteries, long concealed by our voluntary blindness, and by the screens which the world has held up to hide its heart.

3. It would exhibit human character under new and higher types.

All human effort tends rightfully to human elevation and perfection. And such a union of Thought and Action as has been urged, gives greater promise of success, than has the discipline composed chiefly of one of these elements. This may appear questionable to those who think of it for the first time. They may ask whether the division of exertion between two pursuits is not calculated to preclude eminence from both? whether he who gives but half his time to Thought can hope for the same eminence as he who makes it the entire business of his life?

The first answer is, that intellectual eminence owes itself less to the *length* than to the *energy* of intellectual effort; just as the traveller owes the greatness of his journey more to the rapidity of his pace than to the time he travels. A mind fresh and vigorous and clear, and roused up by some stirring occasion, will accomplish more in an hour, than in whole days, when it is jaded and confused and listless. And the action, the toil, the intercourse with the living world, which we have urged, are the means of girding it with strength, of opening its eye, of filling it with enthusiasm. There Thought gathers its materials, and learns the forms in which they need to be moulded, so that when it goes back to its laboratory it can make every effort tell. And many, if not most, of the highest manifestations of character have been instrumentally brought out through their intercourse with the active world. There Newton saw the falling apple which became a text, expanding itself in the explana-

tion, into the theory of universal motion. There Wilberforce and Clarkson heard the wail of African servitude, coming up from the bosom of the sea; and it roused them to an effort which the applauding world has canonized. There Howard found the manacled and dying prisoner, and the sight strengthened him for a task over which distant nations breathe a benison. There Luther found the corruptions which armed him with a strength no learning could resist, no terror destroy. There Butler encountered the flippant skepticism which stirred and held him to the work of rearing that monument of strength—the immortal “Analogy”—Infidelity has never dared to assail. There Shakespeare gained that deep insight into the human heart, which taught him to sketch his portraits with such a life-like accuracy. And as that active intercourse shall be more intimate and general and continued, why may we not hope it will stir to nobler tasks, that it will elevate to prouder distinctions.

The second answer is that those are not the highest types of character which are marked by the prodigious growth of some single element. There is something to be cultivated besides mere intellect. It is the symmetrical development of the whole being that produces the loftiest character. A giant intellect, blended with a dwarfed social and moral nature, deserves rather to be called monstrous than great. It is only when all these are moulded into a grand and noble unity, that the word *great* becomes appropriately descriptive. In Milton's portrait of satan, an intellect towering well nigh to infinity, fills the whole foreground; but no one turns away feeling that he has been gazing upon character under its highest types. A comprehensive intellect is *an* attribute of greatness, is *a* feature of nobility, but by no means the only one. Strong purified sympathies and earnest useful action, with that intellect bent into their service, guiding their hands, enlarging the sphere of their beneficence,—these are the highest evidences of a great being; for they are the chief evidences that God is great. And these are the natural products of that training into which Thought and Action equally and wisely enter.

the Jews until this day;" hence their rejection of Christ. Christians doubted no more, but went forth to their mission, and maintained their faith, even unto death. Paul makes Christ's resurrection the chief corner-stone in the foundation of our faith and hope. "And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain—ye are yet in your sins." 1 Cor. 15: 14. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,*" &c. 1 Pet. 1: 3. It was the point to Peter's sermon, by which three thousand were brought to Christ in a single day. "Jesus of Nazareth ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain; whom God hath raised up; whereof we all are witnesses.—Now when they heard this they were pricked in their heart," &c. Acts 2: 22—37.

It was, in the days of the early Christians, and has ever since been, the point of attack and persecution by the enemies of religion. Then, and now, and ever more, to acknowledge or deny this, is to acknowledge or deny all the cardinal doctrines of the gospel. Now, if God would employ any act in the performance of which men should acknowledge His Son, how natural that He should employ one which would represent that event, which more than all others, goes to prove the fact to be acknowledged. The resurrection of Jesus was that event, and baptism a natural and striking representation of it; and hence the specific action for an ordinance in which to acknowledge the Son of God. This clearly accounts for the selection of baptism as the means of a public profession, which, without note or comment, represents and commits the believer to, the point at issue between him and the unbelieving world.

3. No other view of this subject properly distinguishes between the design and import of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

These ordinances are entirely dissimilar in their actions, and if the truths or facts represented by them correspond with their actions respectively, they must also be equally dissimilar. But in proportion as baptism is made significant of what it merely implies, we make it nearly or quite identical with the Lord's

Supper. Both imply repentance, faith, forgiveness, and the death, burial, and even the resurrection of Christ.

Their customary symbolical use is also nearly identical. It is common to speak of baptism as a symbol of the *death* as well as of the resurrection of Christ. But the bread and wine, and not baptism, are the specific emblems of His death. "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do *shew the Lord's death* till he come." 1 Cor. 11: 26. Baptism is spoken of as an emblem of spiritual resurrection to newness of life; but what other idea than that of spiritual life by the Son of God is expressed in eating and drinking the emblems of His flesh and blood?

The likeness of the design and import of baptism and those of the Lord's Supper, upon the hypothesis against which we are speaking, we will give by copying from a Baptist work before us.

"The great facts, pertaining to the work of Christ and to the experience of His people, *to both of which each ordinance directly refers*, by being presented in different emblems, in accordance with different modes of conception and of representation adopted by the human mind, with different allusions, and for what are, in some respects, different purposes, are made more impressive, their various bearings and relations are more clearly perceived, and they become more fully incorporated with the habitual conceptions and feelings of Christians. The ordinances, however, differ—and *this difference consists, we repeat, mainly in the different aspects, or emblematical lights, in which the general facts to which they both equally relate, are represented.*"

The foregoing comports well with the general method of expression, relative to the design and import of the two ordinances. Can it be that baptism and communion are designed simply to differently represent or set forth the same things? Or is it not true that, though in some sense they relate to and imply many things alike, yet as distinct actions, they are designed to represent, set forth, and impress, entirely different objects? The Scriptures speak of them in terms widely different. Of the Lord's Supper it is said, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew the Lord's *death* till He come." "Is it not the communion of the *body* and *blood* of Christ?" The

*death* of Christ is here the prominent idea. In speaking of baptism, the *resurrection* of Christ is made the prominent point, however much besides is spoken of as implied, or as, in an accommodated sense, represented by it. They differ in their actions or modes, in their order of practice, in their relations to the church, and in their general conditions, requisite to their practice and enjoyment. There is but one legitimate conclusion—they also equally differ in their design and import—the one a profession of faith, the other a deed of affectionate worshipful remembrance; the former asserting the Messiahship and the latter the death of the Son of God, and our life by his death.

4. No other view of this matter is consonant with the nature and object of ethical symbols.

It is the province of such a symbol to indicate in its own action the thing to be signified. Hence the Jewish types were at once intelligible and impressive. Baptism and communion are exceptions to this order, if their primary design and import are not plainly indicated and distinguished in their actions respectively. Besides, each of such symbols of simple action, represents one, and only one, specific object, however many more may be related as implied. Hence, among the Jews, the purity of the sacrifice represented, specifically, the purity of Christ; its death His death; its blood, sprinkled before, and availing at, the mercy seat of the tabernacle and temple. Christ's blood availing before the Father for our salvation. Equally clear is the likeness between Christ's resurrection from the dead and the emersion of believers out of the baptismal grave, and the design of the former to directly and exclusively represent the latter.

5. Again, the method of the apostolic ministry evinces the truth of our position upon this question.

Those early ministers of Jesus sought to make men believe that the Messiah, long prophesied of, and long and ardently looked for, had made his appearance. This they did mainly by the proofs of His resurrection from the dead. "Beginning from the baptism of John unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of

His resurrection." Acts 1: 22. "He seemeth to be a setter forth of *strange gods*; because he preached unto them *Jesus and the resurrection.*" 17: 18. "And declared to be the Son of God *with power*, according to the spirit of holiness, *by the resurrection from the dead.*" Rom. 1: 4. "Hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the *resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,*" &c. This event was a promise, from which they made men feel that but one conclusion could be drawn.

At the instant of believing, baptism was enjoined, in the performance of which believers were taught they would acknowledge and commit themselves to their risen Lord. Perfectly consonant with this method is the position that baptism takes its signification from the resurrection of Christ, the leading proof of his Messiahship, and is designed to represent it as a means of its acknowledgment.

6. Lastly, we cite several passages of Scripture which more expressly attest the truth of our position.

In the sixth chapter of Romans, Paul commences a discourse in which he shows at length and conclusively, that Christians should sin no more. This he argues from several considerations, one of which is, the inferences to be drawn from their baptism. He begins with a literal statement of the facts involved in baptism, v. 4, "Therefore we are buried *with him* by baptism into death." We are, by baptism, buried *as he was*, in likeness and symbolical representation of his burial. In the contexts are instances of the use of baptism as an illustration of a spiritual state. They had been baptized into the acknowledgment of Christ's death, verses 3 and 4, not as an event merely, but as the all-sufficient, and the only expiation for sin, and had, hence, also acknowledged that they were dead spiritually, as Christ was literally; buried as he was; and as he had risen from the dead, by the glory of the Father, so they had risen to walk in newness of life. The primary design and import of baptism are clearly indicated in the apostle's literal statement in the first clause of the 4th verse. The next Scripture which we cite is 1 Cor. 15: 29. "Else what shall ~~the~~ which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not? Why are they then baptized for the dead?" The p'

mon-sense meaning of this text is that Christians, in the act of baptism, expressed their faith in the resurrection of the dead. This was not the direct object of their baptism, that being to represent the resurrection of Christ, as proof of his character, but it was universally acknowledged that if Christ had risen, the dead also would rise, and hence by their baptism they acknowledged both.

Clarke says, "Thus they are *baptized for the dead, in perfect faith of the resurrection.*" We add a note from the "COMPREHENSIVE." "Thus the sense will be; baptized in the confidence and expectation of a resurrection from the dead. Of course are meant by dead, those who die in the Lord, and a resurrection to happiness. Chrysostom establishes this interpretation beyond all doubt; and so Theof., Œc., Phot., Theod., Ham., Wetts. *All the Greek compilers agree that there is an allusion to the FORM OF BAPTISM.* 'I believe in the resurrection of the dead,' to which is added: 'Wilt thou be baptized in this faith? It is my desire.' After which, and other confessions, according to Chrysostom, the rite is performed." Bloof.

We quote once more, and in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established. Col. 2: 12. "Buried with Christ in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." In your baptism ye are buried and risen again, as Christ was; and this ye have submitted to on account of the faith you have of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.

We will close this article with a brief reflection or two.

1. This is an important question, and deserves increased attention. The design and import of the ordinance must determine its proper action and subject. If, as we have argued, baptism is designed to be a profession of faith in Christ, by a specific representation of His resurrection, then immersion only is baptism, and none but believers proper subjects. Hence the different positions of Baptists and Pedobaptists, the former affirming and the latter denying that baptism was designed to represent nothing that does not imply immersion.

2. Baptists, as we think, weaken their own cause by making

out that baptism is designed to represent equally several different things—the resurrection of Christ, of the dead, spiritual resurrection, and the washing away of sin, &c.; endorsing the position of Pedobaptists, that baptism takes its signification from no particular event or events whatsoever, and may be made symbolical of whatever corresponds with it in sense; and by their making baptism emblematical of the washing away of sin; giving countenance to the Pedobaptist argument that baptism is designed to express the sense of purification; from which they conclude that it may be practiced by any scriptural mode in which that sense may be expressed; and that that sense having been expressed in Jewish times by sprinkling and pouring mostly, and the apostle speaking of conversion as a sprinkling of the heart from an evil conscience, these several modes are, hence, authorized modes of baptism. Baptists may respond that the ordinance does not represent purification in any other way than as it is an emblem, specifically, of the washing away of sin, and this, in some sense, may be true; yet it may not be susceptible of satisfactory proof, and going to mere figures of speech for the design of a positive institution cannot but involve the question in obscurity, and give advantage to those whose source of argument lies wholly in that direction.

3. Baptism is authorized, not alone by the will and appointment of God, but by its happy adaptation to the mind's natural process of thought and volition, in the discovery and reception of truth. Men are so constituted that truth is more readily discovered, and more deeply impressed, by the aid of appropriate outward expression. Hence all the natural, spontaneous gesticulations in the common interchange of ideas among men. Hence, also, God's having always employed symbols and modes in religious worship.

Under the New Testament dispensation, two great truths were to be made the principal engines in the work of reform—namely, Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God; and His death is the source of our life and hope. These truths must be made to have all possible weight and power upon the minds and lives of men. But their weight and efficiency can be facilitated by the association of appropriate expressive ordinances. God,



hence, appointed baptism and communion for that express purpose. The former He designed should acknowledge and enforce the Messiahship, and the latter the saving merits of the Son of God.

Had the true design, import and mode of Christian baptism always been preserved, then in every instance of its performance, men would behold a living representation of the most important and glorious event that has ever transpired; would witness a profession at once the most illustrious; and in the louder language of appropriate action would have re-preached to them the truth which of all truths most condemns their unbelief—prompts to repentance and faith,—brings to Christ and his salvation, and marks the distinction between the church and the world. Then would this important ordinance have always been attended with results demonstrative in the highest degree of the wisdom and goodness of God in its appointment, and Divine sanction by the example of His well beloved Son.

---

## ART. VII.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

**LECTURES ON METAPHYSICS;** By Sir William Hamilton, Bart., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. Edited by the Rev. Henry Longueville Mansel, B. D., Oxford, and John Veitch, M. A., Edinburgh. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, &c., 1859. 1 Vol. 8vo. pp. 738.

Few students in Metaphysics need any information respecting the peculiar eminence which Sir William Hamilton has reached in the departments of thought to which he has for years been devoted. His "discussions," issued a few years since in this country, made both his name and his power, objects of general regard. Few writers in any age have shown a more thorough acquaintance with the whole broad range of thought among the problems of mental philosophy and psychology, or exhibited a power of analytic criticism equal to his. The philosophers of every age and school are his familiar companions; he can develop all their theories in order, show their historic procession and logical relationships, lay bare their fallacies, amuse himself with their speculations, and use their broken fragments to build up his own system into compactness and strength and beauty. He understands the sensual philosophy of Scotland, and can interpret the transcendental utterances of the

German metaphysicians, when there is any real meaning in them to be understood. He blends the patient study of the Continent with the strong, shrewd, practical sense of his own land ; and while he is a bold and original thinker, he never parts with his modesty or his religious reverence. The keen intellect and the strong heart are both in him ; and while he freely explores all open avenues, and rejects no beam of light, he ever remembers that life is a serious concern, and that one important test of truth is utility.

The Lectures contained in this volume are those which the author was accustomed to deliver as a biennial course at the University of Edinburgh ; and, though not prepared for publication by his own hand, are, both in their form and style, well adapted to the instruction of all classes of studious and thinking minds. Some of his papers, previously published, have been a little too profound, and implied too large and varied a learning, for most common minds to digest ; but these Lectures are not liable to that objection. Full of strong thought, and critical argument, and careful discrimination, their style will soon become attractive to the reader, and their stimulus will make the study a delight. It is a noble volume ; the product of one of the most solid and powerful metaphysical minds of this century ; and will long be quoted and read in view of its recognized authority and strength. Some of the views will appear fresh and original, and not all of them will get a ready endorsement ; but the manliness and force with which they are presented will compel even dissent to be deferential. But, as a whole, his system seems to us singularly free from the excesses and liabilities of the opposite schools which he so well interprets, and so faithfully and generously criticises. Adopting the German classifications, for the most part, he lends no countenance to the German skepticism ; and giving reverent heed to the testimony of the senses, he scorns the materialistic dogmas propounded in the name of the author of the " Essay on the Human Understanding." To readers who are willing to think and are patient in study, we commend this volume as a rare contribution to the science of mind—as the rare and impressive and original talk of a powerful thinker on some of the highest themes of study.

The mechanical features of the work are every way equal to the best issues of the enterprising House which sends it out to the American public.

**THE LIMITS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT** Examined in eight Lectures, delivered before the University of Oxford in the year 1858, on the Bampton foundation. By Henry Longueville Mansel, B. D., Reader in Moral and Metaphysical philosophy, at Magdalen College ; Tutor and late Fellow of St. John's College. First American, from the third London, Edition. With the notes translated. Same Publishers as the above. 1 Vol. 12mo. pp. 362.

In a somewhat different vein, and yet appealing to the same critical powers of the reader, Mr. Mansel here appears as author, instead of Editor, as above. By the will of a recently deceased English clergyman, a fund is given in trust to the University of Oxford, the avails of which are applied to sustain an annual course of " Eight Divinity Lecture Sermons." The author of this volume was chosen to deliver one of these courses of Sermons, and they are here published, with the ample translated notes, referring mostly to the authors whom he quotes, or consisting of extracts from their writings, intended to jus-

tify, or illustrate the text. It is certainly a work of great profundity and power; peculiar, not so much in its aim as in its method. Other authors, not a few, have sought to show that a true and complete Philosophy of Religion cannot be developed by the processes of unaided human reasoning, and that there was great and absolute need of a special revelation, and great propriety in our expecting it, and reverencing it after it has come. But to attempt a philosophic exhibition of human incapacity, by showing how such an effort runs and must run into all sorts of logical absurdities, from the very nature of human reasoning and the limitations of human thought, was largely reserved for the Oxford Lecturer. There is not a little in the book to suggest Butler's Analogy, though the plane of thought is very different, and the style is wholly another. But in the concentration of attention, in the clearness of view, in the fulness of every sentence with meaning, and in the multiplications of the *reductio ad absurdum*, he often reminds one of the author of the Analogy.

Whether we attempt to construct a philosophy of religion by a scientific exposition of the nature of God, and then deduce from this the moral constitution of the universe; or seek it by a scientific inquiry into the constitution of the human mind, and from this draw out our idea of God and of his ways, we find our reasoning runs us not simply into follies, but into contradictions; and these inevitable contradictions prove to us that the human mind, in its present state, is so hedged in and limited, that it must fail, or take instruction and help from God; and that in taking the teaching of revelation, though the speculative reason may still suffer perplexity, the practical reason is satisfied and rests. This is the leading thought of the book; but its statement suggests nothing of the careful analysis, the vigorous argumentation, the strong grasp of thought, the fulness of illustration, and the complete mastery of the theories of Rationalism, Pantheism and Mysticism, whose influence is so subtle and yet so wide-spread and active. If one will take time enough, the work can be fully comprehended, and no friend and teacher of religion would be employing himself in any other than a profitable way while getting familiar with this argument. It may be cavilled at, but we think an answer to it would be full of difficulty; some of its minor points and subordinate reasonings may be properly objected against, but we have no expectation that any one will give it a fair and annihilating review. In these days of mythical and mystical exposition, of philosophical pride and scientific doubt, of Harmonial Philosophies and Absolute Religions, Mr. Mansel has undertaken no needless task; and the embryo philosophers that so prate of Progress and Reason will probably be much more inclined to ignore this book than attempt to reply to it.

**A NEW HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF MEXICO.** In which Las Casas' Denunciations of the Popular Historians of that War are fully vindicated. By Robert Anderson Wilson, Author of "Mexico and its Religion," etc. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son, etc. 1869. 1 Vol. Octavo, pp. 639.

Judge Wilson has written an interesting book, and the publishers have given it to the public in an attractive form. Its bold theories will arrest attention, and the cavalierly way in which the usual authorities on the subject

of the Conquest are treated, will win sympathy in some quarters and provoke strong prejudices in others. The almost oriental splendor of Prescott's narrative is set down to the egotistic exaggeration of the Spanish chroniclers from whom he draws his materials, and the old Aztec civilization, long a wonder to all antiquaries, is dealt with as was the long-eared animal who had put on the skin of the lion. We are not sufficiently versed in Spanish lore to enable us to judge of the relative value of the old and the new testimony; but we are free to say that Judge Wilson has made out a pretty strong case, and has written a fascinating history,—full of impressive pictures, and abounding in valuable information. His portrait of Cortez is a piece of keen satire, and we suspect more true than otherwise. The spirit of the great Captain had probably less in it to win sympathy and procure toleration than there was in the fierce ambition that sent Napoleon into exile; and the whole story of the conquest, stripped of its trappings and tinsel, is but the narrative of a bold, bad robbery, whose magnitude and success alone have prevented it from falling into contempt, or becoming the scorn of the world. This book will help us hate rapine, and see the loathsomeness of magnificent sins; and in rendering such a service it will not have appeared in vain.

FRANK ELLIOTT; or, Wells in the Desert. By James Challen, Author of "Christian Morals," &c. Same publishers. 1859. 1 Vol. 12mo. pp. 347.

Fiction has its uses, and they are important; its advantages, and they are not small; its licenses, but they have their limits. The communication of moral and religious truth is the highest end it can subserve, and to this it is now more or less devoted by skilful and conscientious writers. It may be a legitimate service of fiction to combat sectarian errors, and promulge sectarian dogmas. We certainly would prefer to be written up for heresy in an interesting novel, over which sentimental young ladies sigh, rather than be roasted on a gridiron in the hall of the Inquisition, with only savage monks chanting Ave Marias about us, or thrusting a crucifix into our face to provoke us to a recantation. It is a great improvement upon the old modes—more humane and refined, if not always more skilful and efficient.

This book illustrates our view. It is a plea for the doctrines and polity of the "Disciples,"—a religious sect usually known as "Campbellites." The tenets of this people are not offensively, but freely thrust forward; and as the author manages both sides of the discussion, it is natural to suppose that the theology always comes out unscathed, and the advocate—who is at the same time the hero—always comes out victorious and jubilant. The book indicates a good talent, and displays some of that quality; though we think it would better develop itself in some other literary sphere.

A COMPENDIOUS INTRODUCTION to the Study of the Bible: Being an Analysis of "An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures." In four Volumes, by Abel Stevens, LL. D. By Thomas Hartwell Home. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1 Vol. 12mo. pp. 391.

This title sufficiently explains the design of the work. At first thought, the idea of abridging such a work as "Home's Introduction," so as to present

has performed a good work in giving these fragments and lectures to the world; and her own introductory sketch shows how fully she had entered into the spirit and labors of the husband she mourns, and of the noble man whose memory two hemispheres are venerating.

**ACADIA; Or a Month with the Blue Noses.** By Frederic S. Corzens, author of "Sparrowgrass Papers." New York: Derby & Jackson. 1859. 1 Vol., 12mo., pp. 329.

Ever since Longfellow wrote "Evangeline," Nova Scotia has been like a fairy land. The pictures of Acadian scenery, and life, and character; the story of the hardships which befel the simple and loving dwellers in the valley of Grand-pré, when false patriotism and a bigoted religious faith drove them out by fraud and violence—all these things change that bleak and foggy region into almost an Hesperian realm. To this same Acadia the author of this volume went as an invalid a year since, and, after a month's travel and sojourn, came home wonderfully recruited. He is bound in honor to love the region, and tell pleasant stories about it. He could hardly be blamed for thinking its fogs delicious, and its business stagnation a charm.

He makes out much more than a readable story. He has a keen eye to see the ludicrous side of life, even though he himself furnishes the fun—a qualification which no tourist can well afford to spare. He wrings a joke out of his own saturated clothing, and feasts on witty similitudes when his dinner is spoiled in the cooking, or the lazy landlord has none to give him. Sometimes there appears a lack of earnestness in his nature, and expressions escape him now and then that betray a disposition to trifle with principles which are sacred, and with sentiments that are holy. As a whole, however, the tone of the book is healthy; and the reading of it would greatly help a dyspeptic digest his dinner, and make a gruff man genial through sympathy or shame. Incidentally, a considerable amount of historical information is communicated; and, though we should feel obliged to make proper allowance for the author's prejudices and preferences, and for his varied moods begotten by his varied experiences, we are certainly obliged to him for the knowledge he has given us of a land and a people of which we knew so little, and to which he has made our heart turn kindly.

**NEW STAR PAPERS; or Views and Experiences of Religious Subjects.** By Henry Ward Beecher. New York: Derby & Jackson. 1859. 1 Vol. 12mo. pp. 403.

The papers in this volume are mostly those which have appeared from time to time in the columns of the "*Independent*," and present Mr. Beecher in not a few of his almost endlessly variable moods. The volume opens with his striking and admirable representation of "Christ knocking at the door of the soul;" and closes with his revised speech at the meeting of the (Boston) Tract Society, held in New York during Anniversary week. Some of the very finest illustrations and enforcements of important religious truth are to be found here;—some of the keenest sarcasm, some of the quaintest conceits, some of the quietest humor, some of the boldest and most startling of statements. Few minds can take in these thoughts, uttered, as they are, without

receiving a stimulus which, on the whole, will prove eminently healthy and valuable.

**PLAIN AND PLEASANT TALK ABOUT FRUIT, FLOWERS AND FARMING.** By Henry Ward Beecher. Same publishers. 1 Vol. 12mo. pp. 420.

The method in which Mr. Beecher gathered up his somewhat extensive and varied information respecting agricultural affairs and methods, as stated in his preface, is really remarkable, and the use to which he puts it scarcely less so. With almost no practical experience, he undertook to edit the "Western Farmer and Gardener," and his observations were so varied and practical, their good sense was so manifest, and the knowledge he sent abroad was found to be so valuable, that he was actually set down by eminent agriculturists as a man of large experience in the field and garden. This volume is made up of his contributions to the periodical referred to; and there is scarcely a department of soil or vegetable culture, of which he has not some shrewd, keen, and often valuable thing to say. Mr. Beecher's popularity has doubtless chiefly tempted the publishers to reproduce this "talk" as a means of money-making; but it is a unique and charming and valuable book, notwithstanding.

**THE AMERICAN HOME GARDEN.** Being Principles and Rules for the Culture of Vegetables, Fruits, Flowers and Shubbery. To which are added brief Notes on Farm Crops, with a Table of their average Product and Chemical Constituents. By Alexander Watson. Illustrated. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 1 Vol. 12mo. pp. 531.

Here is another book in the same line as Mr. Beecher's; but more comprehensive, systematic and complete, both in plan and execution. We have almost longed for ten acres of good land, with capital enough to operate freely upon it, while looking through this volume. It is, as it professes to be, a book of *principles*, and not simply of empirical rules. Almost any one, with the aid of this book, can make an intelligent and judicious selection of the varieties of vegetable existence which it is desirable to grow upon any given species of soil; and by aid of the numerous illustrations may know beforehand what he is obtaining, without visiting a dozen nurseries, or farms, or fairs. It would save a great deal of time and money and patience, to go through this volume, before laying out a plot of ground for vegetable culture, and we hope one of these days to be able to make a practical use of the treatise which we now commend without any qualification whatever. It is just *the* book for those who have grounds to lay out, flower beds to fill, gardens to arrange and plant, or small orchards to set and train. It needs only to be seen to be appreciated, and almost any man's grounds and garden would grow into new beauty and utility by making a practical use of its instruction.

**THREE VISITS TO MADAGASCAR DURING THE YEARS 1853—1854—1856.** Including a Journey to the Capital; with Notices of the Natural History of the Country and of the present Civilization of the People. By the Rev. William Ellis, F. H. S., Author of "Polynesian Researches." Illustrated by Wood Cuts from Photographs, &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 1 Volume Octavo. pp. 514.

The hitherto unexplored countries are rapidly giving up their secrets under the spirit of research which is now so active and general; and some of

the most instructive, instructive and important among the recent issues of the American press are those which narrate the experience of travellers and explorers. Kane, and Burtin, and Livingstone will suggest themselves as high and striking examples. And among these narratives of explorers this work of Ellis may be given a prominent place. He is a close and careful observer, a calm and unobtrusive and general companion, disarming suspicion by his modest and unobtrusive persistence in his attempts, and usually successful in accomplishing his objects. By the exercise of these qualities, he obtained access, during his successive visits, to almost every object and personage that he desired to see, learned almost all that was to be learned respecting the spirit and plans of the government and the tendencies and prospects of the people, and has added not a little to our knowledge of the natural history and the social life of the island. A profession of Christianity is still forbidden to the natives, and the persecutions which were carried on so fiercely against Christian converts there some years since, though it has abated much of its fierceness, still lingers and lives. Mr. Ellis is evidently hopeful in respect to the future of the people, and looks for religious toleration on grounds which, as a matter of expediency, he does not think it proper to state publicly and fully. The narrative is written in a pleasant, easy, unambitious style, and is really rich in its instruction and information. It is issued in a style uniform with the resources of Burtin and Livingstone, and deserves a place by their side in every well selected library.

THE ROMANS AND THE HERB. By the Author of "Magdalen Stafford." Same Publishers. 1859. 1 Vol. 12mo. pp. 424.

THE LAND OF NORLAW. A Scottish story. Same Publishers. 1859.

LOVE HAS LITTLE LOVE ME LOVA. By Charles Reade. Same Publishers. 1859.

These three volumes illustrate the tendency to dramatize thought, and put life on the stage; and suggests, also, how strong and general is the appetite for instruction in the form of the story—or perhaps how strong it is for the story without regard to the question whether the story does or does not carry instruction with it.

The first of these three mentioned volumes has no great skill in the plot, the arrangement, the grouping, or the portraiture. It shows how realities often differ from the semblances which stand for them; how a nature which seems to carry a stern and savage and iconoclastic spirit within it, may have a sea of tenderness and sympathy hidden from sight, which wrestles with its artificial barriers that it may spread itself in fertility; and how all great and generous and noble qualities may be counterfeited by a man who has only sentiment and etiquette instead of a heart.

The "Land of Norlaw" is an interesting work, bringing out the peculiarities of Scotch life and character very pleasantly; exhibiting the pride of nobility and the reverence for pedigree and primogeniture very happily, as they coexist with the native regard for moral and religious character, and the equalizing rule of love. Some of the sketches are spirited, and others are quaint and touching; the ludicrous and the heroic are singularly blended, as they often are in fact in the Scotch character; and the abundance of the old dialect

puts one in fancy among the clans described by Scott, and forever suggests "The banks and braes o' bonnie doon." It portrays the life of the people as it has long been, much more clearly than any merely technical description could do it.

Reade is a writer of unquestioned ability and power and genius. His insight is keen, his portraitures distinct and self-consistent, his descriptions vivid, his power of expression large, his thrusts adroit and severe and skilful; but his genius seems to us somewhat wayward, his spirit is audacious, his scorn of pretension runs almost into hatred of eminence, and his bump of veneration must be a very small protuberance. He can be provokingly cool and severe, but he has evidently a fondness for sensations, and hugely enjoys a catastrophe. His appreciation of the gentle and more delicate qualities in character is not very strong or nice; a shrinking, timid modesty seems to him a weakness, and his principal heroines are more than half men. There is no room to doubt his power; but there is opportunity to question the mental or moral healthiness of his literary influence. His hero and his heroine in this volume,—who, of course, are brought to wedlock through all manner of difficulties that seem impossibilities,—are really noble natures, and they keep their somewhat original sort of nobleness through all the zigzags of their eventful career. That the book will sell, and be widely read, and loudly praised we entertain no doubt, and we can do nothing less than admit its absorbing interest.

**THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, AND THE FINAL CONDITION OF THE WICKED CAREFULLY CONSIDERED.** By Robert W. Landis. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1859. 1 Vol. 12mo. pp. 518.

The discussion of the conditions and laws of our future life was never enlightening more minds and tongues and pens than now. The theories of Swedenborg have had a new revival, the revelations of "the spirits" secure an immense number of greedy listeners, the common and general and long-received view gets new forms of statement, and the old forms are impressively repeated, while the materialistic theory, which makes human life a unit, and the body the parent and only home of the soul—all these diverse views are finding fresh development and earnest and open advocacy. This work of Mr. Landis—who, by the way, is a Presbyterian clergyman, notwithstanding the issue of his work by the Methodist Book Concern—is specially aimed at the overthrow of the last named theory, viz.: that which teaches the unconsciousness of the soul between death and the general resurrection, and the punishment of the wicked by annihilation. It is intended to be a complete manual on the subject, as its discussions cover the whole ground occupied by the various authors who have written in support of the theory he opposes; and most of these authors are quoted and referred to by name. Mr. Landis has made himself thoroughly familiar with the whole subject and the whole field of argument, and there can be no good reason for complaint that he does not state the positions of his opponents with fairness, clearness and strength. He has attempted a reply to almost every argument, and sought an exposition of almost every important passage of scripture which has been drawn into this controversy. It is a large task which he has undertaken, and few men could



probably have done it better within the same compass. He is a good logician and a fair critic; he is mostly courteous and manly towards his opponents; though he indulges in some verbal severity against their dogmas, which he deems false and mischievous, against their exegesis, which he regards as terribly strained, and against their reasoning, which he regards as unfair and sophistical. His Presbyterian theology crops out here and there, as could hardly have been avoided; his protests against the heresy he combats are earnest and resolute and sincere, as such a theologian might well make them; and his conviction that he has utterly overthrown the theory in question, is settled, strong, and often uttered or implied in his book. It is by far the ablest and best discussion of the whole subject which we have yet seen—fair, manly, earnest, strong, comprehensive, and specific. Whoever wishes to see the whole argument on both sides, presented within a reasonable compass, cannot do better than to buy this book and read it with care and candor.

**THE MOTHER'S MISSION.** Sketches from Real Life. By the Author of the "Object of Life." New York: Carlton & Porter. 1 Vol. 16mo. pp. 311.

**THE POET PREACHER.** A Brief Memorial of Charles Wesley, the Eminent Preacher and Poet. By Charles Adams. Same Publishers.

**MY SISTER MARGARET.** A Temperance Story. By Mrs. C. M. Edwards. Same Publishers.

These three books are beautiful specimens of typography, and their contents are every way grateful. The mother's mission is brought out most happily in the story of a home where a true mother wrought on, day after day, in her own sphere, and saw as a result and reward the highest virtues and aims springing up in the hearts she had watched over with a true mother's vigilance, and cultivated with a true mother's fidelity.

The story of Charles Wesley is pleasantly told, as it is a story deserving to be told and engraven on the hearts of the young. He is more known through his hymns than in any other way, and it was fitting that his noble labors as a preacher should be presented in this pleasant, readable way.

The Temperance story is a sad and touching one; familiar by frequency, and yet all the sadder because it applies so often and freely. And yet, as always, the dark background of domestic life, made sombre by sin and suffering, is lit up by many a beam of glory, thrown there by the radiant heroism and the glowing affection which misfortunes often only set off by contrast. These volumes furnish delightful and excellent reading for the family circle or the Sabbath school library. It is a species of literature at once attractive and instructive, nurturing a true taste, and affording it a high and a large gratification. The young surely need not be poisoned by books when healthy and exhilarating food is offered them in such lordly dishes as these.

**THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY.** Conducted under the Sanction of the Congregational Library Association, by Revs. J. S. Clark, D. D., H. M. Dexter, and A. H. Quint. 1859. Vol. I.

A new Quarterly, ably edited, and devoted to the interests of Congregationalism. It ignores the theological controversies and differences implied by the Old and New School parties in and out of New England, and devotes itself to more practical ends. It is furnished at one dollar per year, and is published in Boston.

THE

# FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

---

NO. XXVIII.—OCTOBER, 1859.

---

## ART. I.—THE TRUE PROVINCE AND AIM OF PHILOSOPHY.

The author of the present article very well recollects an impression which came upon his mind with most oppressive weight, when, as a student, he had advanced to a certain stage in the study of Locke. The impression was vague and undefined, but almost oppressively terrible, the more so, probably, for its vague indefiniteness. "Fear came upon me, and trembling which made all my bones to shake. Then a spirit passed before my face; and the hair of my head stood up; it stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof; an image was before mine eyes; there was silence, and I heard a voice." The impression to which we refer, as far as it can be described, was this: that from the depths of philosophy, certain mysterious revelations of a most terrible and ominous character were about to proceed, revelations, the truth of which must be admitted, because philosophy cannot but be true, revelations, whose characteristics we could not divine. We loved philosophy; but what was it to do with and for us? Was it about to reveal the fact that our trust in God and veneration for the Bible, were baseless and vain? Was it about to lay hold, with more than giant energy, upon the pillars of our religious faith, and bury all our hopes of immortality beneath its ruins? Was it about to sweep like a meteor athwart the spiritual heavens, and

Wherein, then, lies the difference between the philosopher and the mass of mankind? In the first place, while the basis principles in their *practical* applications are known alike to all, the philosopher recognizes them, in their *abstract* and *universal* forms, the only forms in which they can be employed as basis principles for the deductions of pure science on the one hand, and for the scientific explanation and elucidation of facts, on the other. All mankind alike as we have seen, in the presence of an event, affirm a cause. Amid the masses of facts which are floating around us, there are also certain great central facts which reveal the existence and operation of universal law, by which themselves and all others are controlled, and may be explained. The philosopher fixes upon such facts, and deduces from them the laws referred to. The same facts are perceived with equal distinctness by all. To the philosopher, however, they appear as the revelators of law. Take, as an example, the descent of a guinea and feather in an exhausted receiver, as witnessed by Newton and some common observer. Both perceive, with equal clearness, the fact as such, and to each alike it is an object of wondrous interest. But to Newton alone did it reveal the great law of attraction, which governs the movements of the material universe. So in all other instances. All mankind perceive the same facts: the philosopher apprehends also their logical antecedents, or the great laws of the universe which they reveal.

#### *Main Sources of Error in Philosophy.*

The main sources of error in philosophy now become manifest. It has been said with truth that there is no great absurdity which has not constituted the central article of the creed of some sect of philosophers. The history of Philosophy might not very improperly be denominated the history of the great battle-field of absurdities, a battle-field on which one great nonentity has contended for dominion against another, and where each, in turn, has swayed the sceptre of Philosophy. Two somewhat eminent modern philosophers of the ideal school, for example, were once engaged in a very warm discussion in respect to the *form* of the upward ascent of the mind.

The upward progress of mind was an admitted fact. But in what direction does it ascend? That was the question in dispute. One contended that the ascent was in the direction of a perpendicular straight line, and the other, that it was in that of a rising spiral. Philosophers of the middle ages, though they long expended the deepest thought upon the subject, were never able to agree in respect to the question, how many disembodied spirits can stand together upon the point of a needle, nor whether any such spirit can be transported from one point of space to another, without passing through the intermediate portions of space. Modern philosophy has hardly settled the question whether the "I Am," the Creator of the heavens and the earth, the Infinite and Perfect One, shall be transformed into a mere development of matter, into a "law of thought," "a regulative idea," or an absolute, undeveloped Impersonality. The universe also has good reason to complain of very hard usage at the hands of philosophy, and might, if the latter were possessed of property, be successful, one would think, in a suit of slander. While this goodly creation, the product of infinite wisdom and love, has caused the great eye of Heaven to shed its light around us by day, and spread its diamond bespangled firmament over us at night, while it has laid open its pages of knowledge divine for us to read, and while it has warmed and fed and clothed us from its exhaustless bounty, philosophers have been looking at it with a kind of evil eye, and wearied themselves with the question, what is it? One sect has maintained that matter with which spirit has unfortunately become enthralled, is the source of all evil physical and moral that afflicts humanity, and that the soul cannot escape the bondage of corruption, till it is wholly disenthralled from material contact. Other sects have taught that matter is the only reality, and that the universe is wholly uninhabited by any spirits finite or infinite. Others have affirmed that neither the universe of mind, on the one hand, nor of matter, on the other, is that in itself, or in its relationship for which we take it, and that nothing exists but certain unknown and unknowable realities having neither extension nor form in themselves, and existing no where and in no time. Others still have declared that nothing whatever ex-

ists out of the mind itself, that the external universe is nothing but spirit, finite or infinite, seeing itself as an object, and mistaking purely mental states for the qualities of objects external to itself, an "unavoidable delusion," a "trick played upon reason." Finally, to complete the circle, the great leading sect of Germany now maintains that both matter and spirit are absolute nonentities, that thought itself is the only reality, and that the universe is constituted of nought but the relations of contradiction between the *ideas of something and nothing*. Now, if this abuse continues much longer, the universe may be fully justified in giving to philosophy "a writing of divorcement, and putting her away altogether." But we were to speak of some of the main sources of error in the construction of systems of philosophy.

1. The first that requires attention is this, fundamentally mistaking the very object itself of philosophy. Its exclusive object, as we have seen, is not to make a universe, or to manufacture facts, or create principles out of which to construct a universe, but to explain *the* universe actually given to us, and as given. As long as philosophy keeps within this its appropriate and exclusive sphere, it is itself surrounded with light and sheds light upon all the great problems of the universe. But instead of occupying itself in this its own sphere, it has occupied itself with questions lying wholly out of its sphere, and consequently whose solutions are impossible to philosophy. One of the main problems of philosophy, according to some, is the *possibility* of knowledge, especially of objects external to the mind itself. Here is mind, on the one hand, it is said, and an external universe on the other. How can a passage be effected from the one to the other? How can the gulf that lies between them be bridged over so that one can become to the other an object of knowledge? If the validity of this one answer be admitted, to wit: that mind is, relatively to such objects, a power, and they are to it, objects of knowledge, we may very easily and readily conceive of the possibility of such a passage, and a world of useless labor is saved to philosophy. But suppose the validity of this answer be not admitted, and philosophy attempts, in some other direction, to "find through the

palpable absence its uncouth way," it will appear at length, that it "has labored in vain, and spent its strength for naught." It will be found equally impossible to explain, on any other supposition, the possibility of knowledge, in any other form than through consciousness, for example. Suppose the question be asked, how can the mind be subject to certain operations, and at the same time know that it experiences them? How can it think of some object, remember a past experience, for example, and, at the same time, think upon its own thought, that is, experience this double operation in the same moment of time, know something, and know that it knows. If the answer be admitted as valid, that the mind knows its own operations in the act of experiencing them, because they are to it objects, and it is to them a power of knowledge, then, as in the former case, the possibility of knowledge is quite conceivable. But if this answer be not admitted, the very principle on which alone any phenomena in the universe can, by any possibility, be explained, and an attempt is made to discover the possibility of knowledge, on any other principle, then philosophy has attempted an absolute impossibility. Now philosophers overlooking this simple and universal principle by which the universal intelligence explains the possibility of each particular phenomenon and event in the universe, philosophers, we say, have wearied themselves with the question of the possibility of knowledge, a question which lies wholly out of the sphere of philosophy, and thus have they consequently wearied themselves to no profit. Suppose we should ask ourselves, for example, how is it possible that water should become solid, when a certain degree of caloric is withdrawn from it, and should then, on the restoration of the heat extracted, return to a fluid state again, and rejecting the answer which the universal intelligence gives, to wit, that such is the nature of the substance, should attempt to explain the possibility of the fact before us, in some other way. We could no more accomplish our object than we could create a universe. So of all other facts and events. The possibility of knowledge is to be explained as that of all other facts are, or it cannot be explained at all. Here lies one of the great errors in philosophy. Instead of accepting of an explanation, the

validity of which must be admitted, or the possibility of no event whatever is explicable, instead also of distinguishing between what is and what is not possible to mind, as a faculty of knowledge, and then pushing research into the boundless field laid open for humanity to tax its powers upon, philosophers have attempted, in an impossible and consequently most unphilosophical form, to explain the possibility of knowledge itself.

The *validity* of human knowledge is another problem, in the attempted solution of which, philosophy has missed its way. That there is a valid and an invalid application of the human intelligence, and that it is the appropriate sphere of philosophy to elucidate the principles by which the one can be distinguished from the other, there can be no doubt. Nor is philosophy ever employed in a more important sphere, than when developing those tests by which truth may be distinguished from error, and the right from the wrong use of the human intelligence. All such procedures, however, rest upon one principle, that the mind is a faculty of real knowledge. Suppose we assume this principle as doubtful, and then attempt to solve that doubt. The conception of the possibility of accomplishing the object involves a palpable contradiction. While we are in doubt about the intelligence, as a faculty of knowledge, we must be in equal doubt about any verdict, which it may pass upon its own character as such a power. The question can, by no possibility, be solved in favor of the intelligence, only by begging the question at the outset, just as when an individual attempts to prove to strangers his own credibility in a given assertion, by the declaration that he is a man of truth.

This very attempt also assumes that there is some one function of the intelligence whose verdict is valid, and which is capable and authorized to sit in judgment upon all others. On what authority is this assumption made in behalf of this function, and denied to all the rest? And who has constituted this one the sole umpire? The attempt to bring one function of the intelligence to the bar of another, is self-absurd. Suppose, for example, that we have a perception of some external object. We wish to know whether that perception is valid, so

far, of course, as the essential qualities of the object, extension and form, are concerned. It can readily be shown that neither of the other primary faculties, consciousness and reason, can sit in judgment upon that act of the intelligence, consciousness being able merely to give the act as a phenomenon of the subject, in the proposition I perceive the object, and reason being able to do nothing more than give the logical antecedent of the quality affirmed. The secondary faculties can only operate upon the basis given in the concurrent acts of the three primary faculties, without changing or modifying it. There is no possibility, then, through any legitimate use of the functions of the intelligence, to adjudicate upon the validity of the act under consideration.

Besides, if one faculty of the intelligence might sit in judgment upon the affirmations of an other, in certain cases, before we can obtain a legitimate judgment in any given case, we must find some truth of which the mind is more sure than of that upon the affirmation of which judgment is to be passed, and which bears upon that affirmation. Now in the case of external perception, there is nothing of which the mind can have more absolute convictions than of the reality of the essential qualities of the object perceived; nor is there any other conviction, which is more absolute, that could be made to bear upon it in determining its validity. The problem, then, in the solution of which philosophers have wearied themselves so much, lies wholly out of the sphere of philosophy, and it is a total misapplication of its object and aim thus to employ the intelligence.

Assuming, as the ideal school have done, that the great end and aim of philosophy is to determine or solve the *problems of ontology*, is also a total misapprehension of the true and proper sphere of philosophy. If we are to understand that it is the province of philosophy to enlarge and perfect our knowledge of substances, all this is very true. But if, on the other hand, it is meant, as it undoubtedly is, that the true province of philosophy is, and that it is reserved for it alone, to reveal the *nature* of substances, as far as their essential characteristics are concerned, it should be borne in mind, that



the problem of ontology, in this sense, has already been solved, by the verdict of the universal intelligence, a verdict which philosophy can neither reverse nor modify. The united aim of all the sciences is to enlarge and perfect our acquaintanceship with realities; but their entire procedure rests wholly upon the assumption that the essential qualities of such realities are already known. The Chemist, for example, never broaches the question, whether the substances on which he experiments are material or mental, or whether they have the fundamental qualities of matter, solidity and extension. All his experiments proceed upon the assumption, that the problem of ontology, so far forth as those qualities are concerned, is already settled. So of all the other sciences. They all have their united basis in the assumption, that the essential fundamental properties of the realities to which they pertain are already known, and known absolutely. On any other assumption, all the sciences would, at once, come to a dead stand still, from which they could never make an advancement in any direction whatever. Suppose that all other questions in astronomy were adjourned, until this one is solved, to wit, whether the so called heavenly bodies are or are not, in reality, objects external to the mind, and really possessed of the qualities of extension and form. An eternity would pass away before we could reach at all the appropriate problems of this science. Suppose that overlooking the fact, that the problem of ontology in respect to mind is already solved, so far forth as the reality of its fundamental qualities is concerned, those of thought, feeling and voluntary activity, we should first of all attempt to determine what, aside from the idea of it, as a substance possessed of the powers of thought, sensibility and will, mind, in its nature, must be. When could such a question as that be solved? Never to all eternity. We can make no approach whatever to substance, but through phenomena, and the very attempt to inquire after the nature of any particular substance, implies, that it is already revealed to us as such, and that, so far, the problem of ontology in respect to it, is already solved. If we should neglect all phenomena, and attempt, without their intervention, to gain an insight into the nature of substance and cause, them-

elves, we should look for light into blank midnight, and should mistake the sparks elicited by rubbing our own eyes, for the realities after which we are searching. Roaming in the darkness around us, myriads of hypotheses and nothing else would present themselves, all having equal authority, and all absolutely baseless. For thousands of years ontology has been the great problem of philosophy with certain leading schools, and what progress have they made in its solution? Absolutely none at all, excepting in one direction, that of greater and greater darkness. All the professed developments of philosophy on the subject, have been nothing but "confusion worse confounded," and nothing better is to be hoped for in the future, while the problem lies in its present form under the eye of philosophy. But let philosophy take up the problem just where the universal intelligence has left it, and in the form in which that intelligence has solved it, and then proceed to add synthetically to what we do know of realities, and also to explain and elucidate what is known, and "her light will go forth as brightness," and all the world will bless her for her illuminations. All the problems of ontology, we repeat, in respect to the reality of mind as a substance possessed of the qualities of thought, feeling, and voluntary activity, of matter as a substance possessed of those of solidity, extension, and form, of space, as the place of substances, and time as the place of events, are handed over to philosophy as already solved, and as the basis and starting point of her entire investigations. If philosophy, neglecting its own proper sphere, and denying the validity of the solution presented, demands a rehearing of the case, and adjourns its own proper problems, until it has itself solved the one under consideration, it may, for a time, dazzle the world with brilliant theories; but they will all at last be found to be constituted of absolute nonentities, and to rest upon foundations if possible still less substantial. The inevitable result will be, what always has been, when similar attempts, based upon similar principles, have been made, a general skepticism in the public and even philosophic mind in respect to the possibility of philosophy itself, the very state into which the worse

than abortive attempts of Germany at the solution of this problem, for the last half century, are fast bringing the public mind in Europe and America.

2. Another fruitful source of error in the construction of systems of philosophy, is *wrong*, or *partial induction of facts*. Suppose, for example, that in constructing our system of mental science, we assume that thought is the only phenomenon which it really presents, and should construct our system on that assumption. We might build up a very magnificent theory, a theory which should possess throughout logical consistency, so far as the connection between the principle and the remotest deductions is concerned. But we should wrongly interpret all the facts of mind, even those which are in themselves consistent with our theory. The same must be true of all theories of all realities whatever. Their entire essential characteristics must be taken into account in determining the principles of our systems, and all our deductions in their entirety must perfectly harmonize with such characteristics. Then, and then only, can a system of philosophy be constructed whose basis shall be truth, whose parts shall all be harmonious with each other, and whose material shall remain, amid the lapse of ages. Now partialism has been the bane of philosophy in all the eras of its history. Systems have been constructed, based upon only a part of the facts, while others equally essential have been omitted as denied altogether. Locke, for example, affirmed that all knowledge is derived exclusively from experience, and thus constructed his system on the assumption that no absolute universal and necessary ideas exist in the mind. He thus paved the way for materialism, and with it atheism. Kant, on the other hand, affirmed that experience not only does not and cannot give, *a priori*, or universal and necessary cognitions, but that such cognitions themselves lie at the foundation of all experience, and thus laid the foundation of idealism, and with it skepticism in its most delusive form. Each took a part for the whole, and each accordingly based his system upon the sand. Sensualism or empiricism may properly be denominated a system of facts without principles, while idealism is a system of principles, principles falsely assumed, without facts.

3. We mention but one other source of error in constructing systems of philosophy, to wit, *unauthorized assumptions* of basis principles, or mere baseless hypotheses, assumed as first truths. False assumptions are just as fruitful in logical consequents as true ones. A system whose basis is wholly in error, and which, therefore, as a system, contains nothing of truth as it is, may possess throughout the most perfect logical consistency. The first thing, then, to be done in determining the validity of any given system, is to examine carefully the foundation on which it is based. Now there is one universal criterion of all basis principles of such systems, a criterion by which the true can always be distinguished from the false. Every valid principle will sustain this one relation to the facts to which it pertains, that of logical *antecedent*, and will therefore, possess the characteristics of absolute universality and necessity. Every principle having those characteristics cannot be false, and all others are nothing but mere unauthorized assumptions, baseless hypotheses. Philosophers are so fond of constructing, that they are too apt to hasten on from mere assumptions to the work of construction, instead of carefully laying their foundations on the rock of truth. They are so pleased also, with logical consistency, that they too often assume that a system having throughout a necessary connection between its principles and deductions, cannot be based in error. A system may be most wide-sweeping in the range of its principles and applications, it may be most vast and perfect in its proportions, and the logical connection of its various parts may be absolutely indissoluble, and yet it may fall by its own weight, and that for this one reason, that it is based upon mere assumptions. On the other hand, a system may be wanting in many of these excellencies, and yet, in its main deductions, it may stand the test of time, and that for the reason that its basis principles cannot be shaken. The want of due carefulness in laying the foundations is one of the most fruitful sources of error in the construction of systems of philosophy. The systems of Locke and of Kant each has its basis in assumptions, instead of necessary and universal principles, and each, therefore, though in different

directions, has signally failed to solve the great problems of philosophy.

*Relations of the Philosophy of Locke to True Science.*

We are now prepared for another somewhat important inquiry, the relations of the system of Locke to science. According to the fundamental assumption of that system, to wit, that all our knowledge is derived from experience exclusively, science can proceed no farther than the first and preparatory stage, the mere classification and arrangement of facts; and we well recollect when, in the school of Locke, it was openly maintained, that all science consisted in this process alone. As the system admits of nothing beyond the facts, and consequently of no logical antecedents to facts, or universal and necessary principles, philosophy, according to its fundamental assumptions, becomes an absolute impossibility. The system of Locke also can give us none of the pure sciences, the mathematics and pure physics, for example. All such sciences rest wholly upon *a priori*, or universal and necessary principles, which, of course, have no place in that system. The utmost that it can do is to advance science to a simple classification and generalization of facts, the first and preparatory step in philosophy.

*Character of the German Philosophy.*

The character of the German philosophy, or of transcendentalism, as it is called, next claims our attention. This system almost totally, and from principle, neglects the first and indispensable requisite to a valid system of philosophy, the process of classification. It occupies itself almost exclusively with another and different question, and to this question it advances directly and immediately, without "casting up at all a highway" for itself, by careful psychological investigations. Without any adequate preparatory processes whatever, it advances at once to the great problems of ontology, and the possibility and validity of human cognitions.

Hence, we remark, as might naturally be expected, as the necessary consequence of a false method, the entire foundation

principles of the system, in all its various forms, are nothing but assumptions and baseless hypotheses, instead of universal and necessary truths. We may take the range of the entire forms which it has assumed, from Kant to Hegel, and we shall not find among all the basis principles from which these forms are deduced, one single principle which bears the marks which Kant himself has given, as the exclusive characteristics of cognitions *a priori*, the only principles of real science, the marks of *universality* and *necessity*. Transcendentalism in none of its forms, is deduced from such principles, but from mere assumptions, or baseless and self-contradictory hypotheses. In the development of the system, in some of its forms, to say the least, there is the most rigid logical consecutiveness, between the assumptions, laid at the foundation, and all the subsequent deductions; while the entire superstructure thus carefully and wonderfully perfected, rests upon nothing but a bank of sand.

We remark, again, that transcendentalism is, throughout, a system of *world making*, and not, what philosophy exclusively ought to be, of *world expounding*. It thinks out a universe, from materials of its own imagining, but fails wholly to explain the universe we have, the only problem submitted to philosophy. Who, that would explain the universe according to the universally acknowledged principles of science, would ever think of telling us that the universe material and mental is constituted wholly of *relations* between ideas of absolute nonentities? Transcendentalism, however, has given us a universe constituted exclusively of such materials, and affirmed that it is the universe handed to it, to be explained.

Hence, we remark, finally, that this system fails totally to meet the great philosophic want of humanity, either in respect to matter or spirit. What we want in respect to the external universe in which we dwell, is to have it explained, and left when explained, at least as pleasant and suitable a habitation, for sentient existences, as it now is. In the laboratory of this system, however, it becomes an unknown and unknowable something, existing nowhere and in no time, and consequently as a suitable habitation for nobody, or a mere subjective phenomenon of "the Me," or a similar phenomenon of

the absolute transformed into an external object, so that the absolute may see itself in it, or lastly, a mere relation of contradiction between the idea of two great nonentities, the idea of something and nothing. The great philosophic want in the breast of humanity is not met by any such expositions as these. The system equally fails to meet the same want, in its expositions of mind. None of these systems explain the facts of the human mind, just as they lie under the eye of consciousness. They all rest upon assumptions which give and explain a system of facts pertaining to an indefinable, inconceivable something called mind, but the system given and explained is not *the* system which we seek and desire to have explained; nor is the mind given by these systems *the* mind necessarily supposed by this system. What we want is a philosophy which shall explain ourselves to ourselves; and shall leave us, when explained, what we are, and not transformed into some other thing, and that thing sublimated into nothing, and that nothing etherialized into an unsubstantial, all-comprehending insubstantiality, which is itself really incomprehensible and comprehends nothing.

We may be thought presumptuous in expressing such an opinion. We shall venture the expression of it, however, to wit, that Germany has yet to produce its first great *mental philosopher*. Of world-makers of the highest eminence, it has produced many, and it has a capacity to produce world-expounders of equal eminence; but its productions of this class are among the realities that are yet to be.

#### *Philosophy of Common Sense.*

The philosophy of common sense requires a few passing remarks. The individual who has suggested or developed some great criterion principle, has set his mark permanently upon his own age, and will not fail to be ultimately regarded as one of the great lights in philosophy. This is the case with Dr. Reid. While he has, since his day, been, for a time, apparently eclipsed by other luminaries, his star is again shining out with increasing brightness, while the others are on the wane, and the time is not far distant when he will be acknowledged as

one of the great central lights in the sphere of philosophy. As the first individual who announced common sense as *the* fundamental test of all basis principles of philosophy, he advanced a principle which will stand the test of time, and to which philosophy must return, before its fixed direction will be in the line of truth. But what are we to understand by the words, common sense? Every one is aware that, in the presence of the facts or phenomena of the universe, the universal Intelligence has made certain fundamental affirmations pertaining to matter and spirit, and God as the unconditioned and absolute Cause. With such affirmations, numberless assumptions, together with their consequents, are intermingled. On almost all subjects of thought, there is, consequently, among mankind, a wide diversity of opinion. In the midst of all this diversity, however, there is an absolute unity of judgment in certain fundamental particulars. *Now, those judgments strictly common to all minds in the presence of the facts of the universe, judgments in their concrete and particular forms, are what is meant by the words, common sense.* These words designate the real affirmations of the intelligence in view of the facts referred to, in distinction from assumptions and the consequents of the same, which are the exclusive source and cause of diversity of opinion among mankind. Common sense, therefore, may properly be appealed to as a final test of truth. Its responses must be true, else the universal intelligence is itself a lie, and real knowledge on any subject an impossibility. No principles or deductions in philosophy or religion, which contradict this one criterion, can stand the test of time. Philosophy, and we might add religion too, will run mad with the wildest conceivable delusions, when divorced from common sense.

We have just said that no principles or deductions of philosophy which contradict the verdict of common sense, can stand the test of time. In illustration of this thought, let us consider a few examples. In the presence of the phenomena of the universe, the universal intelligence has, with absolute unity of judgment, affirmed the reality of two orders of existence perfectly and fundamentally distinct the one from the other, matter and spirit, the one as possessed of the qualities



of real extension and determinate form, and the other of those of thought, feeling, and voluntary activity. This is the verdict of common sense on these phenomena. As real substances actually possessed of these qualities, the intelligence has handed them over to philosophy for explanation and elucidation. Now suppose philosophy hands them back as not being "in themselves" nor in their relationships "what the universal intelligence" has taken them to be, suppose she has resolved spirit into matter or matter into spirit, or both into mere ideas, and thus attempts to reverse the immutable verdict of common sense. Philosophy, in presenting itself as an antagonism to that deep and irreversible conviction in the breast of humanity, has struck upon an immovable rock, and must fall to pieces upon it. No system of philosophy can stand the shock of criticism, which does not perfectly harmonize with this unchangeable conviction.

In the presence of the great facts of the universe, also, the universal intelligence has affirmed the reality of the being and perfections of God, as the unconditioned and absolute cause. In the midst of the endless diversity of opinion among men pertaining to God, there is, from the lowest depths of heathenism, up to the most perfect forms in which inspired wisdom has conceived of Him, an absolute unity of judgment in one fundamental particular, the idea of Him as a free, self-conscious personality. It is only in professed systems of philosophy, and forms of religion developed under the influence of such principles, that any other, or opposite central idea of God obtains. It could easily be shown, also, that the divine idea of universal humanity is moving in one fixed line, the idea of God, as the Infinite and Perfect. Humanity is shocked at the imputation of any acknowledged imperfection to God. Such is the verdict of common sense in respect to God, as the unconditioned and absolute cause. Suppose that professed systems of philosophy meet this verdict with a contradictory one, a denial of his being, on the one hand, or a representation of him, on the other, as a mere "regulative idea," a "law of thought," a "creation of the Me," or as an undeveloped, unconscious impersonality, himself not the author, but the substance, of all things. The verdict of

common sense will not be reversed by such contradictions, but philosophy herself will be pronounced mad. "Her way will be to her as slippery ways in the darkness. She will be driven on and fall therein." The verdict of the universal Intelligence is, that for every fundamental want, in sentient existences, especially in man, there must be corresponding provisions, and for every similar adaptation, a corresponding reality. While this principle is a necessary intuition of the Intelligence, in view of the facts of the universe, and while all our activity is practically based upon the conviction of its validity, it is an undeniable fact, that the great overshadowing want of universal humanity is the conscious favor and friendship of God as a self-conscious personality endowed with the attributes of Infinity and Perfection, and that all departments of our moral and spiritual being are in fixed and immovable correlation to this one idea of him. Now suppose that in the name of philosophy the sentiment there is no God, or an idea of him the opposite of that which is under consideration, is presented to the regard of humanity; will she sit down under the shadow of such an idea, and thus pronounce the above principle of common sense a lie, and affirm her own moral and spiritual nature to be the correlative of the unreal? Never. Other ideas of God may be entertained for a time, but the sense of mental, moral, and spiritual desolation experienced under their pressure will ere long constrain humanity to heave from its bosom the deadly incubus. When philosophers come distinctly to recognize the fact that no professed deductions of philosophy can stand the test of time, which is opposed to the verdict of common sense upon the same subject, then will systems of philosophy arise whose basis is the rock of truth.

In consequence of failing to recognize the above fact, philosophy, on account of the wild vagaries in which she has so flagrantly violated all the principles of common sense, has, for a considerable portion of the last half century, given in many of her developments, not unmistakable evidence of approaching mental aberration. At one time, mounted upon her lean and limping *Rosenante*, we see her running her rotten spear, first against the universe of mind, then against that of matter, and

finally against all realities whatever, and while she has been thrown horse and rider by the verdict of common sense, in every encounter, still she affirms herself ready to demonstrate at the point of her lance, that neither the universe, time, space, God, liberty, or immortality, are anything in themselves, or of themselves. At one time she affirms herself able to prove by absolute demonstration, that all compound substances are made up of simple parts, and also that no compounds are constructed of simples, that the world had a beginning, and that the same world had no beginning, that the world is finite and that the world is infinite, that there is a causality through liberty, and that there is no liberty, and finally that a necessary being does exist, and that no necessary being exists.\* At one time she challenges the universe to prove its own existence. At another, she affirms that there are two and but two unknown and unknowable realities, but that these exist no where and in no time. At one time she affirms that God is the only reality, at another, that he is only a "law of thought," a "regulative idea." At one time she affirms that there are no substances of any kind, subjective or objective, that the universe is constituted wholly of relations between the ideas of absolute nonentities.

And, finally, she proclaims "the Me" to be the only reality, the fountain, source, cause, substance, subject and object of all things. God, instead of being the creator of "the Me," is himself a creation of "the Me," and all realities finite and infinite are embraced and expressed in the single proposition "I am I." Here she exclaims:

" Here on this market cross aloud I cry,  
 I, I, I! I, itself I!  
 The form and the substance, the what and the why,  
 The when and the where, the low and the high,  
 The inside and outside, the earth and the sky,  
 I, you, her, and he, you and I,  
 All souls and bodies are I, itself, I."

Should not Cervantes, by writing out a history of these ab-

\* Kant's antinomies of pure reason.

berations, restore philosophy to her right mind, the common sense of the universe will ere long vote her into a straight jacket, and that with good reason.

### *Relations of Philosophy and Religion.*

We are now fully prepared to consider the relations of Philosophy and religion. If the former term be taken in its widest signification, then theology, natural and revealed, theology scientifically developed, would, as we have seen, differ from philosophy only as a part from the whole. In this sense, then, there can be no contradiction between them. There must be, on the other hand, a perfect harmony.

A true system of natural theology scientifically developed must be throughout in perfect harmony with all the valid principles and deductions of philosophy, as far as they relate to the same topics, and there can be no where any form of contradiction between them; because they both alike are constructed in view of precisely the same facts. If also we suppose the facts and principles of a so called revealed theology to be actually given by inspiration of the author of nature, we may affirm, *a priori*, that there must be between a system of revealed theology, scientifically developed, and the entire principles and deductions of a true philosophy, the same universal and absolute harmony, as in the case of philosophy and natural theology. It would be the height of absurdity to suppose that Infinity and Perfection has contradicted Himself in the two volumes which he himself has written, that of nature and of inspiration.

There are important relations, however, other than those above referred to, between philosophy and revealed religion, and these are the special subject of our present remarks. A volume is put into our hands claiming to have been given by inspiration of God. The first duty devolved upon us is to determine the validity of its claims to such high origin, and to the consequent absolute authority which it assumes, in consequence of such origin. If we would develop scientifically the evidence external and internal bearing upon such an important question, it belongs exclusively to philosophy to determine, systematize, and then to elucidate, the laws of evidence to be applied in their

cases alike. There is no department in philosophy more important than the development of the universal criterion of truth and error, and a volume claiming the prerogative of inspiration must be subjected to this criterion with the same rigidity as the teachings of any other production. If we would argue the question whether a revelation from God to man is possible or impossible, probable or improbable, or whether a given production, the Scriptures, for example, contain such a revelation or not, it belongs to philosophy to develop the criterion by which we may distinguish the possible from the impossible, the probable from the improbable, and the real from the unreal, the true from the false. If the validity of the volume is affirmed to have been established by miracles, then it belongs to philosophy to furnish the test by which we can, with certainty, distinguish between a fact of nature and a real miracle, and to develop the laws of evidence by which we can determine whether said volume has been attested by such interpositions or not. In regard to internal evidence, we know absolutely, *a priori*, that a volume "given by inspiration of God," will contain no real self-contradictions, no absolute absurdities, that, in it, God will be revealed in perfect correspondence to the real fundamental necessities of humanity in its actual present state, and that its teachings will not contradict the known facts of matter or mind. It belongs exclusively to philosophy to develop the tests by which we can discern what is and what is not self-contradictory, by which we can distinguish between a mystery and absurdity, and what is and what is not accordant with the fundamental wants of humanity in its present state, and what is and what is not contradictory to the known facts of matter and mind. If, after we have finally determined in favor of the validity of the high claims of the volume under consideration, we desire to give to its truths, principles and facts, a systematic development according to scientific principles, then, as above remarked, theology becomes a part of philosophy, in the same sense that mental or natural philosophy does. Such are the necessary relations between a valid philosophy and real religion, where the evidences and teachings of the latter are scientifically developed. The two cannot, by any possibility, be op-

used to each other. They are together, harmonious parts of the great whole. Religion natural and revealed principally reaches man through the faculty of intuition, but always in harmony with the principles of philosophy material and mental. Philosophy develops reflectively what religion has taught intuitively, and thus reveals the perfect harmony between itself and religion.

Before any of the principles or deductions of philosophy can be arrayed against the claims of Christianity, for example, the laws of evidence external and internal must be fully and systematically developed, and then, by a rigidly logical application of those laws, it must be shown that our holy religion is weighed in the balances and found wanting." What has she to fear from such an ordeal as that? Of all other men, the Christian has most reason to be the fast friend of philosophy. Of all other men, he has least to fear and most to hope from its valid principles and deductions. He should never betray the least symptom of fear when the validity of the claims of that religion which is the foundation and source of all his hopes and consolations, is passing the ordeal of the most rigid examination. Let philosophy proceed in its sanctified work of elucidating the facts of the universe material and mental, and religion in her mission of moral renovation, and the time is not distant when it will be seen by all the world, that he who most fully meets the claims of science, is the most deep in his penitence, the most self-renouncing in his faith, and the most simple and devout in his religion of all the sons of men. Philosophy on her knees in the presence of Infinity unveiled, that is the consummation towards which science is advancing.

Those Christians, and especially Christian theologians are not wise who even directly or indirectly intimate, that there is or can be the relation of antagonism between a valid philosophy and real religion, between reason and revelation. If such contradiction did exist, he only would act reasonably who rejected religion, and no one could be a Christian but by acting against reason and renouncing philosophy. The religious principle and philosophic idea in man do not lead to contradictory deductions. Each points to the same great reality. It is

charging him who is equally the author of each foolishly to suppose the opposite. "The Christian is the highest style of man," and the faith of the Christian is the highest dictate and the sublimest ascent of reason. It is enough for religion to say that a denial of the validity of her claims has always been based, in some form or other, upon a denial of the validity of the human faculties, and that no man, as the result of a careful and rigid application of the laws of evidence scientifically developed, ever came to the conclusion that Christianity is not from God.

---

#### ART. II.—SIN—ITS NATURE AND CONDITIONS.

All truth is harmonious. No truth can be inconsistent with any other. The mind intuitively assumes this in all its processes of reasoning, and all its judgments of rational deduction. No one can rationally admit contradictory propositions when that contradiction is seen. To attempt it is to stultify the mind and confuse all our ideas of truth. Every sentiment we adopt draws in its train, and demands the acceptance of, its logical consequences. An error assumed as truth will not remain alone. By an unchanging law of affinity, it will draw its kindred to its fellowship, as far as its relations can be traced. If it be fundamental, its evil influence will be correspondingly great, distorting the whole edifice of faith in which it is a corner stone. Our idea of God—of Christ—of virtue and vice—holiness and sin, will modify and impress its character upon our entire system of moral and religious faith.

No idea exerts a more potent influence in shaping our religious system of belief than the notion we entertain of *sin*. Sin sustains such relations to the government and law of God, the atonement, moral obligation, regeneration, justification, sanctification, and salvation, that we cannot hold an unscriptural

view of *that*, without an equally unscriptural view of *these*. The importance of truth on this subject can hardly be overestimated. But as important as it is, it is hardly too much to say that on scarce any subject is there less thorough scriptural investigation, or more loose, indefinite, indiscriminating and unscriptural views.

The poison of Augustinian philosophy endorsed by the Papal church has diffused itself through the theology of the popular religious denominations, reproducing itself in their creeds, theological institutes, and standards, and finding an utterance in their sermons, exhortations, hymns and prayers. Not only do these absurd, pernicious, and unscriptural views find such utterance, and pass almost unquestioned, but they are made the "*shibboleth*" of orthodoxy, the test of "soundness in the faith," by the popular religious sects and "masters in Israel." From their decision and from their views that outrage reason and justice, contradict the Bible, and reflect dishonor upon the government of God, we turn to the infallible Word, and inquire, "What is truth?" But not like Pilate to crucify it, nor like Peter to deny, under the influence of popular clamor, but to reverently learn, receive, profess, and obey it.

We inquire,

I. WHAT IS SIN ?

II. WHAT ARE THE ESSENTIAL CONDITIONS OF ITS EXISTENCE ?

I. WHAT IS SIN ? Has God defined its signification ? If so, where and how ?

A definite answer is given, 1 John 3 : 4. *"Sin is the transgression of the law."* This is a universal proposition concerning sin. By its terms it includes *all* sin, as the proposition, "man is mortal," includes *all* men, and is equivalent to the proposition, *all* men are mortal. So this is equivalent to the proposition, *all* sins are the transgression of the law. Nothing can be sin that does not involve this characteristic, viz.: *Transgression*. That which is not a transgression of the Divine law, whatever else it may be, is not *sin*. To assume that it is, is to contradict God in explicit terms. Whatever is sin, is "the transgression of the law." No sin of any kind or degree can



that is not transgression. Any definition of any sin that conflicts with this is unscriptural and false, and not only of mere human origin, but a direct contradiction of God's definition of sin. Any sentiment, opinion, doctrine, or creed, that *implies* that there is, or can be, sin which is not transgression of God's law, is anti-scriptural, and we cannot accept it as truth without a virtual rejection of the testimony of God.

When, therefore, we know *what* God requires, of *whom* he requires it, and who *transgress* his requirement of them, we know who are sinners, and in what their sin consists.

II. WHAT ARE THE ESSENTIAL CONDITIONS OF THE EXISTENCE OF SIN? What is always implied in it as essential to its existence?

1. *Accountability is always implied.*

No being of whom God requires nothing can *transgress* his requirement. Sin in such a being is absolutely impossible, because *transgression* is impossible, and nothing is sin that is not transgression. He is under no law, there is to him no law, and "where no law is there is no transgression." Rom. 4:15. Whatever such a being may *do* or *be*, whatever may be his propensities, proclivities, appetites, passions, desires, or actions, whatever there may be in him or about him, there can be no sin in him, for none of these things in him is a transgression of any requirement of God towards him. God no where requires him to *be* or *do*, differently from what he *is* and *does*. He can in no sense be a sinner, because in no sense can he be a transgressor of any requirement, because none exists. To assume or imply that any being can be a sinner, till there is something required of him; in other words, till he is *accountable* to some law, is not only nonsense, but much worse than nonsense, it is a palpable contradiction of the Word of God.

2. *Ability to obey the requirement transgressed, is always implied in sin.*

No being can be accountable for the use of ability which he does not possess. If he has no ability, he is under no obligation to use any. No man *ought* to do that which he *cannot* do. To believe and seriously affirm the contrary on any subject but religion, would subject one to the suspicion of insanity, and if

ersisted in, would ripen that suspicion to confirmed conviction in every rational mind. But is it less insane and irrational in religion than in any thing else? No truly sane man can ever believe himself under obligation to perform that which is impossible. No rational being can blame himself, nor another, for what he could not help, or for not doing what he knows he has not ability to do. No just being can ever require what he knows impossible of another. Hence it is as certain as that God is reasonable and just, that he does not, never did, and never will, require anything where there is not ability to perform it. If he has made no requirement where there is not ability to perform, there can of course be no *transgression*, and therefore no sin. To affirm that God has required that which he had given no ability to the subject of that requirement to render, is to charge God with the blackest tyranny, the basest injustice, and has far more tendency to promote infidelity than Christianity.

### 3. *Sin always implies light rejected.*

Where there is not the ability and opportunity to know the requirement, there can be no obligation in relation to it. God makes no man responsible for not walking according to light which he has not, and could not have; nor for the performance of duty of which he has no knowledge. A man that shuts his eyes to the light, will be justly held responsible. His ignorance is wilful. But if he were *blind*, he could have no sin. He would neither sin in not seeing, nor in not acting in view of light impossible to him.

Said Christ to the Pharisees, "If ye were *blind*, ye should have no sin." John 9: 41. To Nicodemus he declared, "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light." John 3: 19.

Light, then, and the ability to see, is an indispensable condition of sin, the rejection of light, the ground of condemnation.

### 4. Sin always involves guilt—blame; not as a condition, but as an essential quality, or inevitable consequence.

There is no *guiltless* sin, no blameless sinner. No being of whom God requires anything, can fail of compliance and be

blameless. To assume the contrary, is virtually to assume that the requirement is itself unreasonable and unjust. For if the requirement be reasonable and righteous, it can neither be reasonable nor righteous to fail of compliance. To talk, therefore, of any kind of *sin* which does not involve guilt and condemnation, is not only to talk of a kind of sin of which the Scriptures make no mention, but is a direct impeachment of the righteousness of God's requirements. The doctrine of the Scriptures is, that *all* sin involves guilt and condemnation. Any doctrine that implies the opposite, is not only false and unscriptural, but incalculably pernicious.

In the light of these truths, the absurd and unscriptural character of many popular and cherished theological dogmas is clearly seen. To some of these the attention of the candid reader is respectfully invited.

1. *The popular but absurd, and unscriptural distinction in relation to sin, as "ORIGINAL," and ACTUAL.*

That there was a *first* sin is unquestionable. If any are disposed, in view of *this* fact, to call it "original," we do not object. But whether first, or last, if sin at all, it is *actual* sin. That which is not *actual* sin is not *actually* sin, but is *actually not* sin. To call anything *sin*, "original sin," "birth sin," or any kind of sin, that is not *actually* "transgression," is a misnomer, and utterly anti-scriptural. Hence our great American lexicographer, Noah Webster, though educated in the belief of this dogma, remarks on the term "original sin:" "In strictness original sin is an improper use of words, as sin, *ex, vi termini*, implies volition, and the transgression of a known rule of duty by a moral agent."

There is no such expression as original sin in the Scriptures, nor any intimation that there can be any sin, which does not imply volition, and "the transgression of a known rule of duty by a moral agent." It is difficult to conceive of a more unscriptural and absurd distinction or expression, than that of "original or birth sin."

2. The second absurd and unscriptural idea to which attention is invited, finds expression in the language often heard in confession, exhortation and prayer, "*we are sinners by nature,*

nd much more so by practice." This, if it means anything, implies that men become sinners in some other way than by actually transgressing; and that there is sin that is not transgression.

There is not an intimation in Scripture that there is any sin without transgression, nor that men are sinners in any way but by transgression. If we accept God's definition of sin, how can we fail to see that to be a "sinner by nature," as distinct from practice," or prior to, or aside from, our transgressing, is absurd and impossible? If men were sinners in any other way than through their voluntary choice, voluntary transgression, they could be in no way responsible for it, nor to blame for it, and to make this expression as a confession is absurd. If true, it would be an excuse. It is an assertion of a misfortune, not the confession of a wrong. But it is not true. Sin is not misfortune, but crime. God is the author of our nature, but not of sin.

3. Another assumption of similar character with the foregoing is, that "*we sinned in Adam.*" As the couplet of the primer runs:

"In Adam's fall,  
We sinned, all."

Of all theological absurdities, this is the climax. It could be possible only on condition that we were moral, accountable agents six thousand years before we were born. The only conceivable alternative is, that without personal or conscious existence, without ability, knowledge or will, without accountability or obligation, without any requirement of us, we transgressed a requirement of us which never existed.

But we are gravely told that "we should reverently admit the teachings of Scripture, whether we can comprehend the philosophy of the facts or not. Very true. But where do the Scriptures teach that "we sinned in Adam," any more than in Cain, Canaan, or Korah?

"In Cain's murder  
We sinned further,"

Or,—

“ In wicked Cain  
We sinned again ;”

is as scriptural, as good sense, as good poetry, and as good theology, as the other. Both are ridiculous nonsense.

4. Another absurd and unscriptural dogma, the character of which is seen in the light of the truths we have been contemplating, is this, viz.: *That the propensities, passions, appetites and nature of the new-born infant are sinful.*

They can only be sinful by being a transgression of some rule or requirement prohibiting them. But of what command or requirement of God are they a violation? Has he required new-born babes not to have them? Has he required them to be at birth any way different from what they *are*? Or to have any different nature or propensities from what they *have*? Has he required anything of them whatever? What? Where? If he *has*, then they are moral, accountable agents, and will be dealt with as any other moral agents. If he has *not*, then their nature and propensities can have no moral character nor qualities. They neither obey nor transgress. Obedience and transgression are alike impossible to them. They are under no moral law nor rule till moral accountability commences, and it is a most palpable misnomer to call them sinners, or anything in them, sin.

5. *The doctrine that sin is hereditary, and transmitted from parent to child by natural generation.*

This is based on the assumption last considered, that “the nature and propensities of the infant are *sinful*.” It must, therefore, fall with that assumption. Sin is not a propensity, proclivity, tendency, nor appetite. If it were, it might be transmitted by natural generation. But sin is a transgression. It is the transgression of a known rule of duty by a moral agent. Sin can only exist in a moral agent. It is a crime against Divine law, and crime cannot be transmitted by natural generation to posterity. We might as well talk of rape, murder, or blasphemy being transmitted, as of *any* sin being transmitted. If sin is admitted to be what God defines it to be, how can we

fail to see that its being transmitted by natural generation is absurd and impossible?

6. *The assumption that if the infant is not sinful he must be holy.*

This assumes that the infant must have a moral character of some kind before he becomes a moral agent. It is quite common to hear one class of theologians speak of the infant as sinful, impure, corrupt, defiled, unholy, having a sinful nature, &c., &c. While, on the other hand, some are ready to maintain that they are holy, pure, &c., &c. If either intend by such expressions to indicate moral character, or qualities of moral character in those who are not moral agents, the idea is preposterous. How can a being that is under no moral law or rule be compared with any moral standard? If there be no moral standard by which he can be compared, how can we rationally or scripturally judge or affirm any moral qualities of character concerning him? We must, in order to judge, have some standard by which to compare and judge. But if he is accountable to none, none exists by which we have any right to compare or judge. As all moral qualities of character depend upon its agreement with, or non-conformity to, some moral rule, applicable to it, it is obvious that beings which are not accountable to any moral law, can have no moral character, good nor bad, and that to affirm the qualities of such character of them is infinitely absurd.

7. The last idea to which attention is invited, is the doctrine, *that Christ died to atone for the sin of unconscious babes, and of those who have not arrived at the age of accountability, and to deliver them from the wrath of God and eternal condemnation.*

That Christ has made an atonement for all sin, and all sinners of the human race, is a precious truth. In this respect we believe in no "limited atonement." But that he has atoned for the sin of a being who never was accountable, and never did, nor will sin, we are not prepared to admit. The doctrine under consideration assumes that infants before accountability have sin, and of course that sin consists in something else than what God declares it to consist in. It assumes, too, that such in-

ants were under condemnation for that which they could not help,—exposed to the wrath of God for that for which they were in no wise to blame. We have seen that each of these ideas is unscriptural. We cannot but see that they cast the blackest imputations upon the government of God, impugning his justice and tarnishing his glory.

If the infant is not accountable, he cannot transgress, and can have no transgression, in other words, no sin, to be atoned for. If he *is* accountable and has transgressed, he is a sinner in the same sense and way of any other, and older sinner, and must be saved, if saved at all, by compliance with the same conditions of faith and repentance. But if not a transgressor, he is not a sinner. If not a sinner, he can have no sin to be atoned. If he has no sin, Christ could not have died for it. We do not deny that his death may benefit the infant, living or dying. We do not undertake to say what influences for good, may or may not flow to him through the incarnation, death, resurrection, or intercession of the Saviour. We have no doubt of the final everlasting happiness of all dying before accountability. We believe that Christ will raise them to immortal blessedness at the resurrection, and that their happiness will be gratuitous and unearned, for, they "have neither done good nor evil." But that Christ died for their sin, suffered in their stead as a substitute, delivered them from endless condemnation and the wrath of God, we cannot believe while we believe the Bible, accept God's definition of sin, or recognize the government of God as a just and righteous government. That Christ has done, and will do, all that in the nature of the case needs to be done for them, we do not doubt; but that he will do it for them as *sinners*, we do not believe. He has neither atoned for nor pardoned their sin, nor delivered them from condemnation and the wrath of God, for the very good reason that they have no sin to be atoned nor pardoned, and never were condemned nor under the wrath of God.

If the sentiments of this article are true, many of the popular theological notions of the day are false. From those who think it presumption and arrogance to question established and popular creeds, we expect neither candor nor justice. But we

earnestly bespeak of the candid inquirer after truth a candid and thorough investigation. Let the scriptural basis and logical process of every position and argument be *thoroughly tested and sifted*. "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."

---

### ART. III.—THE NATURE OF RELIGION.

Piety—true goodness of heart—essential to man's welfare here as his needed aid and the only end of his earthly existence, and to his salvation hereafter as the continuation of that existence, is too frequently very imperfectly understood. And notwithstanding it so nearly concerns every individual, there is hardly a subject upon which so much is thought, written, and read, upon which the ideas of mankind are so various and so indefinite. The picture of a perfect Christian which exists in the minds of very many, is the realization of the Puritan ideal. He must be a man of unbending dignity, of stern and forbidding, not to say of morose, aspect. Amidst the changes continually taking place around him; the vicissitudes of human fortunes; the sunshine of prosperity; the sweet converse of friends; the weary, crushing toils of life; the loneliness of the heart when those nearest and dearest are consigned to the grave; though tempests howl, thunders rumble, or lightnings flash; though the elements are convulsed and heaven and earth pass away, the truly sanctified must exhibit a stoical indifference. No tear must ever bedim his eye; no smile play upon his lips, let his lot be cast where it may; in disease of body; alone and in want, or in plenty, in health and in friendship's sacred joys. The heart once changed and heaven is sure. There is his home forever afterwards. There is no fear of falling from grace. Happiness on earth he neither seeks nor wishes, nor would he enjoy it were it presented to him. The contemplation of nature's scenes awakens no emotion. He views with



indifference the golden splendors of the summer's sunset; the mountain-circled lake, sparkling in the moonbeams; the starry heavens when Orion rises in majestic glory, and when the sweet influence of the Pleiades reigns. He hears not the melodious songs of the forest warblers; the voice of the cataract; the bubbling notes of the rippling brook, nor the music in ocean's billowy roar. Not *through* these works of nature, but *over* them, he looks up to nature's God. His religion is a cold, abstract faith, or an uncomprehended, uncertain state of the feelings—sometimes induced by hearing a fervent prayer, an affecting sermon or a conference hymn, when the soul, as it were, gets a little foretaste of heaven; sweet because transient; dearly prized because so seldom enjoyed. Again, his life is a life of difficulty—hard to overcome. The Christian must not only deny himself of all amusement; of all which renders life desirable to men in general; but he must do penance; he must cross every feeling, every inclination, and every wish of his heart, as being the suggestions of a totally depraved nature, prompted by the adversary of his soul's salvation.

Now, such religion as this is the religion of sentiment and not principle. It may be true to a certain extent, but there is no merit in possessing it, for it arises from not understanding the requirements of God upon us. We would not say a single word against the communion of the Holy Spirit. We believe it is the duty, the privilege of every Christian to enjoy it. It lifts up his soul in his desponding hours. And everybody has them. There are times when the body is weary with watchings and cares, and when the soul faints. It is then that that heavenly messenger is peculiarly welcome, for it breathes hope into the despairing heart, and whispers of a blissful rest beyond the grave. But whether that system of theology is the true system which builds upon the religion of sentiment upon this peculiar abstract feeling as a foundation, and which excludes human reason and rational enjoyments in this life as being inconsistent with true piety, or whether it is not, one thing is certain, it is not the doctrine taught by Christ when he says his yoke is easy and his burden is light. There is no easy burden, no light yoke in such a life. It is in vain to say that we should

bring ourselves into such subjection that a life like this would be delightful. No one has succeeded in doing so, or if now and then one has done so among the vast multitudes that have peopled the earth, he has soon paid the penalty of death for the violation of physical laws. We are made sympathizing, social, loving beings, to be cheerful, to be happy, and to act otherwise is to act contrary to our principles of reasoning, and opposite to every generous feeling of our nature, and the attributes of a just God. Were we prisoners on this earth, sent down here from the world above to be punished for some transgressions previous to our present existence, then we might conclude that our Creator intended that this life should be one of hardship, of sorrow and suffering; but there is no reason for assuming such to be the fact. On the contrary, it is evident that the object of our creation was to increase the amount of happiness, and consequently the glory of God. Did this system of theology under consideration affect only those who adopt it and advocate its truth, it might be passed in silence. But it is not so. Its influence is extended far and wide, and deeply felt. Originating in the early ages of Christianity, when the church began to decline from its pristine simplicity, and the papal power to be exalted, it became of vast importance to the Romish priests in bringing the credulous superstition of the ignorant masses subservient to their use. The man full of zeal to serve God must immure himself within the walls of a monastery, bequeath his property to the church, and die to the world. The woman in a similar manner must shut herself up in a nunnery. There, in fastings, self-inflictions, and convulsive prayers; upon the coarsest food, and clothed in the meanest attire, without a sympathizing friend, were they to finish their earthly existence. But the task was too hard. Human nature could not submit to it. Paradise, as glorious as it was represented to be, was too far off, too abstract to prove a sufficient inducement to such austerities. The consequence was, the church was scandalized, infidelity sprang up and fed upon the imperfections of Christian professors, and receiving a reflex influence, the world receded into almost barbaric darkness. Suddenly the light of the Reformation dawned. Rejecting

many of the dogmas of popery, and all to a greater or less extent, it unhappily retained too much of the former erroneous ideas of true piety. And notwithstanding its effects were known to have proved the corruption of the Romish church, the doctrine has been cherished and kept alive, that the life of a Christian is a life of austerity, and that he must not expect to be rewarded in his present existence for good deeds. The difficulty is, it is too abstract. It is not practical enough. It is not *true*, if we can judge by its fruits.

A man, reflecting seriously upon his present existence, its object and destination, becoming convinced of his need of true piety, and seeking earnestly after an abstract state of feeling, so to speak, which has been taught him he must strive to attain—though no person having permanently reached it can be a living model for him to pattern after—becomes, after days of gloom and nights of prayer, discouraged, and concludes that he has not *feeling* enough upon the subject at this time, and that he will postpone it till a more convenient season; or, if he obtains a hope, true and worthy to be relied on, that his sins are forgiven, after striving, ineffectually striving, to separate entirely his affections, his whole soul from the scenes of his earthly existence; although he feels that he loves God better than all beside, that if it were necessary to give up one, the favor of God or the enjoyments addressed solely to the senses, he would not hesitate an instant in his decision, yet we say when he finds that his thoughts will steal away upon the pleasures of life, in despair he doubts first his acceptance with God, next the reality of religion, and rushes into sin and infidelity, driven there by his own ignorance of the nature of true religion. Or, even if he escape this course, amusement—innocent recreation, which he finds it impossible to restrain himself from partaking, and which the laws of health require just as much as the lungs require the air of heaven—comes up before him according to the teaching he has received, as sin after sin, until he is ashamed to approach his God in prayer, and finally the duty ceases to be performed at all; coldness and indifference succeed, and his term of probation is over before he has made scarcely any attainment in virtue. And why? Simply because he could not

be a hypocrite. And firmly believing what he had been taught, without giving it an examination, he suffered his ignorance to destroy his hopes of heaven.

Such cases are by no means rare, and was Revelation silent upon the subject, we might conclude that there is something wrong in the practicability of such a doctrine. God has created us, given us faculties, and placed us under certain laws, physical and moral. The physical we can ascertain by experience of ourselves and others; the moral, partly by experience and entirely by his revelations. These laws were made to harmonize! What affords us physical pleasure without transgressing any physical, or moral, or spiritual law, cannot be a moral detriment. In short, then, we are living in accordance with the will of our Creator as nearly as possible, when we bring into use all our faculties, physical and spiritual, and partake of the enjoyments of life in such a manner that we know we are violating no law of our being. For our Creator cannot reasonably require anything more of us than to use all the faculties he has given us without transgressing the laws he has established. And we can use every faculty both of body and mind without committing a single sin—else why were they made? Does God make anything in vain? Has he given us powers and made it a sin to use them? If so, better have withheld those powers in the first place, for they serve no purpose but to embitter the pleasure we might enjoy from others. To live, then, in accordance with the laws of our being—our whole being, with a supreme love to God—a love of doing right because it is right—is religion, true piety. And how can a man use his moral faculties properly and not feel his affections entwined around the Author of all moral beauty and perfection? How can he love to show justice and see it manifested in others, without loving Him who is infinite in justice? And how is it possible to exercise the moral and spiritual faculties intelligently, and be virtuous, without hating evil—without repentance of every wrong act? Taking this view of religion—and what other reasonable one can there be?—when, by the grace of God, one has brought every passion, every desire of his moral and spiritual nature into its proper bounds;

when his physical acts are all in accordance with physical, moral and spiritual laws; and when habit has accustomed and confirmed him in living in this way, how can he live so as to be happier? He drinks at the fountain of science—its draughts delight him. His mind expands with study. All the treasures of literature are his. He sails through the giddy flights of the imagination in the verse of by-gone poets. The fine arts claim his attention—more, his admiration. The concord of sweet sounds charms his ear. The thrilling tones of eloquence find a vibrating chord in his own bosom. Of the comforts of life he freely partakes; nor does he say, in the canting tone of the ascetic, that the pleasures of the senses should *never* be indulged in, for the body is soon to perish; but their gratification, at proper times, adds to his enjoyments; and through all he looks up to his Heavenly Father with filial love and grateful heart, that he has made life so pleasant; feeling—nay, knowing—that he is best serving his Creator, when, in the full development of all his powers, he best enjoys the happiness they bestow with reference to life present and future.

But it is often said, this is all well enough, so far as it goes; but something more is needed to be a Christian. Well, what is it? Let it be explained. Mind, we do not say that the physical senses are to be gratified to the exclusion of the moral and spiritual nature, but all together, in due proportion. And now, if we can judge anything by fruits; if love to God in the heart will show itself in love to man; if the Christian is the light of the world, set on a hill, which cannot be hid; and if he is to be an example in all the cardinal virtues, worthy to be imitated, worthy of him who gave his life for his doctrine, which shall we say is the Christian, he whose countenance is beaming with love, who ever wears a pleasant smile, reverent and fervent, but intelligent in the performance of his religious duties; who is known by his sympathy with suffering, by his benevolence and charity; who sees a brother wherever he meets a human form, and who has a word of encouragement to give to the desponding, as a social companion, is beloved by all; or he whose forbidding aspect, cold and formal gravity, is never

relaxed ; who would feel his dignity irreparably injured by imitating his Divine Master and embracing little children in his arms, even though such are of the kingdom of heaven ; who frowns upon all amusement, indiscriminately, of the young, looking with suspicion upon a happy countenance ; and who freezes the life from every social circle he enters ? There can be no hesitation in deciding. The Scriptures condemn the performance of religious rites with a sad countenance, and they tell us that the fruits of piety are joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. What we want is to act like men, with reason in our religion.

But again, we daily see the man of affable manners possessing an influence over the hearts of his fellow-men above all comparison, with his whose exterior appearance has a repulsive iciness about it. If, now, this influence is exerted for truth ; if he sincerely desires to make men better, purer, holier, will he not accomplish far more good by his pleasing address, his benignant smile and cheerful looks, than he could otherwise ? And if so, what does it prove, but that it is right, nay more, a duty ? For if it cannot be judged by the results of an act what its moral quality is, we know not how it can be. And what are the results of that system of theology which teaches that heaven is won by a life of seclusion, austerity and penance ? The unconverted man gets the idea that the life of a Christian is one of gloom ; that as soon as he becomes pious, he shuts himself from the world ; and that the moment anything yields him pleasure, that moment self-denial requires him to abandon it ; that if he loves his child with all the fondness of a parent's heart, God will deprive him of that child ; that if his religious affections lose their warmth, on his especial account, God will remove the object upon which he has set his heart. It may be the dearest friend he has, but his heart-wanderings must be recalled, while the open transgressor may feel all the love for his offspring his indulgent nature is capable of feeling ; may heap up his thousands for that child, and devote himself day and night, body and soul, to his worldly concerns, and yet God suffers him to go on unnoticed. With such an idea of God, no wonder that many a mother's heart, lacerated and bleeding,

has murmured at his dispensations. And what can be more unreasonable to suppose, than that the Governor of the universe will deprive one individual of life, who has just as much right to live as another, that the latter may become a better Christian? Where has he taught us that he destroys one man or nation to build up another? The fact is, when an individual or nation has become so stained with guilt as to call down his vengeance, he suffers their destruction to take place in such a manner that it may be a warning to others. This is all. And let no mother repine at God for depriving her of her children; no special Providence has removed them from the world, because they were loved with an affection too pure or ardent. They have died because some physical law of their being has been violated, or that their constitution was too feeble to support life longer. But though we should not regard the death of dearest friends, or the loss of property always as a direct judgment from God, yet it is fitting and right that both should lead us to reflect upon the shortness of time, the comparatively little value of earthly treasures, and the much we have to do to prepare ourselves for that eternity towards which we are so rapidly hastening.

But to return: when the unconverted man gets the idea that the Christian's life is thus cheerless and sad, does it look as though the yoke was easy and the burden light? And who shall number the souls that are thus shut out of heaven by false ideas of what religion is?—By those that would place a burden upon the young believer which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear? Never, no, never, tell the penitent that religion will make the world more gloomy, more unpleasant than it already is. For to most it is bad enough now. But tell him if he would enjoy the world properly, if he would be happy, really so; so that pleasure shall bring no reaction of pain, he must be a Christian.

But from this let no one get the idea that we are advocating the indulgence of all or any of the unhallowed desires and passions of our corrupted affections, or that sentiment and feeling should not be subordinate to reason and judgment. We do no such thing. There is nothing easy, nothing attractive about the

life of the sensual debauchee. Who has to deny himself of the comforts of life like the besotted inebriate?—heats and colds, curses and reproaches, remorse and despair, in perils by night and horrors by day; surely there can be nothing delightful about such a life! And when does an abiding gleam of joy enter the heart of the miser? What is life worth to him who spends it all in vain, trifling amusement, without a serious thought upon his existence, till adversity darkens his pathway, and his days are ended in poverty and wretchedness? Or to him who passes the night in revelry or the excitements of gaming, and as a consequence, suffers the pains of violated physical laws for days after? Such are not the courses we are advocating. It cannot be said of such lives, that their yokes are easy and their burdens light—hence they are not such as a Christian should live. But whilst discarding these, must we of necessity take the other extreme? Let us rather choose the golden mean. Let us use all our faculties, and abuse none; and never fear because we enjoy a moment's sunshine in a world where there is so much toil, so many weary watchings and cares, so great temptations to unbelief, that we are sinning in yielding to its influence. The life of our Saviour—the perfect model for our imitation—was not the life of an ascetic. • He came eating and drinking. He was found at the table of publicans and sinners—at the marriage feast—in social converse often, and mingling freely with men of all conditions: pharisees and sadducees, fishermen and doctors. In his life are no accounts of prolonged fastings with his disciples; but he had compassion on their physical wants, and miraculously fed thousands at a time. By him are no commands to disfigure the countenance with sadness; but, on the contrary, he especially enjoined his followers not to do so. He had sympathy for the erring, and when one was brought before him, he turned and said, “go and sin no more,” and on another time, “If thy brother trespass against thee seventy and seven times in a day, and turn to thee saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him.” How unlike the sweeping denunciations we so often hear from those who, folding their arms with pharisaical complacency, looking upon their own standing in society, thank God that they are not as



the exercise of which affords them so much pleasure, and which they have no disposition to abuse. The spire of grass, the shrub, the tree, afford no evidence that the law of vegetable life is entirely opposite to the nature of plants. The planets wander not from their established paths. There is no contrary force which ever and anon draws from its orbit a sun or a satellite, but the law under which they are placed, is such as perfectly corresponds to the motion assigned them. And they move harmoniously on, while the music of the spheres in one grand anthem sublimely swelling, delights the ear of angelic intelligences. From these, what can be inferred, but that every thing is just adapted to the laws which govern it. Yes, everything—man forming no exception. If the intelligence he has received above other sublunary beings; if his superior light perverted, has caused him to look far beyond his sphere of action, and to be vain; and presumptuously to imagine that he can subvert the laws of his being, and establish others, or dispense with any, and if thereby he has found to his own cost that his folly and arrogance have so misled him, that it is often difficult for him to return to a right course of action; and equally so for a long while after he has returned, to keep himself from wandering again and again; we say, if man has thus brought misery upon himself, is it fair to say that his lot is necessarily hard; that he must not follow the inclinations which were and should be natural to him, because God's law requires him to deny them?

But to this it may be objected that wrong-doing does not result so often from man's deliberately planning it; from his desiring it in reality, as it does from circumstances; from his being beset by unexpected temptation, and yielding to a sudden impulse of his evil passions; and we know well there is much plausibility in the objection. We know, too, that it is in vain to say that circumstances should have no control over us; for whether they should or not, they always do. And do what we will, we cannot make ourselves machines, perfectly insensible to everything around us. Our sympathies will be voluntarily enlisted for certain objects; our desires clamor loud for gratification when stimulated by the certainty that that gratification

can be enjoyed; and in spite of our powers of resistance, for the time being, temptation may rush upon us like a tornado and sweep us before it ere we have time for scarcely one sober reflection. But there is a question back of this. Why had not anticipation outstripped the reality and placed us on our guard against any emergency that might arise? How came we surrounded by circumstances favorable to guilty indulgence? Have not we sought them, made them where they did not exist, by interpreting everything according to our own depraved feelings? Let the guilty one answer these questions, unblushingly if he can. Let him who, yielding to unexpected temptation, has committed any offence against the law of right, examine the condition of his mind before his open transgression. Was it free from pollution? Had not the imagination often pictured scenes of vice in such alluring colors, so attractive, so consonant to the unholy desires of the heart; that the mental eye delighted to gaze upon them; that they were warmly welcomed and keenly enjoyed in day-dreams, and often-indulged reveries, long before they became a reality? When in this state of mind an occasion presents itself, the man falls;—no, not falls, for he was already fallen—but it is thus that he exhibits to the world his inward depravity. Here, then, is the guilt. A corrupt mind is not long, nor need seek far, to find circumstances favorable for its gratification, even when it is known that that gratification is followed by sorrows deep and lasting, both of body and soul. Hence the fault, to a great extent, is often in ourselves that we are not good and happy, and not in the net of circumstances in which we are entangled; neither in the laws our Creator has placed us under. For this by no means proves that it was difficult, and required all our energies, exerted sometimes to no purpose, to live in obedience to these laws and be a Christian. It is not hard to resist evil thoughts, if they have not been long indulged, as every one knows who has tried to do so and can testify; and if they are resisted, we are securely fortified against every temptation, come it when it may, where it may, or in whatever form it may—sudden or long expected. And not only is it not hard to resist evil thoughts, and to keep the mind from dwelling upon mental pic-

tures of vice when they first present themselves ; but their indulgence is always painful, till the conscience has become seared. There is a monitor within, continually whispering, it is not right—God sees you now—he knows of what you are thinking—banish such unholy desires from the heart—there are thorns concealed beneath the roses that the corrupted imagination has painted so beautiful. Awake or in dreams ; in the midst of active duties, and in the hours of relaxation ; when lying down or rising up ; in health or disease ; hope or despondency, that still small voice is ever upbraiding, till it is lost amid the loud clamor of evil passions, which gain access to the ear, and lead the soul away captive. Hurried on by ambition for fame ; for the luxury of wealth ; for sensual pleasures ; and for the sweets of power, the voice may be heard no more, till perhaps adversity in worldly prosperity ; disappointment in dreams of greatness ; or the death of one who was the object around which clustered the warmest feelings of the heart, vibrates startlingly upon the auditory nerve of the soul, and awakens it to just reflection. And if none of these things has that effect, death launches the transgressor unprepared into eternity, to stand before his God, and hear his sentence of condemnation. But ere the voice of conscience has been stifled, and it is heard, as it is before one has become habituated to evil thoughts, and cherished them as sweet enjoyment, can the soul that yields to them be happy ? And is it not easier ; is there not more satisfaction in resisting them than harboring them ? And does not this prove that we have to learn to do wrong, and learn, too, amidst the upbraidings of our better nature ? Is it not plain, therefore, that it is not only right to observe the laws of our being, but pleasant, and that it leads alone to happiness ?

By the watchfulness, the prayers, and the denying evil inclinations to live in this manner, the life of the Christian is not rendered irksome ; the Saviour's burden hard to be borne, or his yoke painful to wear. But far from being uncongenial, these duties are pleasant. It is sweet for the pious, confiding heart to lift up, in holy breathings, itself to its Heavenly Father, and feel that his Father is granting his Holy Spirit's commun-

ion. It is a duty agreeable and loved by the Christian to be vigilant, and anticipate every temptation by fortifying himself with the shield of virtue. What a pleasure, then, to see the arrows of the adversary glance and fall harmless to the ground from his impenetrable armor! There is no more welcome reflection than that we have done right; that we have yielded to nothing which reason, conscience, experience and revelation equally demonstrate wrong. He surely is the happy man, and he is the one that can say life is easy and its burden light, who is conscious, as he lays his head upon his pillow for nature's rest, that he has spent each day in this manner. If angels ever watch over the slumbers of any mortal, it is over his.

But again, true piety of heart, as we have defined it, has a remarkable influence in regulating the every-day actions and feelings of the Christian; those occurrences, small in themselves, singly considered, but which, nevertheless, taken together, make up the sum of life's enjoyment or misery. The person who is continually giving away to petulance, who suffers himself to be fretted at the little things happening almost every hour in the day, till his ill-humor has rendered him an object of aversion and dread to all who associate with him, finds no real peace or happiness in his discontent, because he is transgressing social laws as well as the spiritual laws of his own being. Perhaps there is no one who leads a more wretched life than he does. The twelve labors of Hercules were not to be half so much dreaded as is the fate of him who is forever repining at his lot; forever contrasting his situation with others above him; and who sees no end to his misery; no bright oases in the future, where he may refresh and invigorate himself after his toil. It is easy to nerve the soul for one effort, desperate though it be; to prepare for one struggle, even though that struggle should exhaust the whole strength, if we can feel when that is over that there is no more. But it is not so with the man habitually unhappy. He retires to his rest at night dissatisfied with himself—dissatisfied with every one besides. The penalties of violated laws, the effects of yielding to an irascible disposition, reacting constantly upon him, make him unhappy. Sleep brings no rest; dreams of dire

calamities disturb his slumbers and weary him, body and mind; so that when he rises, he is worse prepared than ever to bear the burdens of the day. But let such a one become truly pious; let him check his spirit of discontent, instead of yielding to the petty annoyances; in short, let him in these respects observe the laws under which God has placed him, and though it may require effort at first, in how brief a time will he become a different man! Piety teaches him to cherish feelings of contentment, and that happiness is not dependent upon rank or wealth, or any external circumstances whatever, but upon peace of mind; upon doing and feeling right; upon having every desire restrained within proper bounds, and recognizing the Supreme Being in all that we do, or, in other words, upon acting in accordance with the laws of his being. And he that lives thus will not have to endure the pain of violated physical laws, terminating in wasting disease and death; he will not have to bear the frowns and curses of those he has wronged by the transgression of moral laws; nor will he have to despise himself when he looks into his own heart and beholds its moral condition, the result of disobedience to his own spiritual laws.

But finally: the great difficulty with us all is, that we make heaven too far off, and hence we lose much happiness that we might otherwise enjoy. Our whole course of action is based upon the belief that heaven does not commence till this life ends, and then if we can die—no matter how we have lived—if we can die in a right state of mind, we shall enter into a heaven rivalling the Elysium of the ancients, and the paradise of Mahomet. By this idea we rob ourselves of a large portion of life's felicity; and not only so, but we peril our soul's salvation; for, as sure as God's Word is true, he that does not live prepared for heaven here, will find none hereafter. He will find no heaven located far away in the sky, isolated and walled in with stones of jasper, or any other precious mineral, who has not found it first habitually in his own heart, by using all his faculties without violating the laws of his being. A city paved with gold and glittering with diamonds, will afford no happiness to him who is not prepared to enjoy it. It is surely

well for the Christian to dwell much upon the revelations of God in regard to the future state of the faithful; it strengthens his good resolutions; like a magnet it draws him towards purity, towards heaven, and when, like Moses, he can climb the Pisgah which overlooks the Jordan between him and his immortality of glory, and catch a glimpse of the Promised Land, it is refreshing to his soul. But, however prized such a view may be, it should not render this life distasteful, or detract from its pleasures, or cause us to look with indifference upon our present happiness. If we bear life's burdens cheerfully, or rather live so life has no burdens, and enjoy the labor allotted us to perform, we are as truly doing our duty and pleasing our Creator, as when engaged in our most solemn religious ceremonies. Therefore, as happiness is that for which we are all seeking in the present and future; as it is in our dreams by night and thoughts by day; let us not make ourselves *unhappy* to obtain it; falsely believing if we seek it not, nay, more, if we spurn it in this world, it will, on that account alone, be our inheritance in the next. Whenever a course of action is presented for us to follow, the question may ever be safely asked, will it conduce to our happiness and the happiness of our fellow brethren, on the whole; and if it will, we may be sure it is right, for it is in accordance with the laws of our being. And when once decided in the affirmative, then let us follow it, whether bigots persecute, scoffers jeer, or superstition opposes its sanctified ignorance; and it will bring felicity on earth and a glorious immortality in heaven, by aiding us in becoming accustomed to live in accordance with the laws of our being.

## ART. IV.—AFRICA AND HER CIVILIZATION.\*

It is a marvellous fact to contemplate, that, while Africa is second in size to the largest division of the world, as respects both territory and population, that such a general ignorance should exist, for the last thousand years, of the country and the people. The Romans, we doubt not, after the fall of Carthage, explored considerable portions of Western, Central and Northern Africa; and the inhabitants of Southern Europe were better acquainted with it than we are. But judging from the statements and testimonies of geographers, how little information has been obtained from the many excursions made into the country, from the days of Necho down to our own times.

As a general thing, the explorations of travellers heretofore have extended but a limited distance beyond the coast, the impression having long prevailed that, beyond certain latitudes, there stretched a belt of pestilential effluvia, interdicting and punishing, with terrible disease and death, all who dared to penetrate or cross this boundary line. So, upon this opinion, being shut out from the march of the civilizing tendency of trade and commerce, and the Christianizing influences of the gospel appliances, Africa has been given up to the wildest and most erroneous conjectures. But when we take into consideration the results of this limited intercourse of the civilized nations with this less favored part of the world, we are almost forced to conclude that that which appears so strange and mysterious is, after all, but the plain development of Divine providence.

Of Christian nations, the French claim the honor of first discovering the coast of Guinea. It is said that the records of Dieppe in Normandy show an agreement of certain merchants of that place and Rouen, in the year 1365, to trade to that

\* This is the first of what is intended to be a series of articles on this subject.

coast, which is supposed to have commenced as early as 1346. They claim to have traded along the Grain coast, and made establishments at Sesters and other places, doubled Cape Palmas, explored the coast as far as Elmina, and commenced a fortress there in 1383. In 1387 Elmina was enlarged and a chapel built there. The civil wars which raged soon after proved so injurious to commerce, that the company were compelled to abandon their trade. This is supposed to be the first modern effort to introduce trade and commerce into that country.

The next to enter and explore this region of country were the Portuguese, who seem to have gone under very different circumstances, and for very different purposes from their French neighbors that preceded them. Being incensed against their Moorish invaders and oppressors, an order of Knights was organized, called the "Order of Christ." Its object was to maintain the war against the Moors, and also to conquer and convert all who denied the truth of their holy religion. To this they were solemnly obligated. Henry of Loraine was rewarded for his services in these wars with a gift of Portugal, and of what ever else he should take from the Moors. John I., having expelled or extirpated the Moors in his dominions, passed into Africa and took Centa in 1415. He was attended in this expedition by his son, Henry, Duke of Viser, and Grand Master of the Order of Christ. Henry distinguished himself during the siege; remained sometime in Africa to carry on the war, and learned that beyond the Great Desert was the country of the Senegal and Jaloffs. With the double design of conquering infidels and finding a passage to India by sea, having already pushed his discoveries to Cape Bajador, he obtained a bull from the Pope, Martin V., granting to the Portuguese an exclusive right in all the islands they already possessed, and also in all territories they might in future discover, from Cape Bajador to the East Indies. The Pope also granted a plenary indulgence to the souls of all who might perish in the enterprise, and in recovering the nations of those regions to Christ. This was at first strongly opposed by the laity of the



greatly increased respecting African affairs, through the published discoveries of Dr. Livingstone and Barth, Mr. Bowen, Ellis, Clark and Thompson. Livingstone, Barth and Bowen have penetrated far into the heretofore unknown regions of Africa, and discovered tribes much farther advanced in civilization, presenting a very different character and aspect from what we have been led to suppose. From these facts we shall be able to show the adequate means at work to effect the speedy civilization and evangelization of this long neglected and greatly outraged people—"trodden down and meted out, whose lands the rivers (nations) have spoiled."

---

#### ART. V.—BRITISH POWER IN INDIA.

India has exerted a powerful influence on the western nations from time immemorial. She has been pouring a stream of opulence on the western world for nearly three thousand years. During that long period the channels of commerce between India and the western world have often changed. Arabia and Syria long enjoyed its Indian commerce. Palmyra and Tyre were enriched by it. The great wealth of Tyre excited the cupidity of the great Macedonian conqueror—and after he had conquered Egypt, the granary of the world, he determined to make Egypt an emporium for eastern trade, and draw the commerce in that direction, hence the origin of that celebrated city which bears his name—Alexandria. And to accomplish his grand scheme he pushed his conquests into India.

After Rome, the proud mistress of the world, fell into decay, Arabia once more sprang into more than its original greatness, under the martial spirit, and fanaticism of the great warrior prophet. And his followers spread over many of the fairest portions of Europe, Asia, and Africa, gathering up the spoils of the shattered empire of the Cæsars, planting even the crescent into more distant nations than were ever reached by the Ro-

man eagle. The Moslem conquests having obtained the control of the Eastern and Western seas, would probably have overrun all Europe, had not the spirit of Western fanaticism been aroused in the great Crusade to recover the Holy Sepulchre, which drove back, and forever checked the spread of Islamism in the West.

But Moslemism held the supremacy over the Eastern and Western seas, and for several centuries the almost exclusive trade with India. And Bagdad, their capital, became the Rome and Athens and Alexandria of the East.

Western Europe seems to have had no part in Indian commerce until into the 11th and 12th centuries, when the trans-Alpine barbarians of the crusading armies were brought into contact with the comparatively civilized Saracens, where they first acquired a taste for Asiatic and Indian luxuries. On their return, they carried specimens of Indian and Oriental articles of luxury, such as jewels, silks, spices, &c., which aroused the curiosity and inflamed the cupidity of their countrymen at home. This led them to determine to obtain them. Here dates the origin of civilization in the West. They must turn their attention to agriculture and the arts for means to obtain Eastern luxuries. A way of commerce was first opened through Italy. Venice and Genoa became great commercial cities. This new spirit of discovery aroused Portugal, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, to find some new passage to India. Thus she became the most enterprising nation on the seas, of that age—and continued to push her efforts on the western coast of Africa, until 1486, when Diaz reached the Cape of Good Hope, which was by him called the "Cape of storms"—but afterwards called by the King of Portugal by its present name—as it indicated "Good Hope" in their efforts. And it was for the furtherance of the same design that Columbus dedicated his life. He thought that by sailing directly west he might reach India by a much shorter route—following the erroneous idea of Aristotle and Ptolemy, who supposed that the Eastern Continent extended around nearly to the west of Europe. In doing this, he discovered what he called the "West Indies," and which led to the discovery of America.

In 1498, the Portuguese Vasco De Gama, doubled the Cape and reached Calicut, a port on the southern coast of India, where he obtained a rich cargo, and reached home after having been gone two and a half years. On his return he entered Lisbon, with almost regal pomp. The delighted king conferred on him wealth and honors. And this discovery has been recognized as the greatest event in the history of the world, excepting the discovery of America six years previous. Calicut was then a place of extensive trade with the Mussulmans of Egypt and Arabia, and was under the government of an independent Hindoo chief, and lay south of the limits of the Mahomedan conquests. The king of Portugal, who had, through neglect of the great navigator Columbus, lost the opportunity of adding the New World to his dominions, determined to seek a compensation for his loss by following up the discoveries of Gama. A second expedition was fitted out on a more extensive scale, consisting of 13 ships, 1200 men, and 8 friars to preach Christianity to the natives, and who were ordered to carry fire and sword into every country that refused to listen to them. This expedition, which was commenced in the year 1500, on its way out to India discovered the coast of Brazil, in South America, which was immediately taken possession of in the name of the king of Portugal, and which continued from that time one of the brightest jewels of that crown. It is the only part of the New World, which was ever governed by a European sovereign in person. The king of Portugal reigned there from the year 1808 until 1821, when it became independent. The Portuguese in the beginning of the sixteenth century, commenced their conquests in Southern India, with a determination to establish an empire in the East. And the king of Portugal assumed the lofty title of "Lord of Navigation, conquest, and commerce of Ethiopia, Arabia, Persia and India." And he sent out a viceroy for India before he had obtained a foot of land in India. In 1506, the Portuguese took possession of Goa, a small island on the Malabar coast, which they fortified, and made their capital, so long as they held sway in Southern India, which was nearly through the sixteenth century. And so long as Portugal enjoyed the exclusive monopoly of Indian commerce, she sat as

queen among the nations of Europe. Though they never possessed a single province on the continent of India, still for more than a century they commanded her seas without a rival. They had over twelve thousand miles of sea coast in the East under their control, along which were scattered thirty factories, or trading houses. They were also most active in propagating the Romish religion in India, which has spread over a large part of Southern India. Many of the descendants of the Portuguese are still to be found in all parts of India, who are known as East Indians, and who are, for the most part, Roman Catholics. When the Portuguese first reached the shore of Southern India, they saw a lofty Hindoo temple or pagoda, which they concluded must be a Christian temple, because the half-naked Brahmins wore strings of beads, like those of the Romish priests, and sprinkled the people with water, which might be consecrated—and presented sandal-wood powdered, as the Romanists do ashes—so they sought admission into the temple to worship; when they found the walls covered with images, which, being willing to identify with those of the Madonna, and saints, they threw themselves prostrate on the ground—one of them, however, chancing to look up, and observing the strange and uncouth appearance of these imaginary apostles, some of whom had four or six arms, and as many faces, and enormous teeth projecting out of their mouths, deemed it advisable to guard himself by the exclamation—"If these be devils, it is God whom I worship."

But the days of the Portuguese dominion and glory were numbered in the East, as well as at home. About the year 1600, a new enemy appeared in India, and much more formidable than anything the Portuguese had encountered in the East. The Dutch, driven to desperation by the tyranny of Philip II., had revolted against Spain, and after a long, hard, and glorious struggle, raised themselves to the rank of an independent republic. And owing to the small extent of their territory, and the great number of refugees, who found among them the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, they were induced to seek on the ocean the means of subsistence and wealth—hence they became one of the first naval powers in Europe. They were

also attracted, not only to the New World, where they founded what they called New Amsterdam—now New York—but also by the trade and wealth of India. They attempted a passage by the north of Asia, but failing in the effort, they determined to follow the route of the Portuguese around the Cape. And in the year 1597, they arrived in the island of Java, where they carried on a successful trade with the islands of Java, Sumatra, Malacca, &c. And gradually they became complete masters of the Eastern Islands and seas—and the emporium of Eastern trade was transferred from Lisbon to Amsterdam, and in proportion as Holland rose in wealth and importance, in the same proportion did Portugal sink in importance. The Dutch East India Company still has a bare existence, the headquarters of which are in Java.

But that nation which was destined to reap the largest harvest from India, and in return, it is hoped, confer the largest amount of benefit, was no uninterested observer. The spirit of industry and enterprise, already partially awakened in England, received, during the long and peaceful reign of Elizabeth, an accelerated impetus. And all, from the throne down to the humblest citizen, were now seized with a restless, insatiable ambition to share in the commerce of diamonds, pearls, embroideries, silks, and perfumes of the East. But how was this to be obtained? From priority of discovery Portugal claimed the exclusive right to the passage of the cape, and was determined to hold it by force of arms. What, then, was to be done? Proclaim war against Portugal? England was not prepared for that—to defy so formidable an enemy. What then? abandon the pursuit of the golden prize? No! never! The spirit which had been aroused in England was not to be smothered; but it broke forth in another direction. It led to those most wonderful series of voyages which figure so conspicuously in the annals of the sixteenth century. Voyages which added more to our knowledge of the surface of the globe, than had ever been known before, and perhaps more than has been added since,—and which distinguished England more than any other nation during that period, and gave her the almost entire command of the seas. And yet the great object in them was to

discover some new passage to India. An attempt was made to find a north-east passage, which failed—then an attempt was made to find a north-west passage, which also failed, but which led to discoveries in the north part of British America, which bear the names of many of the discoverers, such as Hudson, Davis, Frobishers, &c. The next attempt was to find a south-west passage around the American continent, which failed of reaching India, but led to the discoveries in the Pacific and Southern oceans, and a highway around the world. An attempt was then made to reach India through the Mediterranean Sea, which partially succeeded—for they were able to obtain cargoes of Indian goods, brought overland to the eastern shores of the Mediterranean. And a merchants' company, called "The Levant Company," was formed for that purpose.

But the English, seeing that the Dutch—not terrified by the arms of the Portuguese—had followed them around the Cape, and established themselves in the East, determined to hazard an attempt around the Cape. Consequently, about the close of the fifteenth century, a successful attempt was made to reach the East Indies by the Cape. And in the year 1600, when Elizabeth reigned in England, and Akborsot on the throne of India, the East India Company was formed. It is said that 215 knights, aldermen, and merchants of London united and formed the company, and obtained privileges which it was then customary to bestow on mercantile corporations, which in this case was called a royal charter. Three ships were at once fitted out and sent to India. This was the first appearance of the English in India, and the beginning of the British power in the East. The little trade which they had commenced previous to this around the Cape, had been confined to the Malacca islands.

This company first obtained ground in Musulipatam, on the Coromandel coast, and afterwards in Madras, where they obtained permission to erect a fortification, called Fort St. George. Still later, another place on the same coast was obtained and fortified, called Fort St. David. The commerce of India being considered more and more as a national object, King James I., in 1614, sent out Sir Thomas Roe as ambassador to the great

Mogul court, with a view of obtaining permission to trade, on reasonable terms, in the principal ports of his dominions. But it was with much difficulty that he obtained a firman of the splendid but semi-barbarous court of the Great Mogul, which then regarded England as scarcely worthy of notice. It was from Sir T. Roe that England first obtained the flaming accounts of the gorgeous court of the Moguls, which inflamed the cupidity of the English, and intensified their desire to trade with India. But the English met with great difficulty from the first in the East. Their rivals, the Dutch, who were then vastly their superiors in naval force, and who looked upon them with great jealousy, opposed them. The English continued on in their Indian trade, without much success in obtaining territory, during most of the seventeenth century. Soon after the English directed their attention to India, the French also sent several expeditions to the East. They first directed their attention to Madagascar, but not finding that profitable, they next made an attempt to share in the spoils of India, which they found more profitable. And in 1664, they established what they called "The French East Indian Company."

This company, after various reverses and repeated collisions with the Dutch, at length gained a foothold in Pondichern (Southern India), which they fortified. They also had some smaller factories in other places, as well as at Chandernagore in Bengal. They continued to increase in strength, and proved rather formidable enemies to the English in India. Madras, which had been fortified by the English under the name of Fort St. George, and was the headquarters in India until Calcutta rose into being, was taken by the French in 1746, but it was soon restored to the English. In 1656, the East India Company succeeded in erecting their first factory in Bengal, on the Hoogley, at what is called Hoogley, a few miles above Serampore. And in 1662, the island of Bombay was ceded to the British crown as part of the marriage dowry of Catharine of Portugal, Queen of Charles II., and was by him granted to the Company. At first the Company had only trading establishments, with very little protection; but gradually small bodies of troops were sent to defend them in their trade, and they

also succeeded in enlisting natives, for pay, to join their service, not only as servants, but as soldiers. But as they increased in strength, they began to entertain projects of conquest, though on a small scale at first, and under the guise of protecting their trade. The Dutch seem to have gradually disappeared before the English; but the French held their own, and so late as 1748 the two nations were so equally divided that neither ventured upon any serious movement. But the face of Indian affairs was entirely changed by the arrival of an English expedition of nine ships of war, with 1400 men. This gave the English the ascendancy. The struggle between the English and French, however, continued for years after this reinforcement of the English, but was confined mostly to Southern India.

We will now turn our attention to consider the progress of the British power in Bengal and Northern India. It has been mentioned that a factory was established at Hoogley in 1656. We hear little or nothing more of their progress in Bengal during the remainder of that century. But in the year 1700, the villages of Chuttanuttee, Govindapore and Calcutta were obtained by means of a large present to Agim, grandson of Aurungzibe, and Viceroy of Bengal, and were at once declared a presidency. And they were forthwith fortified; and in compliment to the then reigning sovereign of England, was called Fort William, which name it still retains. And for the half century which followed, we find nothing of special interest connected with the history of the English in Bengal. Of all the provinces subjected to the Moguls, Bengal was regarded as the wealthiest. No part of India possesses such advantages for agriculture and commerce, embracing the rich valley of the Ganges. It has the most dense population of any part of India, and perhaps of the globe. And in spite of the misrule and plunder to which it had been subject from time to time, it was known through the East as the Garden of Eden—the rich kingdom. It was peopled by a race enervated by its soft climate, and long accustomed to peaceful avocations. The great province of Bengal, together with Behar and Orissa, had long been governed by a Viceroy of the Great Mogul; and after the decline of the Mogul power,



it had virtually become independent. Ali-Verdy Khan, who had long been the Viceroy or Nabob of Bengal, died in 1756, and was succeeded by his grandson, Suraja Dowlah, a youth under twenty, and who, it was said, had become so depraved, at that early age, that he delighted in cruelty, for its own sake. From a child he had hated the English—he also had formed an exaggerated idea of the wealth which might be obtained by plundering them. So he determined to march with a large force against Fort William. The fort was taken, after some resistance by the English, and those who were unable to escape fell into the hands of Suraja Dowlah. The Nabob then seated himself in regal pomp in the principal hall of the factory, and ordered Mr. Holwell, the governor of Fort William, to be brought before him, whom he violently reproached for having attempted to defend the place against the ruler of Bengal. He complained bitterly at finding only 50,000 rupees. But he promised that their lives should be spared, and then retired to rest. Then followed one of the most barbarous acts in the annals of history, and which met with a terrible retribution. The English captives were left at the mercy of the guards, who, to secure them for the night, thrust them into the prison of the garrison—a chamber known by the fearful name of the “Black Hole.” It was only twenty feet square, with but small and obstructed air-holes. And it was in the hot weather, when the heat in Bengal is scarcely tolerable to Europeans in well ventilated rooms. One hundred and forty-six European prisoners were confined in that cell for the night. And scarcely nothing in history or fiction equals the horrors which were recounted by the few who survived that night. And it is said that the barbarous soldiers made sport of their frantic sufferings, and all their importunities for relief, or to awake the Nabob, were unheeded. After day-break—and the Nabob had slept off his debauch—he permitted the door to be opened. But it was sometime before the soldiers could make a way through the dead bodies, on which the burning climate had already begun to do its loathsome work—for the survivors to be taken out. Twenty-three ghastly figures were all who were found alive. But all this produced neither remorse or pity in the

bosom of the Nabob. He showed no compassion to the poor survivors. Those from whom he had no hope of obtaining anything, were allowed to depart; but those from whom it was thought that anything could be extorted, were treated with great cruelty. The Nabob changed the name of the fort—placed a garrison in it—and forbid any English to dwell in the neighborhood. He then returned home to Mushadabad. When the news of the calamity which had befallen Calcutta reached Madras, the Governor and Council were filled with alarm. At the same time the fiercest and bitterest resentment was excited, and the cry was for vengeance; and it was at once determined that an expedition should be sent to the Hoogley, and that Clive should be at the head of the land forces, and Admiral Watson in command of the naval armament. Clive came out to India thirteen years before, at the age of eighteen, in the civil service, but having a turn for military life, he soon distinguished himself as a soldier, and had been appointed governor of Fort St. David. Nine hundred English infantry, and fifteen hundred sepoy (native soldiers) composed the army which sailed to punish a prince with more subjects and larger revenues than the King of Prussia. At this time the Nabob was revelling in fancied security, at his capital, Moorshadabad. It had never occurred to him that the English would dare to invade his dominions.

Clive, with his usual vigor, after reaching Bengal, routed the garrison of Fort William, recovered Calcutta, stormed and sacked Hoogley, a post of great trade and wealth. The Nabob on learning this, was greatly enraged, and ordered his army to march immediately to Calcutta, and punish the English. And he reached within half a mile of Clive's forces, near Hoogley, on Feb. 2, 1757, with an army of 40,000; but when he saw the resolute front which the English presented, he fell back, and consented to make peace with them on their own terms. The treaty was no sooner concluded, than he formed new designs against them. He intrigued with the French, who were quite numerous at Chandernagore, on the Hoogley river, above Calcutta. This was well known to Clive, who determined to strike a decided blow by attacking the French at Chandernagore,

before they could obtain assistance from Southern India, or anywhere else. This he did most successfully. The French fort, garrison, artillery, military stores, and nearly 500 French soldiers fell into his hands. This cut off all hope of the Nabob from the French. The Nabob's administration was so bad, that all classes of his subjects were disgusted with him, and a conspiracy was formed against him by a part of his own court. It was to ask the English to assist in deposing him, and placing Meer Jaffier on the throne. The plot was arranged principally by Mr. Watts, the resident of the Company at the Nabob's court, and a Bengali by the name of Omichund. This Omichund had been one of the wealthiest native merchants in Calcutta, and had suffered great losses in consequence of the Nabob's expedition against that place. He had seen much of the English, and was well qualified to act as a medium between them and the Nabob's court, where he had great influence. After everything was ready for action, the plan was nearly defeated by Omichund's cupidity. He had been promised five per cent. on all the money which might be obtained; but not content with that, he demanded a promise in writing, signed by Clive and Watson, guaranteeing to him three millions of rupees more, which, if not complied with, he would discover the whole affair to the Nabob, which would have led to the immediate execution of Mr. Watts, and all concerned in it, at his court. Watts immediately informed Clive of this, who looked upon it as a villanous artifice to extort money, and thought that any artifice to defeat him was justifiable; so he drew up two papers, in one the money was promised, and in the other it was not. And the one in which the money was promised was shown to him, but the other preserved for him. Admiral Watson, being a conscientious man, declined giving his signature to these papers. It was, however, attached by another hand, upon a half-way concession by the Admiral.

Everything now being ready, Clive wrote a letter to the Nabob, charging him with having violated the treaty, and that he had invited the French to join him, &c.; and ended by saying that he was coming in person to submit their differences to the chief men of his court. The Nabob, alarmed by the style of

this letter, as well as by hearing that Clive was advancing with his forces, at once marched down with his army as far as Plassey. On the 17th of June, Clive reached Cutwa, and took the fort. And on the 19th, the rains set in with great violence; and as there was no sign of Meer Jaffier joining him according to agreement, he was in great doubt whether to cross the river, which would bring him near the Nabob's forces or not to cross. He called a council of war, which decided against fighting. Clive at first approved of their decision, but after further weighing the matter, he determined to hazard all and give battle. He clearly saw that if they then yielded, that it would be equivalent to the English giving up Bengal, or that they would be ruined if they attempted to stay. On the 22d, they all crossed the river, and marched on and took up quarters in a mango grove, near Plassey. The Nabob's forces consisted of 15,000 horse, and about 40,000 foot, and Clive's forces of about 3,000 men, about 1,000 only of which were Europeans, the rest were native soldiers. But these European troops were well disciplined, and had efficient officers. Conspicuous in the little army were the men of the 39th regiment, which still bears on its colors, amid many honorable additions—"Won under Wellington in Spain and Gascony,"—the name of "Plassey," and the proud motto, "Primus in Indis."

Clive slept none that night, and at break of day, the 23d, the Nabob's army was in motion to attack the English. The Nabob himself remained in his tent in the rear. The cannonading continued with little effect on the part of the Nabob's forces, but with fearful execution by the English. Meer Jaffier did not engage on either side; but about noon the Nabob's general, who led on his forces, fell—this alarmed the Nabob, who, at the suggestion of Meer Jaffier, ordered his army to fall back, promising that he would lead them to victory the next day. This order decided his fate. Clive at once ordered his troops to advance, and the Nabob's army was completely routed. In an hour, the forces of the Nabob were dispersed, never more to reassemble. Only 500 of the vanquished were slain; but their camp guns, baggage, cattle, wagons, &c., fell into the hands of the English, who lost only 22 soldiers. This, which is known

or, presence of mind in danger, and all the qualities which constitute an eminent warrior. He soon gathered around him a company of freebooters, who asked no pay but the plunder they might collect. When he had become sufficiently strong he seized the throne of the young Rajah of Mysore, whom he pensioned—and assumed the control of affairs, and began to extend the kingdom by conquest. His rapid and vast extension of territory and power began to alarm the other great powers of Southern India. In 1767 the Mahrattas and the Nizam of the Deccan united to resist him. They also invited the English to assist them, which they agreed to do with a small force. Hyder, seeing his danger, succeeded in bribing and buying off the Mahrattas and the Nizam, and engaged the latter to unite with him against the English, who, being unable to meet so large a force, were defeated. The son of Hyder Ali—Tippoo, afterwards the most deadly and fearful enemy the British have ever encountered in India—then only a boy of 17—made a rapid and bold push with 5,000 horse, to the vicinity of Madras. But all of Hyder's forces were eventually driven back, and Madras saved. But Hyder Ali was not content with this partial defeat—he determined to drive the English out of the country, and for this purpose he formed an alliance with the Mahrattas.

About this time the American colonies were struggling for their independence, during which crisis, and consequent upon it, war broke out between England and France, as the latter had assisted the weak colonies in their laudable efforts for freedom. This war between England and France extended to India. The French immediately opened correspondence with Hyder, and united with him against the English—the results of which were most fatal to their own interests in India. Early in June, 1780, after the Mahomedans had offered prayers in the mosque of Seringapatam, Hyder's capital, and the Hindoos had performed the solemn ceremony called *jebbum*, for the success of the proposed expedition, Hyder left his capital with a force of 28,000 cavalry, 15,000 infantry, 4,000 troops, in all 47,000, besides 2,000 rocket men, 5,000 pioneers, and 400 French, and started for Madras, laying the country waste as he went. Meantime

the English concentrated their forces from all parts of the country. Troops were sent down from Bengal by land. The English suffered some defeat at first, before their forces were concentrated. Sir Eyre Coot, governor of Madras, fell upon Hyder's host of over 80,000 with only 7,000 men, and most of them native soldiers, forced his lines, carried his batteries, and gave him a thorough defeat. Hyder leaving more than 3,000 of his force dead upon the field, and raving and tearing his clothes, fled on a fleet horse, and was soon out of sight. But owing to the small force of the English, Hyder took courage, and was more successful—but never regained his great defeat. On the 2d of Dec., 1782, Hyder died. He was one of the most remarkable of Indian adventurers.\* About this time intelligence was received of hostilities between the Dutch and English, and as the former were still numerous in Southern India, it was deemed necessary by the English to reduce Negapatam, their capital, which was accomplished by a detachment of troops, and all the other Dutch settlements in Southern India soon fell with it.

On the death of Hyder, his son, Tippoo, succeeded him, and became one of the most noted characters of India. He was even superior to his father in talent, ambition, and intrigue, and he added to these a fanatical zeal—which his father had not—in the cause of Islamism. The principal mosque now in Calcutta is said to have been built by him, as well as others in all parts of the country. The efforts to resist the invasions of Hyder and Tippoo taxed to the utmost the energies and resources of the Governor-General, Hastings, during the last four years of his stay in India. In 1784 Hastings left India, and his place was filled by the distinguished Lord Cornwallis, who is perhaps better known in the American struggle for independence by his honorable surrender of Yorktown in 1781.

Hastings was graciously received in England by the Crown, and the Court of Directors. Yet, in the next session of Par-

\* Hyder, before his death, began to have a more correct idea of the spirits and resources of his enemy. He said many defeats will not destroy the English,—“I can ruin their resources by land, but I cannot dry up the sea to prevent more coming.”

liament, the Commons resolved to impeach him for his administration in India. His trial lasted nine years, and exhausted all the wealth he had accumulated in that country. It is said that when the eloquent Burke made his famous speech impeaching the administration of Hastings, that Hastings was heard to say at the close of it that he was not aware, before, that he was so guilty. He was finally acquitted, and lived to the advanced age of 86, or till 1818.

Marquis Cornwallis, the second Governor-General, and the first who united to that office that of Commander-in-Chief, was considered an able general, notwithstanding the unsuccessful manner in which he ended the American war. In 1791 he took the field in person in Southern India against Tippoo. He drove him into his capital, Seringapatam, but was unable to take so strong a hold, and returned. But early in January the next year, the English having engaged the Nizam of the Deccan to unite with them, made a more successful attack on Tippoo—they drove him again into his capital, where he was obliged to capitulate and pay nearly three and a half millions of rupees to cover the expense of the war, and yield up half of his dominions to the English and the Nizam, and give two of his sons as hostages for the fulfilment of the treaty. Thus the Tiger of Mysore, as his name indicates, was obliged to yield. By this treaty the English obtained all of his domain on the coast of Malabar, and most of the Carnatic. He was obliged also to restore to the Mahrattas what he had taken from them, so that Tippoo's vast dominions were nearly all divided. Cornwallis left in 1793, and was succeeded by Sir John Shore, who aimed at a pacific administration, but which produced an effect the very reverse of what was expected. The Nizam, and other allies of the English, who had a claim on their protection, were left to their own resources, while Tippoo and the Mahrattas acquired a strength and importance which subsequently rendered them formidable. Shore resigned in 1798, and was succeeded by Marquis Wellesley, whose splendid career in India almost eclipsed those of Clive and Hastings. He was sent with strict orders to pursue a pacific course—the very opposite of what he did pursue. Wellesley, on reaching India, found that Tippoo

was forming an alliance with France against the English in India. At this time the Governor-General had received information that Bonaparte had landed a large army in Egypt. Moreover, as soon as Bonaparte arrived in the valley of the Nile, he dispatched a letter to Tippoo requesting him to send a confidential person to Suez or Cairo to confer with him and concert measures for the liberation of India. This letter was intercepted by the English, and sent to the Governor-General. And in 1799 hostilities were again commenced against Tippoo under the command of general Harris, assisted by Col. Arthur Wellesley, young brother to the Governor-General, and afterwards the Duke of Wellington, who rendered great service in this campaign. During the six years since the treaty was made with Tippoo, he had been strengthening his previously strong fortress at his capital. He had constantly employed on it during the six years 6,000 men, at an immense expense.

Tippoo took the field against the English, but was driven into his stronghold, which evidently he supposed impregnable. It was then besieged for a month, in which 22 British officers, 181 British soldiers, and 119 of the native troops were killed. It was then carried by storm with about 4,000 against Tippoo's forces of 48,000. Tippoo Sultan was killed during the storming of the fort. His body was found disguised, as in an effort to escape, pierced with four wounds, near a dark gateway. Col. Wellesley had a narrow escape. General Sir D. Baird, who had been for nearly four years immured in the gloomy dungeons of that fortress, led the storming party. This made an end of the Hyder Ali dynasty, and of the Mysorean war. Mysore was then entirely at the disposal of the British government, who pensioned the surviving heirs of Tippoo, and placed on the throne an heir of the ancient dynasty, who was found in great poverty. Col. Wellesley was left in charge of the garrison of the fort. The French now began intriguing with the Mahrattas, a powerful and much dreaded race, many of whom had been under the discipline of French officers. Col. Wellesley, at the head of the British, succeeded in conquering the Mahrattas, which established his fame as the greatest general of the age. But he had a most desperate



struggle for it, with forced marches through the hills and jungles of the Mahratta country. He took the fortress of Ahmednager in 1803, and obtained a decisive victory at Assage soon after—in which he met the Mahratta forces, 56,000 strong, with a force of not more than 14,000 men, a considerable part of whom were native troops. He suffered a heavy loss in this battle; he had 409 killed and 1622 wounded. He himself had two horses killed under him, and his orderly's head was shot off by a cannon ball by his side.

This brought the southern part of the extensive Mahratta country under British control. The province of Orissa, which, up to this time, was held by the Mahrattas, now fell into the hands of the English. The most resistance in Orissa was made when taking the fort at Cuttack, in 1803, in which several English officers fell. This completed the British dominion on the eastern coast of India.

During this time, General Lake was engaged with the Mahrattas and their allies in the most northern part of India.\* He took the capital of the ancient Moguls—Delhi—drove back the Mahrattas, and released the old Mogul Rajah, Shah Alum, who was held in confinement by the Mahrattas. He then marched down and took Agra, another important place, and one of the Mogul capitals, and then pursued the enemy and overtook them at a village called Laswaree, where he had a most powerful battle, in which it was estimated that 7,000 of the enemy fell, and 172 of the English, and 652 wounded.

There remained one more stronghold of the enemy—the fort of Gawil-Ghur, one of the strongest fortresses in India, situated on a lofty rock in a range of mountains. But Col. (now Major-General) Wellesley, assisted by Capt. Campbell (afterward Sir Colin Campbell, and now Lord Clyde, and Commander-in-chief of India), reduced this fortress in December, 1803, which

\* The great Mahratta chief in North India, Scindiah, and the powerful Rajah of Berar, had united to resist the English. Scindiah had some able French officers in his employ. Lake, when within six miles of Delhi, met these formidable forces with only 4,500 men, drove them from their defences, and they fled, leaving behind 3,000 or 4,000 killed and wounded. Lake lost about 400 men.

put an end to the Mahratta war, and gave the British the control over the most of Central, and part of Northern, India. But it was found necessary to subdue the Rajah of Bhartpore, who had been an ally of the Mahrattas, and intrenched himself in the strong fortification of Bhartpore. Lord Lake besieged his fortress for three months, and then, in an attempt to carry it by storm, lost 3,000 men. The Rajah, however, sued for mercy, and the war stopped in 1805. At this juncture, Lord Cornwallis returned to India to succeed the Marquis Wellesley. On reaching Calcutta, he at once proceeded to the Upper Provinces to consult with Lake; but his advanced age could not bear the journey; he died on the road, and was buried at Benares.

Major-General Wellesley governed Mysore for five years with great ability. The English now seemed determined to pursue a pacific course, and rather diminish than extend their dominions in India. But this policy they were unable to carry out long, for they were obliged to keep up a defensive war, or abandon the country which they had conquered. However, from this time up to 1823, there was comparatively little war or conquest on the side of the British.

In 1823, when Lord Amherst was Governor-General, the Burmese war broke out, which lasted nearly three years, and resulted in the King of Ava ceding to the British the provinces of Arracan, Yeh, Tavoy, Mergui, and Tennasserim. Lord Wm. Bentick became Governor-General in 1828—distinguished himself for his retrenchment policy in reducing the expenses of government—especially in reducing the salaries of government officers, which was not very tasteful to the officers, but acceptable to the home authorities. In 1833, Parliament renewed the East India Company's Charter for twenty years, but somewhat modified it.

In 1836 Lord Auckland became Governor-General; and his administration was distinguished by two important events. The first was war with China. Many of the Chinese people indulge in the evil practice of opium eating. The Emperor saw its bad effect upon his people, and, in order to stop it, put a heavy duty on the importation of the drug. English merchants, disregard-

ing the interdict, smuggled opium into the country. Large quantities of the prohibited article were in this way introduced—and when their cargoes were seized by the revenue officers, the owners resisted, and were backed by the East India Company, much to its discredit. The reason for doing it is very obvious, as India supplies the drug, and it is a source of immense revenue, not only in China, but in India, where the natives are much addicted to the use of it, and where it has long been producing its most deleterious effect. Its effect upon the Chinese is said to be much worse than on the Hindoos, because they smoke it instead of eating it. All attempts to settle the opium trade affairs with the Chinese government failed, and in 1840, the English declared war against China. A force was sent from India, consisting of sepoys and Europeans, under the command of Sir Hugh Gough. A series of operations followed, in which the Chinese were always beaten, though greatly out-numbering British troops. Several towns were stormed, and Sir Hugh was about to march on Nankin, when the Emperor sent to propose an accommodation. A treaty was signed, by which the Chinese agreed to pay twenty-one million dollars, to give up the port of Hong Kong to the English, and open four other ports for trade with the world. This treaty was made in 1842.

And still further to the disgrace of the East India Company and England, the contraband trade in opium with China has been kept up unto the present day, and protected by a British fleet. And reports up to a somewhat recent date have shown that the English were realizing for this worse than useless drug nearly five million pounds sterling, which was impoverishing China to enrich India and England.

The second and great event in Lord Auckland's administration was the Afghanistan war—a war pronounced at once untimely, unnecessary, and most calamitous, and which won for the British arms the greatest disgrace they have ever sustained in the East.

A revolution occurred at Cabul, and its Chief, Shah Suja, with whom the British government had been in communication, was driven from his throne. He took refuge in the Company's

territories, where he was liberally provided for. A rumor that Russia was about to take the part of the new ruler of Cabul, and through him attack India, led the British authorities to wish to reinstate Shah Suja, and for this purpose a large force was sent that long distance, and through unfriendly countries, where they suffered immensely for want of supplies. But at length they reached the noted city of Ghizni, in 1839, which they took by storm, and then they proceeded to Cabul, which they took with ease, as the chief fled. They reinstated Shah Suja, and about 5,000 men were left to guard him, and the rest returned. They remained there until 1841, when they were nearly all, excepting the officers, massacred by the treacherous Afghans. Sir W. Macnoughton, the political agent and envoy at Cabul, was assassinated by the hand of Akbar-Khan, the aspiring chief of Cabul, while in conference with him.

In 1842 Lord Auckland was succeeded by Lord Ellenborough, who immediately on his arrival in India determined to humble the Afghans, and avenge the death of so many Englishmen. A large force was sent for that purpose, through upper India. The first serious obstacle this army met was at the far-famed Khyber Pass. This tremendous defile through the high range of mountains which separates India from Afghanistan, was defended by about 10,000 brave mountaineers, thoroughly skilled in this kind of warfare. The British troops were obliged to scale the precipitous heights on the right and left, and dislodge the enemy before they could pass. And between this pass and Cabul were several other formidable passes, well defended by the enemy, which they were obliged to force. At the Tezeen pass, they met Akbar the chief, (who aspired to the throne of Cabul, and who assassinated the British Envoy at Cabul—Sir W. Macnoughton)—with a force of 16,000 men. But they were routed by the British forces, after a severe contest. They then pressed on for Cabul, which, after a long and toilsome march, they reached on Sept. 16, where they hoisted the British colors, and sang the anthem of "God save the Queen."

Akbar, on seeing the British so victorious, dispatched all the English prisoners in his possession to Turkestan,

where they were to be either thrown into dungeons or given as slaves to the principal chiefs. The British succeeded in recovering all of them, among whom were over thirty commissioned and twenty-eight non-commissioned officers, besides a number of ladies. No further operations were undertaken against the enemy, who had fled to Turkestan, and, as winter was approaching, the British thought it best to immediately return to India—not, however, before they had shown resentment by destroying the great bazaar erected by Aurungezebe, and estimated the most spacious edifice and chief seat of trade in Central Asia,—it being 600 feet long, and containing 2000 shops—and where had been exposed to public insult the remains of the late Envoy.

Immediately on the close of the Afghan war, the Sindh war broke out, which called into the field Sir Charles Napier, to subdue the Amirs of Sindh. His first engagement with them was near their capital, Hyderabad, where they had posted 22,000 men, and his force was only 3,000. The enemy had a large body of Beloochees, of Beloochistan, who fought desperately; but the whole Sindhean army, estimated to have been over 5000, or twenty times that of the British, was routed and driven from the field, with great slaughter. Sir Charles had, soon after, another equally contested battle, before the Sindheans would yield. A few months subsequently, their country was annexed to the British possessions, and Sir Charles Napier was appointed its Governor. The Gwalior war immediately followed the Sindhean, and was quite equal to it, before the Gwalior and Mahrattas would yield to British rule. The British forces in this war were commanded by Sir H. Gough, the Commander-in-Chief of India. At the close of this war, in 1844, Lord Ellenborough was recalled by the Court of Directors, and Sir H. Hardinge succeeded him. He had scarcely been in India a year before the British were plunged into a fearful war with the Sikhs.

The Sikhs, a religious, rather than a political, body originally, had exercised in the Punjab, and over the valley of Cashmere, a divided authority, for some time. Until Runjit Sing, a man of surprising natural talent, but of no education, brought all the

chieftains under his control. And then, taking into his service a good many French and Indian officers, gave discipline and efficiency to his army. And a very fine army it was. The Sikhs were a much superior race, physically, to the inhabitants of the plains. They were large, robust, and brave. His infantry, under French discipline, became very efficient. They had guns of large calibre, and admirably horsed. His cavalry was very numerous. Runjit was too well acquainted with his British neighbors not to stand in fear of them. He often prophesied that the English and his countrymen would fight for the empire of India. But being too fearful of the results, he never allowed anything of the kind in his day, but always adhered to a peaceful policy. Runjit Sing died in 1839. His son succeeded him, but was slain in a tumult—when the widow, an abandoned character, seized the reins of government, as guardian of her child, an infant. Anarchy began to manifest itself. The army, freed from the restraining hand of Runjit, insisted on being led against the English, even to Calcutta, fancying they could expel them.

In 1845, Sir H. Gough, the Commander-in-Chief of India, was in Simla, where he was able to observe what was going on among the Sikhs, and accordingly prepared for it. The Sikhs first attacked the British in December, 1845, near Ferozepore, or between that and Ludiana. The whole force under Sir H. Gough amounted to 11,000, while the Sikhs were estimated at 30,000. The Sikhs were repulsed with serious loss, and 17 of their guns taken; but the British learned in this battle that they had no trifling enemy to deal with. They had 215 killed and 657 wounded. The British now brought every available force into the field, and soon another and more desperate battle was fought near Ferozeshoh, where the Sikhs, with an army of from 40,000 to 50,000, had strongly entrenched themselves, and another army of 30,000 lay on the banks of the Sutledj, ready to move to their support. The British, only 14,000 strong, including the native troops, attacked this strongly entrenched body, who possessed an artillery, in front of which the British six-pounders could not show themselves. One of the most successful battles in Indian history followed. The

lines were carried, and the Sikhs, after a hard struggle, fled in great confusion. In 1846 another most desperate battle was fought at Aliwal, on the banks of the Sutledj, when the Sikhs were driven across the river, with immense loss. The whole of their guns were taken, spiked, or sunk in the river. This victory is considered one of the most important ever gained by the British in India, and at the time when the Sikhs were exulting in anticipated victory. This completely overthrew their schemes, and Golob Sing, the successor of Runjit Sing, did not attempt to rally his defeated forces, but opened negotiations with the English. The English, however, it seems, determined on thoroughly humbling and subduing them. The enemy had very strongly entrenched themselves on both sides of the river Sutledj, and notwithstanding their previous defeats, they were determined not to yield.

The 10th of February, twelve days after the victory of Aliwal, was fixed upon for storming the Sikh position, and driving them beyond the river. The English availed themselves of their cover of night to establish themselves within reach of the enemy's entrenchments. The Sikhs were taken by surprise, but soon rallied, and by sunrise the most desperate battle ever fought, perhaps, in India, commenced. At this time both sides had a good supply of large ordnance and ammunition; but by nine o'clock it became evident that the issue of this struggle must be decided by the bayonet. The resistance of the Sikhs was terrible—the deadly fire of their muskets and well-served artillery, mowed down the advancing lines of the British, and compelled them to give way; but rallying, they carried a part of the enemy's batteries. Still the Sikhs stood their ground. No panic seized these hardy warriors. One point after another was forced, still they fought with all the fury of despair. It is said that the scene beggared all description. Never before had British arms been opposed by such determined bravery and skill, as on that day. But they found British valor, nerve, and skill, more than a match for them—they were obliged to give way, not without fearful losses on both sides. Some of the first British officers, who had served at Waterloo, fell—320 British soldiers were killed, and 2083 wounded. The loss of the

Sikhs was not less than 8,000, while they were broken and scattered, without hope of again being able to take the field. This ended the Sikh war. But it has been remarked, that a few such victories would ruin the Indian army. The country of the Sikhs—*i. e.*, Punjaub, (five rivers) was now disposed of by the Governor-General. All on the further, or west side of the Sutledj was added to the British empire—the valley of Cashmere was given to Golob Sing, and the remainder was allowed to the grand-son of Runjit Sing, being yet a child, on whom was imposed a tax to defray the expenses of the war.\* For these services Sir H. Hardinge and Sir H. Gough were raised to the peerage.

In 1848, Lord Hardinge left India, and was succeeded by Lord Dalhousie. During the two years after the conquest of the Punjaub, the Sikhs seemed quiet; and it was anticipated that there would be no more trouble with them, but their spirits were not yet broken. South of Lahore is a large territory by the name of Multan, with a capital of the same name, celebrated of old for its great strength. The inhabitants of Multan are principally Jats, and have long held the province, often asserting their independence. They offered a fierce resistance to the Mahometan invaders of Ghizni in 1026. They now became hostile to the British government, and it was deemed necessary to subdue them. But it was soon discovered that the outbreak at Multan was connected with a conspiracy of the most alarming character at Lahore, among the Sikhs, having for its object the massacre of all the British officers, and the expulsion of all the British troops from the Punjaub. The British marched against Multan with 15,000 British troops, 17,000 allies, and 150 pieces of ordnance, nearly half of which was of the largest calibre. After one of the most obstinate and gallant defences on the part of the enemy ever recorded in the annals of Indian warfare, the city of Multan yielded, in Jan., 1849. Then Lord Gough again took the field against the Sikhs—two severe battles were fought before they would yield. The

\* Dhuleep Sing is the name of the heir of the throne of Runjit, at Lahore. He has since become a Christian, and has visited England where he was during the mutiny in 1857.



first, the Chillianwallah battle, was without any decisive result,—the second and decisive battle of Guzerat put a final end to the Sikh war in 1849. It was now confidently asserted that the wars of the British empire in India had ceased, and that attention would be devoted to internal improvements—railways and telegraphs were now projected. But early in 1852, the British government was again plunged into war with Burmah, the details of which need not be recounted. It resulted in adding another portion of Burmah to the British dominions in the East, before the close of 1852—greatly humbling the court of Ava, and extending British rule over a large part of Burmah—a boon devoutly desired by all who felt any interest in the spread of the gospel in that promising field of missionary effort.

#### *Annexation of Oude.*

This is a large, important, and very ancient territory, on the northern frontier of Bengal. It was independent, and was to India what Switzerland was to Germany—the home of a large part of the Bengal native army. It formerly belonged to the great Mogul empire, and since that broke to pieces, has been under the misrule of Mahometan chiefs, subject to much internal anarchy and oppression. Early in 1856 it became the scene of great internal commotion between the Mahometans and Hindoos, growing out of their religious differences. The imbecile old king was unable to restore order, and the British government was obliged to interfere, and do it for him. It was, however, found necessary to depose him, in order to accomplish this object, and about the last act of Lord Dalhousie before leaving India in February or March of 1856, was to annex Oude to the British possessions, under the express sanction of the Court of Directors, and the English Cabinet.

Lord Canning immediately succeeded Lord Dalhousie in his long and successful rule in India. He at once disbanded 44,000 of the rajah's troops, and incorporated the rest with the British troops, but did not disarm the people, or dismantle a single fort. In addition to this, three English regiments were sent from Oude to the Crimea. He also intro-



companies, which makes the largest and loudest guarantees in payment of the smallest per centage. Most persons dislike the trouble and responsibility of studying hard in order to find a true and safe faith. They want all their severe thought and hard work in the worldly sphere;—the time required to weigh moral evidence and deduce the proper code of practical life, they prefer to use in laying plans for money making, and in other ways advancing their own immediate personal interests. Romanism gratifies this tendency, and offers this relief. She has a creed already formed, endorsed by ancient councils, defended by bulls and edicts and anathemas, with supplements and addenda promised as fast as they may be needed. The church assumes the responsibility of answering the question: "What is truth?" She asks no man to comprehend her dogmas. He has only to say *Credo* over the schedule, and his salvation is guaranteed. Practical duty is revealed in a sliding scale of demands, and a plain programme of ceremonial performances. A regularly appointed officer takes the exact dimensions of every sin at regular office hours, or at extra times, according to the convenience of the transgressor, and forgiveness is promised whenever the atoning cash is paid over, or the requisite degree of penance is submitted to. Souls long for the repose of faith, instead of its active and heroic struggling; and the Papal church offers it in a form such as that it soothes to unconsciousness or to pleasant dreams, like chloroform. Romanism discourages the asking of questions; she is never pleased at discovering the strong sense of personal responsibility in her adherents; she would have the individual confide in her own asserted ability to take care of all human interests. To every applicant for aid she offers her nostrums of sentiment, always summarily saying, "*Gape, sinner, and swallow.*"

If it be said that the tax laid on the devotees of Romanism, in the form of penance, and contributions, and rituals, is of the very severest sort—much severer than that imposed by the gospel—it is to be promptly replied that all history teaches that human estimation is otherwise. The last thing a man yields to the claim of religion is his heart. Rites, however

numerous or burdensome, are submitted to with comparative cheerfulness, so long as the selfishness of the heart is left untouched. Anything that leaves the character unchanged, and nurtures self-complacency, is welcome, instead of being severe and distasteful. A religion of rituals has always been more popular than a religion of internal purity,—a soul yields its acquisitions much sooner than it yields itself. A Hindoo devotee will be cheerfully swung on the hooks to meet the requirements of a religion he only half believes; but after being fully convinced of the truth of Christianity, he has not enough of the martyr spirit to break the cord of caste, even though promised Christian protection, sympathy and support.

3. The strong assumptions of spiritual jurisdiction, and the control claimed by Romanism over the future destiny of men, constitute another element of great power in the system.

The Papal church claims to be the Divinely appointed exponent of the will and law of Heaven, and the representative of infinite authority. The church is held to be the depository of religious knowledge,—the only earthly mouthpiece of God. She is set to rule in all things spiritual. Her decisions are absolute and final on earth. She legislates alone for the souls of men. Her utterances are claimed as settling the question of human guilt or innocence, and her censures and benedictions measure the moral desert, and anticipate the final awards of the Great Trial. Her excommunications are held to be only the first but decisive steps in the procedure which concludes with the sentence, "Depart," dropping from the lips of the Infinite Arbiter. Whomsoever she blesses, is said to be blessed indeed; and he who incurs her curse would have been less a victim of calamity had he never been born.

Into the unseen world this ghostly church follows the liberated soul, and, standing at the gateway of the purgatory she has created, drives her foes into its awful fires, and releases her favorites, that they may ascend to the celestial sphere. Escape from her presence and freedom from her control are secured only when she has given her consent that the approbated soul be passed over to angelic and Divine tutelage.





