





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1854.

No. II.

Lyman A. Stewart

ART. I.—*Modern Explanations of the Doctrine of Inability.*

The Inability of the Sinner to comply with the Gospel, his inexcusable guilt in not complying with it, and the consistency of these with each other, illustrated, in two discourses on John vi. 44. By John Smalley, D. D. New York: 1811.

THIS little treatise has long been accounted standard among those who attach importance to the distinction between natural and moral inability, which it elaborately explains and vindicates. It is for the most part characterized by candour and good judgment. It clearly and ably sets forth much important truth. If we were to indicate objections to it, we should call in question certain portions of it, which seem to represent the inability of the sinner as being of the same sort as that of a man to perform any outward act, which he is no way unable, but simply indisposed to do. (pp. 10, 11.)

These instances, however, are few, and aside of the main drift of the treatise. The grand principle which it maintains and successfully vindicates, is that men labour under a real inability to obey the gospel; that this inability is moral, and therefore culpable, yet not, for this reason, any the less real and invincible, except by divine grace. A still more material

fault is a mistaken, or defective, or confused view, (we hardly can say which) of the nature of sinful blindness and spiritual illumination. (pp. 42 et seq.) Just views on this subject are obviously necessary to any clear and complete analysis of man's inability. With these abatements, many important things are said, and well said, in these sermons, by the author, who was among the most judicious and weighty of the circle commonly known as the New England divines. He protested ably and earnestly against the extravaganzas of Emmons. He contributed largely to give the distinction of natural and moral inability that prominence which it has had in American theology.

The peculiar prominence which this distinction has obtained among us, has given rise and currency to opinions in relation to it equally peculiar, especially in certain sections, and among certain theological coteries of this country. It is the boast of those who make the most of it, that it was born into the light, not merely in these United States, but in a province of them, whence it has irradiated our land; or, at all events, that its true import and uses have here first been duly developed; that what is American in it constitutes its value, and is entitled to the support of all good Americans, surely of all loyal New Englanders.

For ourselves, we have long ago learned to distrust, and jealously scrutinize all opinions in theology that are merely national, provincial, or sectional in their origin or prevalence. We look with especial jealousy upon theological provincialisms, in reference to subjects like that in question, which touch the very vitals of Christian experience. In regard to these, all Christians are of necessity, as to all that is essential, illuminated by the Spirit and guided by the word of God. A merely casual, local, and variable type of doctrine, on a subject which enters as an integral element into all our conceptions of sin and grace, has not one chance in a thousand of being true, if it be either opposed to the doctrine steadfastly held by the great body of the people of God of all ages and nations, or if it has been unknown or ignored by the Church as a whole. If a given opinion in relation to this class of subjects, be merely a German, or French, or English, or American opinion,

and that too of recent origin, while it is disowned by the great mass of the saints of all ages and nations, the most formidable presumptions lie against it. That cannot be a part of the faith of God's elect, which is unknown to, or repudiated by God's elect. If it prevail for a while in variable forms among the Christians of some province, or denomination, or party, it is much more likely to prove some casual eddy in the stream of doctrine, deflected for the time by some temporary barrier, out of its true course, than to be in the true current, which has its sources in the Infinite Mind. So far as any views of essential Christian doctrine are local, temporary, provincial, idiosyncratic, they are likely to prove false. Those which have commanded the assent of enlightened Christians as a whole, will survive all occasional opposition or neglect. They are catholic doctrines held by the true Church catholic and universal. The gates of hell shall not prevail against them.

In regard to the subject of the discourses at the head of this article, we suppose that all who come within the outermost verge of evangelical doctrine agree,

1. That man by the fall did not lose any of the faculties or capabilities that are essential to manhood. The essential properties of human nature inhere in every human being, fallen or unfallen, regenerate or unregenerate.

2. That by the fall, human nature, in all of the race, has been corrupted, without being destroyed, and that this corruption infects not the essence of the soul, but only the moral state and working of its faculties and powers.

3. That this corruption of nature involves an inability, of some sort at least, to good, to right moral action, and especially to self-purification or renovation.

4. That this inability is moral, as arising wholly from moral corruption, and pertaining exclusively to our moral nature and state; that it is therefore our sin, and so in the highest sense culpable and worthy of condemnation.

5. That, therefore, this inability is no excuse for the non-performance of any duty for which it disables us, much less for itself, since it is itself the most fundamental, fontal sin.

6. That the only inability which excuses a failure to fulfil any command that would otherwise be binding, is such as dis-

ables for it when the moral state is itself right; and which no degree or perfection of holiness could remove. It is an obstacle or hinderance that would render it impossible, were we as sinless as the man Christ Jesus. Thus it is agreed that a man cannot justly be required to lift a mountain, or a child or idiot to govern a nation with prudence and success; neither can they be properly blamed for failing to do these things. And this for the obvious reason, that were they as holy as Gabriel, they have not the faculties or powers which render it possible.

While this comprehends the substance of that wherein there is agreement, so, justly understood, it comprehends the substance of what is true and important on the subject. But the principal diversities of opinion in respect to it, arise from diverse conceptions of the meaning of those little but important words, "moral" and "sin," and so of the phrases moral corruption, moral inability, moral state, sinful corruption, &c. And here the chief Americanisms in this branch of theology lie.

It is undisputed that, in fallen man, sin is co-extensive with his moral nature; and that if we determine what is properly included in his moral nature, we determine the extent of his sin and moral corruption: or if, starting from his sinfulness, we ascertain its extent, we shall also thus define the limits of his moral nature, and hence the true reach of his moral corruption and inability.

To the question, What is sin? our received translation of the Bible answers, and, as far as it goes, answers right, "sin is the transgression of the law." The original Greek, thus translated, however, answers, Sin is *ανομια*, i. e., lawlessness—which includes not only a positive overleaping of, but a failure to come up to, the law—most exactly rendered in the definition of the Shorter Catechism: "Sin is *any want of conformity unto*, or transgression of the law of God." Nor do we know of any who object to this definition. But one important school of theologians practically ignore it, when they insist that moral quality pertains only to acts done in conscious violation of known law, and in support of this dogma, triumphantly quote the text, "sin is the transgression of the law." It is plain,

that if sin be "any want of conformity to the law," all other questions implicated with this subject depend for solution on this: "What does the law require?" All will agree that the obedience it requires is a moral obedience; and that in the light of its demands, we can surely learn the extent of our non-conformity to it, of our moral corruption, and our inability to keep it. "By the law is the knowledge of sin."

Before proceeding directly to answer this question, it will assist us better to understand the *status quæstionis* for our present purposes, if we just bring to view some of the chief varieties of opinion as to the requirements of that law, which is exceeding broad. For it will be found that this is one of those sources from which the more important divergent currents in theology take their rise. Superficial views of sin and grace, and of the whole circle of Christian doctrine, always involve low conceptions of the divine law, and sooner or later, of God its Author.

A numerous class restrict moral quality and responsibility to acts of the soul committed in view of known law. Of these again, some contend that the only acts which can be sinful or holy, are of the nature of a purpose or determination to pursue a given course or object, formed by a power of choice with a supposed power of contrary choice, and which the soul can therefore make or unmake at any moment. With such theorists, of course, moral inability means simply, that the sinner at present purposes to sin, but may at any instant, when he shall see cause, form a counter purpose, and thus make himself holy. That is, it means nothing at all. It is as clear a misnomer and fraud, as it would be to say that one who can walk, but will not, is unable to walk. Those who adopt this view, hold that the wayward desires and depraved lusts of men are innocent constitutional propensities, void of moral character, except so far as they are sanctioned, or gratified, or fostered by the acts of the faculty of choice and contrary choice just mentioned. This, they say, exclusively constitutes the will and the subject of moral responsibility in man. But there are few who can persuade themselves that no merit or demerit attaches to the desires and preferences of the soul, until they have ripened into deliberate purposes. On

the contrary, they know full well, that all such purposes are prompted by these spontaneous inclinations of the soul, are formed to gratify them, and derive their character from them.

Another and much larger class, therefore, say that the law of God extends to these spontaneous exercises of desire, longing, or preference, with reference to moral objects—whatever the law requires or forbids. They pronounce not merely the purpose to do evil, but the lusting for it, sinful. And they are surely right, according to Scripture, conscience, and the universal and intuitive judgments of mankind. For, says Paul, “I had not known sin, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.” But many who go thus far, restrict all moral quality, and so all sin, to the exercises of the soul. They deny that those states of the soul which dispose it to sinful exercises, whether of desire or purpose, are themselves sinful. At all events, they deny that any innate habits or dispositions, which are not the product of its own exercises, possess this character. Yet, as it is a familiar fact of consciousness, that men cannot at pleasure, by any mere purpose, or fiat of will, reverse the current of their affections and desires, it is evident that moral inability in the mouths of such men, may mean a real inability.

But the Scriptures, and the Christian Church as a whole, take a deeper view of human sinfulness. They pronounce not only the *exercises* of man’s whole optative faculty sinful, but also the innate *moral disposition or habits whence these exercises proceed*. The streams are like the fountain as to their essential quality. It cannot plausibly be denied, that by the words, *flesh, carnal mind, old man, corrupt tree, evil heart, heart of stone*, the sacred writers mean, and the great body of Christians have always meant, something more than an evil choice, or exercise of desire. They signify that native principle or habit of soul, which developes itself in desires, purposes and acts of enmity to God. It is no less certain that they represent what is condemned as sinful in the Bible. The old man is declared “corrupt according to deceitful lusts.” “The tree is known by its fruit,” and hence pronounced “corrupt.” The heart is “evil,” “desperately wicked.” Hence

we are "by nature children of wrath." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." This "fault and corruption of every man's nature" is declared to be sin, which "deserveth God's wrath," by the unanimous voice of the Protestant confessions.

But among those who are agreed thus far, a question still remains, as to the extent and manner in which the intellect is implicated in man's moral state and exercises, and so in his sin and corruption. It has been the common doctrine of the Church, as shown in her confessions, that the whole soul, the heart and the mind, the will and the intellect, the optative, emotional and cognitive faculties are contaminated, and that this corruption pervades his "whole nature." Hence spiritual illumination has ever been held to be a primary element in man's regeneration. But there is a large class of casuists, who contend that no operations or states of the intellect involve any moral character or responsibility, except so far as the products of the will. They divide the soul, as if it were two different entities, one percipient and intelligent, the other elective. To the latter alone, they contend, does moral quality directly pertain. To the former it attaches only mediately, as its state and acts may be produced by the latter. They say that the will first chooses or refuses, the heart first loves or hates an object; and then, in consequence of such love or hatred, the mind sees a corresponding beauty or deformity in it. Hence the perceptions or judgments of the mind, in regard to moral and spiritual objects, have a moral character, not as they determine, but as they are determined by, the will and affections. But there is in reality no ground for such a partition of the human soul. It is not two, but one. It is not in one part corrupt, in another part incorrupt. The will and the intellect cannot be divorced. Every choice and desire supposes a prior apprehension of the qualities of the object chosen or desired. They are but the motions of the soul toward an object which it first sees to be desirable. As in all æsthetic exercises there is a perception of beauty or deformity, attended by a corresponding feeling of pleasure or disgust; so in all moral exercises there is perception of that in moral objects which pleases or displeases, attracts or repels the soul, and so evokes a correspondent

feeling, desire, or purpose. Edwards's great principle is, that "the will is as the greatest apparent good." This cannot be plausibly disputed. Thus, the intellect, heart and will are interblended in all moral acts. This none call in question. The only question is, which takes the lead. This is sufficiently answered, when we say that man is a rational being. He first, at least in the order of nature, sees, then chooses and desires. He does not first desire and choose at haphazard, and then see by virtue of his choice. Such aimless and irrational exercises could have no more of a moral character or accountability, than the most fortuitous motions of an idiot.

But it is strenuously objected, that this view destroys moral responsibility, because it makes the acts of the will dependent upon the perceptions of the intellect. To this we answer, 1. In point of fact the exercises of the will or heart are not independent of the views of the intellect. This every man is taught by his own consciousness. And he knows equally well, that he is responsible for these exercises. If they were unaffected by the perceptions of the mind, they would be irrational, and therefore irresponsible. 2. As we have already said, we do not acknowledge such a division in the human soul, as that one part is pure, the other impure; the moral perceptions holy, the desires and choices resulting from them unholy. The human soul is one thinking, willing substance. The will and heart are somewhat in all moral perceptions. The intellect is somewhat in all desires and choices. Our consciousness teaches us that these are inseparable. We cannot say then, that the cognitive faculties are pure, while the will is the only sinner. But it is the one intelligent and voluntary soul, the whole man, judging, inclining, willing, acting wickedly, that is sinful.

And here we may safely appeal to the decisions of conscience, and the intuitive judgments of the human race. Men not only know that it is impossible to love or choose what is not first seen to be in some respect desirable or lovely, but they fix responsibility and guilt upon perverse moral judgments, with as much certainty as upon any acts of the soul. Any one who is blind to the beauty of moral excellence, in whose view virtue is odious, and vice attractive, mankind inevi-

tably and unavoidably pronounce a bad man. They attach the deepest guilt to all such moral judgments. He who judges prayer fanatical and loathsome, and profanity harmless and pleasant, therein commits foul iniquity. Our responsibility, therefore, for the character of our moral perceptions and judgments, *i. e.*, in reference to things morally good or evil, is past all doubt. As to our knowledge or opinions in regard to things morally indifferent, of whatever kind, that is another affair, and has nothing to do with the subject in hand. The reason why there is guilt in being blind to the excellence and binding nature of moral truths, is the same that renders ignorance of all moral obligation inexcusable. Moral truths shine in their own light, and are their own evidence. If any see them not, they give the most decisive proof of being morally corrupt.

3. But what is still more conclusive evidence of the truth of what we have advanced on this subject, is the uniform current of scriptural teaching in regard to it. One way in which the Holy Spirit sets forth the aversion of men to Christ, is that to their eyes there is "no form, nor comeliness," "no beauty" in him, that they "should desire him." If such is the reason why they have no desire for the one altogether lovely, are they, or are they not, held responsible for it? "Woe to them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness." Light is universally represented as the element of purity, just as darkness is represented as the element of corruption. This is the condemnation of men, that they "love darkness rather than light."

As to the natural blindness of fallen man, there is no subject on which the Scripture is more emphatic. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, * * neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Not that he may not discern much about them. He can see, to a certain extent, their meaning in a speculative sense. But he sees not their most vital part, their moral excellence and spiritual beauty, which alone can attract the heart. The crucifiers of Christ saw everything but the glory of his divine excellence, and therefore they crucified him, not knowing what they did, "for had they known it, they would not have crucified the

Lord of glory." But was not this very ignorance their sin? Under a similar infatuation, Paul verily thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. But because he did it "ignorantly and in unbelief," was he therefore innocent, and in no need of mercy? The sacred writers constantly represent deceit, especially self-deceit, as one of the elements of sin. They tell us of the "deceitfulness of sin," the "deceivableness of unrighteousness," of the "old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts." Is this deceit sinless? "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked."

Corresponding to this sinful blindness, is the work assigned to the Spirit in regeneration. It is just as surely, and just as far a work of illumination, as of purification. It opens our eyes to behold wondrous things out of God's law, to "behold the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." It calls out of darkness into God's marvellous light. It is an unction from the Holy One, whereby we know all things, even the things that are freely given us of God. As it is eternal life to know God and Jesus Christ, so the Spirit in regeneration and sanctification is a "spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of God; the eyes of our understanding being enlightened that we may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power."

An effort is sometimes made to break the overwhelming force of scriptural testimony on these subjects, and to prop the theory, that moral quality attaches only to the optative and not to the cognitive exercises, by reference to the fact, that the Scriptures sometimes ascribe this spiritual blindness and illumination to the heart. This argues, it is said, that the blindness and illumination exist, first, in the perversity or rectitude of the will, and only mediately in the understanding, as that is controlled by the will. In our view, however, it proves just opposite; or rather, it proves that the Scriptures contemplate just what we have insisted on, viz., that there is no dualism in the human soul; that in all exercises of the heart, the action of the intellect is also implied, and that in all the moral per-

ceptions of the intellect, the inclinations, the likes and dislikes of the heart are awakened. The mind perceiving, the heart desiring or choosing, are but one and the same soul perceiving, desiring, and choosing a given object. All its faculties, when exercised with reference to these objects, are implicated with each other. Hence such phraseology as the "thoughts of the heart," and the "desires of the mind," abound in the Bible. "The carnal mind is enmity against God." And in like manner the heart is deceitful. In accordance with this usage, the Scriptures speak of the blindness of the heart, and of the Holy Spirit shining into the heart, of believing with the heart, and of the willing mind.

If the Bible pronounces the mind, it also declares the conscience, "defiled." In truth, conscience is but the mind judging of moral actions or states as right or wrong, guilty or innocent. Though least of all our faculties corrupted by the fall, it is still more or less disordered.

Thus moral defilement pervades the whole inner man in all its parts and faculties; and original sin is no less than the "corruption of his whole nature," whereby he is "indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good."

This "whole nature" of course includes the body itself, so far as it is implicated in our moral state or conduct. That the body is corrupted by the fall, so far as it is made subject to weakness, pain and death, is among the most familiar facts. That it is so united to the soul that they have a powerful, though mysterious, reciprocal influence, is equally evident and familiar. We know that many states of the body are antagonistic to moral and spiritual excellence, and that it is in many respects an organ, or instrument of the soul, in sympathy with it. There are likewise some moral states that pertain more immediately to the body than the soul, although the soul is implicated in them, and so far lends itself to them, as to contract their purity or impurity. Who can doubt this, that remembers that he who looketh on a woman to lust after her hath already committed adultery in his heart? That gluttony and drunkenness are heinous sins, which exclude from the kingdom of God? We are required to yield our members as instruments of righteousness to God, and forbidden to yield them as

instruments of unrighteousness to sin. The corruption which wars against grace, is styled a "law in the members warring against the law of the mind." Of course these scriptural statements are not to be interpreted as metaphysical formulas. They, however, indicate the well known fact that the body, within certain limits, contributes to, or concurs in, our moral states and acts. What we mean to say is, that, so far as it is in this or any other way implicated with our moral being, it partakes, to the full extent, of its corruption, which is a corruption of the whole nature. The eyes are full of adultery, the poison of asps is under the lips, the feet are swift on errands of evil. In its impulses and propensities, it serves the flesh, lusting against the Spirit. And so the process of sanctification reaches "body, soul and spirit," and in pursuing it we are required to "keep the body in subjection," to "mortify the deeds of the body," through the Spirit, that we may live.

If such be the extent of man's moral corruption, pervading his whole nature and defiling all his faculties, inducing blindness of mind, impurity in the affections, perverseness in the will, defilement in the conscience, pollution in the body, so far that it at once inflames and obeys wicked lusts, the question, whether man has ability to deliver himself without grace from this bondage to corruption, answers itself. He cannot. His inability is indeed a moral inability; it consists in and arises from his moral depravation, and from nothing else. It consists not in the want of any natural faculties or outward opportunities for the discharge of his duty. It would vanish if he were holy. But although it be moral, it is none the less real, entire and absolute.

We find that we have virtually answered the question, What does the law of God require? in handling the different views held on the subject, in different quarters. We have thus been led to show in detail what it requires, and that it is exceeding broad. But the fundamental principle of it, as set forth by our Saviour, covers the whole ground. It requires us to love God with all the heart, soul, mind and strength. This surely shows that all the faculties of the soul, intelligent and voluntary, yea, all the powers, the "strength" of our being, that are capable of contributing to, or participating in this affection, or

of obeying its dictates, must be enlisted in the service. We need not say how distant from this are the affections which in fact absorb the whole soul and strength of fallen man.

Nor is the Bible less explicit and manifold in its assertion of the utter inability of corrupt nature to purify itself, and turn to God. "The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh, cannot please God." "No man can come to me, except the Father who hath sent me draw him." These passages so plainly assert an inability beyond the control of the will, that we have often known the advocates of ability try to evade them by the pretext, that they mean simply, that while a man remains a sinner he cannot be a saint. It is a sufficient reply, that the whole Church of God have understood them otherwise, according to their natural obvious import to every mind that has not some counter theory to maintain. This natural import of these words is verified in the consciousness of the Church, and of every man who has a Christian experience. Withal, to ascribe to the Holy Spirit the use of language, to express a senseless tautology and barren truism, which has misled the friends of God in all generations on a fundamental point, savours more of profaneness than of exegesis. But the obvious meaning of these passages is abundantly confirmed by all the representations of the Bible, which show man to be in bondage to sin, spiritually blind, dead in sin, and so requiring to be delivered out of this bondage of corruption, to have his understanding enlightened, to be born again, or raised to spiritual life by the Holy Ghost, by "the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead!"

If all this does not convey the idea of a real inability to holiness in fallen man, then language is incapable of doing it; the Bible, as an attempt to reveal the truth of God to men, is a failure; the Church has been misled by it in a vital point, and infidelity will have new occasion for boasting and exultation. It will not be denied that the creeds of all the great branches of the Christian Church, go at least as far as the Anglican Church, Art. X. "The condition of man after the

fall of Adam, is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God: wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will."

Of course, such a doctrine is in the highest degree unpalatable to the carnal mind. That there should have arisen, in all ages, the most dexterous and persistent efforts to evade or emasculate it, was a matter of course. Plausible objections to it have always been abundant and cheap. But it still remains the faith of the innumerable throng of God's people. If some of them disown it, when arraigned at the bar of their "philosophy falsely so called," they all confess it on their knees before God.

The objections to this doctrine, although variously stated, virtually resolve themselves into this: that men cannot justly be commanded to do, or blamed or punished for not doing, what they are unable to do. How then can a just God require them to repent and exercise faith, and punish them for impenitence and unbelief, if they are unable to obey the command? To this the unanswerable reply is, that they labour under no inability but their sin, and which does not disappear the moment their sin disappears. Nothing is required of them which they could not do, and would not do, if they were morally good. Can sin then be its own excuse, because it perpetuates itself, and disables for its own destruction? If so, there is an end of all blame and guilt. Moreover, this state of the soul, although a bondage, is a willing bondage, which it freely adopts. He who committeth sin, is the servant of sin. Although there may be in some cases a desire to be rid of it, on account of the punishment it incurs, there is a preponderating love of sin in the ruling bias of the soul, so that, if it acts freely, it still cleaves to sin. And herein lies the essence and peculiarity of its bondage. As Augustin says, the soul, is "both bond and free, and bond because free." In other words, the inability is moral, but none the less entire and absolute. And the more complete it is, the deeper is the guilt, for the deeper is the sin. How can it be otherwise? Is

it not the universal judgment of men, that the guilt of sinful propensities increases instead of lessening, in proportion to their strength and obduracy?

It is alleged that it is contrary to the goodness of God to bring men into being with a corrupt character, which they are unable to remove, and to hold them blamable and punishable for it and its workings. It is a sufficient reply to this, so far as our present purpose is concerned, that if sin exists, and in such strength as to be invincible except by divine grace, then it is the universal dictate of conscience, that it is in its own nature culpable and guilty, whatever may have been its origin. The sinful states and acts of free moral agents, are ill-deserving in themselves, whatever influences or agencies may have contributed to produce them. The relation of the Most High to the fall of man and the origin of evil, is another and independent subject, presenting its own problems and methods of solution. But they are aside of the case in hand.

Probably the efforts which many have made to explain or attenuate this doctrine, have been prompted for the most part by a desire to free it from the embarrassment which they suppose it occasions, in exhorting sinners to obey the gospel. They wish to take out of their mouths the stale excuse, "It is useless for us to attempt to do what we cannot do. And if we cannot do it, how are we to blame for not doing it?" This was the leading impulse with Pelagius, whose views and arguments have reappeared in all the assaults made upon the doctrine in later times. Says Neander, "on this principle, and from this point of view, he denied that there was any such thing as a corruption of human nature, which had grown out of the fall. Such a doctrine appeared to him but a *means of encouraging human indolence—a means of excuse supplied to the hands of vicious men.* The question which had from the first occupied the profound mind of Augustin—the question concerning the origin of sin in man—could not be attended with so much difficulty to the more superficial mind of Pelagius. This was no enigma for him; it seemed to him a thing perfectly natural that there should be moral evil. *The necessary condition to the existence of moral good, is the possibility of evil.* Evil and good are alike to be derived from free-

will, which either yields to the seductions of sense, or overcomes it." This single passage contains the radical principles of New-school improvements in theology, and, indeed, of all the arguments we have ever met with, for attenuating or rejecting the doctrines of grace.

As to this complaint, that the doctrine of the sinner's inability arms him with excuses, discourages moral effort, and embarrasses Christian teachers in their instructions and exhortations to the unregenerate, several things are to be said.

1. If a given doctrine is proved true by incontestable evidence, it is no argument against it, that the wicked abuse it to harden themselves in sin. There are few evangelical truths against which this objection will not lie. Certainly it will lie against the doctrines of grace. The pretence of "continuing in sin that grace may abound," is as old as the gospel. A doctrine of grace which the wicked could not "turn into lasciviousness," "wrest to their own destruction," and make "a savour of death unto death," would thereby prove itself not to be the doctrine of the Bible.

2. All facts show that this doctrine is not unfriendly to moral improvement. The saints, the excellent of the earth, have always held, that of themselves they were unable to keep the commands of God. On this basis they have conducted their moral and spiritual culture. They have ceased from themselves and gone to Christ. They have made the most strenuous and successful efforts known among men to advance in holiness. An objection contradicted by all facts must be false.

3. The whole method of evangelical culture proceeds on the principle—not of arousing men to a consciousness of their own goodness, or strength to become good—but of their own corruption, weakness, and utter insufficiency of themselves to do works acceptable to God; and so, of persuading them to look wholly to the grace of God in Christ, that in him they may find righteousness for guilt, holiness for sin, and strength for weakness. It is so far from being true, that men can be stimulated to seek gospel holiness by a consciousness of their own strength, that, in such a state of mind, they cannot comprehend it, much less pursue it. The most that they can do with

such superficial and delusive views, is to disguise their disease. They will never apply the remedy. The whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. They can be strong only in the Lord and the power of his might. And this is possible only when they are sensible of their weakness. It is one great business of the preacher to bring them to this consciousness; the opposite persuasion is fatal to his success. When they are weak, then, and then only, are they strong. Then only is it possible to obey the gospel, or pursue evangelical holiness, when we know full well that we are not sufficient for anything as of ourselves; our sufficiency is of God; that without Christ we can do nothing; through him strengthening us, we can do all things; and so, emptied of self, go to Christ for all—wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. And in this conviction alone shall we render to God due gratitude and honour for our salvation, from first to last; from his first election of us as vessels of mercy, to our final entrance into glory; so that it shall be in all its parts to the praise of the glory of his grace.

Among those who have been led to attenuate or do away the inability of man, by the same practical interest, which prompted Pelagius to deny it entirely, two principal forms of opinion may be found. 1. A large class admit that man's nature is not only corrupted, but disabled, by the fall. But they suppose that such impotence to good, and subjection to condemnation, by nature, implies an obligation on the part of God to repair these effects of the original apostacy. In other words, if there be any meaning in the theory, God is bound to remedy his own injustice; an idea which refutes itself. A great number contend that he does this, by providing the sacrament of baptism, which, by an *opus operatum* efficacy, washes away the guilt of original sin, and implants a germ of spiritual life, which is capable of being developed by the efforts of the person baptized. Thus, potentially at least, man's forfeited power to good is restored. Such, in substance, is the theory of ritualists. To say nothing of the denial of special and sovereign grace involved in this scheme, and of its antagonism to spiritual religion, how does it afford any relief with respect to the unbaptized, if the natural corruption and

impotence of man by the fall, involve any injustice on the part of God? Another and very large class say, that, although human nature is thus fallen into sin, guilt, and moral impotence, yet common grace is given to every man, through the redemption of Christ, by which this disability is removed, and he has full power to make himself holy—many say, perfect. Wide of the truth as these two schemes are, and distempered as are the types of religious life to which they give rise, nevertheless they agree in asserting the native moral corruption and impotence of man, and the impossibility of its removal, except by a supernatural work of grace. This is therefore the catholic doctrine of christendom. They, however, neutralize it, in great part, by the doctrine of universal grace, or grace co-extensive with baptism, a grace, nevertheless, dependent on the will of man for its efficacy. On this system, it is not God, but the Christian, that makes himself to differ from others, and grace is no more grace. Religion becomes superficial, outward, unspiritual; ritualism, formalism, fanaticism, or a graceless, self-righteous morality. Most of these, with other still graver objections, lie against another favourite scheme of many, viz., that God has lowered the demands of his law in accommodation to man's corruption.

The other method of invalidating this great truth, is chiefly American in its origin and prevalence, and has but a slight currency in other parts of christendom. It takes for its first standpoint, that element of truth which is denied by the systems we have just been considering, viz., that whatever be the moral state of fallen man by nature, it is not such as to impeach God's justice, or to impose any obligation upon him to remedy its faults or disabilities. It is not such as lessens man's sin and guilt. It is such, that whatever God does for its removal, is of grace, and not of debt. But then, in order to maintain this position against rationalistic objections, it explains our inability into a species of ability, either plenary, or nearly so. And, of course, the whole doctrine of sin and grace, native corruption and spiritual regeneration, is explained so as to conform to the degree or kind of ability contended for. The essential peculiarity of this system is, not that man's inability to obey the gospel is a moral inability, but that it

lies solely in the will, and is under its control. Even this, however, means more or less, according to what is comprehended under the word *will*. Under the term are sometimes included all the optative powers of the soul, spontaneous and voluntary, whether operating in the form of desire, wish, preference, or purpose. It often has a more restricted sense, which, excluding the affections and inclinations, makes it a mere power of purposing to do or to seek given things which are objects of desire; indeed the executive of our desires. In popular language, the term is used more or less in all these senses. With a numerous class, too, it means not only the power of choosing what the soul pleases, and rejecting its opposite, but also the power of making a contrary choice at the same moment and in precisely the same circumstances, which is not only contrary to all known fact, but a self-contradiction. And still further, when the word *will* is used in the broad sense already mentioned, as including desire, wish, disposition, or affection towards any given object, it sometimes, in loose popular usage, means nothing less than the whole soul consenting to, or embracing that object; including not only the optative faculty which desires it, but the cognitive, which apprehends it as desirable.

All these loose usages of common speech often insinuate themselves into the elaborate arguments of theologians and metaphysicians on these subjects. Hence have been reared many plausible arguments, which are nothing else than gross sophisms, in which the word *will* has one meaning in the premise, and another in the conclusion. Such ambiguities give rise to much logomachy and mutual misunderstanding. And it is very certain that when men say that our inability is purely an inability of will, or heart, every thing depends on the meaning which they attach to these terms, and the theory which they hold concerning the nature and properties of the will. Under this phrascology, every type of doctrine on the subject of ability may be held, and, in fact, has been and is held and propounded, from the strictest Calvinism to the blankest Pelagianism—from the most absolute impotence to the most plenary ability to make ourselves new creatures by the power of contrary choice.

In this connection, the distinction of natural and moral ability and inability has been prominent. It has long been a boast, in certain quarters, that this is the invention and the glory of American theology, that it has enabled us to hold fast the doctrine of inability, and yet so to explain it as to make the sinner inexcusable, and to prevent him from abusing it to purposes of carnal apathy and desperation. This happy result, which the Bible ascribes to the Holy Ghost, is supposed to be accomplished by showing men that they have full *natural* ability to fulfil God's requirements, that they have no inability, but simply a want of will, or purpose, or inclination to obey the gospel, which they have full power to remove, *if they will*. While this language is used by many in a sense which, as explained by themselves, as a close approximation to the truth, at all events coheres with the doctrine, that man has lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; it is used by others to express and vindicate the dogma, that men are perfectly able to make themselves Christians at pleasure. This is Pelagianism, without even a decent disguise. Yet it is this very class who make the most of the distinction in question. They think it a convenient and safe shelter for their doctrine, that man can make himself a new heart. This distinction has been much valued by many divines, whose praise is in all the churches, for orthodoxy, because they held to a real inability to holiness in fallen man. It is surely, then, a safe resort for those who deny it, and yet would not hazard their standing in the ranks of orthodoxy: who assert plenary ability, and call it natural ability, and then say that they teach the moral inability of the sinner, simply because they say he will not use his plenary ability to turn to God!

This class claim that Edwards was the inventor of this distinction; that it is the distinguishing characteristic and special property of his followers; that therefore they are the true Edwardseans, because they are the patrons and inheritors of this, his grand discovery in theology. It can easily be shown, however, 1. that whatever of truth is connected with this distinction, was familiar to theologians, not only before the time of Edwards, but from the time when the heresies of Pelagius

first occasioned thorough discussion of the subject of sin and grace.

2. That Edwards did not regard himself as introducing any novel doctrines or discoveries on the subject. A formerly distinguished champion of New-school doctrines recently said, in a public speech, with great truth, "that the common idea that the power of Edwards's system lies in the distinction of natural and moral ability is a fallacy. This was well understood before his day. It lies in his views of spiritual light which constitute the key to his whole treatise on the Religious Affections." All who have read this treatise, or his sermons on the "Natural Blindness of Men in Religion," and on "The Reality of Spiritual Light," must concede the justness of this statement. The great principle of his work on the Affections is, that "they arise from divine illumination."

3. So far as anything new on this subject has gained currency since his day, it is not true, unless the views which we have taken of the subject are false.

4. However the doctrine of spiritual illumination may have been weakened or vitiated by confining all depravity and moral quality to the will and affections, on the part of any claiming to be Edwards's successors, they intended by moral inability, a real inability, removable, not by any power of contrary choice, as is now claimed, not by "the will of the flesh, or the will of man, but of God." The precise point in the recent vaunted improvements in theology is, the discovery that this inability being moral, is therefore removable by the will, and so enables us to say to sinners, without qualification, they have all requisite power to obey the gospel. And since even the power of contrary choice, yea, if it be able to act "despite all opposing power," cannot, when choosing sin, under the sway of such a choice, also choose God, a process has been invented, by which it may be induced, from motives of self-love, to suspend its sinful purpose, and having thus become neutral, may, by the promptings of the same self-love, be induced to choose religion!

The amount of truth contained in the proposition, that man is naturally able, but morally unable, to obey God's commands, may be thus stated:—1. Man is really unable to do things

spiritually good, without divine grace. But this inability is moral, because it pertains to our moral nature. It does not excuse, because it is our sin, and the greater it is, the greater is our sin. 2. This corruption and inability do not destroy any of the faculties of will, affection, or intelligence, which are essential to humanity, moral agency, or responsibility. They only vitiate the state and action of those faculties with reference to things moral and spiritual. All power remains which would be requisite to the fulfilment of God's commands, if we were holy. Any hinderance, or want of power or opportunity, which would prevent us from fulfilling any command of God, if we were morally good, excuses the non-performance of it, and this alone. So far, then, as the assertion that we have natural ability is intended to express the fact that we have no disability but our sin, or that is excusable, it expresses an important truth. So far as it is used, or is adapted to convey the idea that we have ability to remove our sinful corruption, without the prevenient and efficacious grace of God, or that our inability, though moral, is such that we can remove it by the strength of our own will, or that it is not by nature, it contains a dangerous error. It is not only contrary to Scripture and all Christian experience, but it is inconceivable that any state or act of the unregenerate will of man should make him a holy being. The corrupt tree cannot bring forth such good fruit. Nay, as all Christians find to their sorrow, they cannot, although partially sanctified, by any power of their wills, exclude all corruption from their souls. The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, so that they *cannot* do the things that they *would*. When they *would* do good, evil is present with them. Though they love the law of God after the inward man, they have a law in their members warring against the law of their minds. How, then, is this indwelling corruption, having the entire mastery of the sinner, removable by his will? And does the phrase "natural ability," according to its natural import, fairly express, or rather, does it not express more than the truth, in regard to the power of the sinner? Is it not, unless carefully explained, adapted to mislead him? That cannot properly be called ability to do things spiritually good, to purify our corrupt natures, which is not adequate to pro-

duce the result. Man has not such an ability, whatever adjectives we affix to the word. He has only the faculties which would enable him to do his duty, if he were holy. Is it not best, in plain terms, to say so? Have we a right to do otherwise than speak the truth in love?

In conclusion, we ask the attention of our readers to a few quotations from recognized authorities, in proof of the several propositions we have just advanced, to the effect, that what is true on this subject is not new, and what is new is not true.

1. Bernard, whom Calvin represents as subscribing to what was said by Augustine, and whom he quotes with approbation, thus expresses his views: "In a perverse and wonderful way, which I do not understand, the will imposes a necessity upon itself, being changed by sin for the worse, so that this necessity (since it is voluntary) cannot excuse the will, nor can the will, inasmuch as it is enticed, exclude necessity in its actions." "So the soul, in a certain marvellous and evil manner, is held under a sort of voluntary and badly free necessity as both bond and free; bond by reason of the necessity; free on account of the voluntariness which characterizes it. And what is more marvellous and more miserable, it is guilty because it is free; under bondage because guilty; and by this means in bondage, because it is free."* He abundantly sets forth the distinction between "necessity and compulsion," asserting the former, denying the latter, and showing that his bondage and necessity are free and unforced; that he means simply to assert the *unavoidable certainty of sinful action*, if there be free action in unrenewed man.

Turretin.—"A new heart is said to be produced in us by regeneration, not in a physical, but moral sense, because the same substance which was infected with sin must needs be rectified by grace. Nor if it be said that we must put off the *old man* and put on the *new man*, is anything more intended

* Bernard as quoted in Calvin's Inst. Lib. ii. Cap. iii. Sec. 5: "Ita nescio quo pravo et miro modo ipsa sibi voluntas, peccato quidem in deterius mutata, necessitatem facit, ut nec necessitas (quum voluntaria sit) excusare valeat voluntatem, nec voluntas (quum sit illecta) excludere necessitatem."

"Ita anima quodam et malo modo sub hac voluntaria quadam ac male libera necessitate et ancilla tenetur ac libera; ancilla propter necessitatem, libera propter voluntatem, et, quod magis mirum magisque miserum est, ideo rea quod libera: eoque ancilla quo rea: ac pro hoc, eo ancilla quo libera."

than that the corruption of sin, which in a moral sense is called the *old man*, because it descends from the old Adam, is to be cast off from the man, in order that the work of regeneration, which is signified by the *new man*, may be begun and carried forward. The same is to be said of other phrases denoting sin or grace derived from the substance of man itself; which are taken in a moral, not a physical sense, nor so much in the abstract as the concrete, for the purpose of more emphatically expressing the greatness of our corruption.* This passage occurs in an argument upon the question, whether original sin has corrupted the substance of the soul, which he, of course, denies. He elsewhere says, indeed, † that regeneration “partakes somewhat of the moral and the physical.” “It is not merely moral, as if God operated only by setting truth objectively before us, and by a slight suasive influence, as the Pelagians pretend.” “It is not merely physical, because it is wrought with respect to the moral faculties, which must needs be moved agreeably to their own nature.” “It has a physical character, because God creates, regenerates us by his Spirit,” &c. “It has a moral character, because he teaches us by his word, inclines, persuades, and by various reasons, as by chains of love, draws us to himself.” That is, it is moral as it is wrought upon a moral subject, producing moral results, in the free choice of Christ, and from rational motives. It is physical, as it is more than a moral suasive influence, acting directly upon the heart or dispositions, and so changing them that they will be swayed by the arguments and motives of the gospel. This also will serve for a key to the meaning of Owen and others when they call regeneration, in a certain sense, a physical change. They mean simply, that it is something more than a change wrought by moral suasion—a supernatural

* Elench. Loc. IX. Quæst. xi. Sec. 5. *Novum cor dicitur fieri in nobis per regenerationem, non physice, sed ethice, quia eadem substantia quæ infecta fuit peccato, debet restaurari per gratiam. Nec si exuendus dicitur *vetus homo*, et *novus induendus*, aliud innuitur, quàm corruptionem peccati, quæ moraliter *vetus homo* dicitur, quia a veteri Adamo descendit, esse abjiciendam ab homine, ut opus regenerationis, quod per *novum hominem* significatur, inchoetur et promoveatur. Idem dicendum de aliis phrasibus peccatum vel gratiam connotantibus, ab ipsa hominis substantia petitis; quæ sumuntur *ethice*, non *physice*, nec tam in abstracto, quam in concreto, ad magnitudinem corruptionis nostræ eo efficacius exprimentam.*

† Loc. XV. Quæst. iv. Sec. 18.

change wrought directly on the heart itself by the Holy Spirit effectually disposing it freely and sweetly to yield to evangelical persuasions, which otherwise it would repel. But as to the clearness with which Turretin saw and taught that our corruption was *moral*, pertaining to the moral state and dispositions, and not any corruption of the substance of the soul, or destruction or diminution of its essential faculties, there cannot be the shadow of a doubt.

Pietet, (edition of Presb. Board, p. 200.)—"But this impotence of the sinner does not excuse him in sinning, since it is not *involuntary* and merely *physical*, arising from a defect of natural power, but *voluntary* and *moral*, arising from a depraved nature. To say that man can do nothing but what is evil, is the same as saying, that man is so delighted with sin, that he is unwilling to cease from it. * * * God therefore justly punishes those whose impotence is such as this." This needs no comment.

Owen.—"Some pretend, that whatever is required of us, or prescribed unto us in the way of duty, that we have a power in and of ourselves to perform. If by this power, they intend no more, but that our minds, and other rational faculties of our souls, are fit and meet as to their *natural capacity*, for and unto such acts, it is freely granted. For God requires nothing of us but what must be acted in our minds and wills, and which they are naturally meet and suited for. But if they intend such an active power and ability, as being excited by the motives proposed unto us, can of itself answer the commands of God in a due manner, they deny the corruption of our nature by the entrance of sin, and render the grace of God useless, as shall be demonstrated." (*Works*. London edition, 1823, Vol. II. p. 302.)

"There is a *natural power*, consisting in the suitability and proportionableness of the *faculties* of the soul, to receive spiritual things in the way that they are proposed unto us. This is supposed in all the exhortations, promises, precepts, and threatenings of the gospel. For in vain would they be proposed to us, had we not rational minds and understandings," &c. (*Id.* p. 301.)

"There is in the minds of unregenerate persons a *moral*

impotency, which is reflected on them greatly from the will and affections, whence the mind never *will receive* spiritual things; that is, it will always and unchangeably reject and refuse them, and that because of various lusts, corruptions, and prejudices, invincibly fixed in them, causing them to look on them as foolishness." (*Owen's Works*, vol. II. p. 309.)

Owen also asserts, in addition to this, a *natural impotency*, consisting in the want of spiritual light for the saving apprehension of spiritual things, "whence his mind cannot receive them for want of light in itself." As we have already intimated, the view taken of spiritual illumination will of necessity modify the view taken of natural and moral inability. Upon this subject we have said enough already. It will suffice for our present object, to quote another passage from Owen, showing that, while, for the purpose of distinguishing it from mere wilfulness, he called it, in a certain sense, a natural impotency, yet he, after all, so explains himself, as not to militate against the kind and degree of natural ability he had previously asserted, nor to take it out of the category of moral inability, as generally explained by divines. "And this (natural impotency) *is consistent with what was before declared, the natural power of the mind to receive spiritual things*; for that power respects the natural capacity of the faculties of our minds; this impotency, the *depravation of them with respect to spiritual things*." (*Id.* p. 309.) We might quote more to the like effect from Bates, Watts, and others; but it would be tiresome to accumulate further what is already before our readers *ex abundantî*, viz., proof that the distinction in question, so far as it has truth in it, was always a familiar one among divines of the Augustinian school.

Edwards treats of natural and moral necessity and inability as terms already established and in use to denote certain recognized distinctions, which he proceeds to define at length in Section iv. of his *Treatise on the Will*. He says, (New York edition of his *Works*, Vol. II., pp. 33—35,) "I do not mean to determine that, when a *moral* habit or motive is so strong, that the act of the will infallibly follows, this is not owing to the *nature of things*. But *natural* and *moral* are the terms by which these two kinds of necessity have usually been

distinguished; and they must be distinguished by some names, for there is a difference between them that is very important in its consequences. This difference, however, does not lie so much in the nature of the *connection*, as in the nature of the two terms *connected*. The cause with which the effect is connected is of a peculiar kind; viz., that which is of a moral nature; either some previous habitual disposition, or some motive exhibited to the understanding. And the effect is also of a particular kind; being likewise of a moral nature, consisting in some inclination or volition of the soul, or voluntary action."

"*What has been said of natural and moral necessity, may serve to show what is intended by natural and moral inability.* We are said to be *naturally* unable to do a thing, when we cannot do it, if we will, because what is most commonly called *nature* does not allow of it, or because of some impeding obstacle or defect that is extrinsic to the will; either in the faculty of understanding, constitution of the body, or external objects. *Moral* inability consists not in any of these things; but either in the want of inclination, or the strength of a contrary inclination, or the *want of sufficient motives* IN VIEW to excite or induce the act of the will, or the strength of apparent motives to the contrary. Or both these may be resolved into one; and it may be said in one word, that moral inability consists in the opposition or want of inclination. For when a person is unable to will or choose such a thing through a defect of motives, or prevalence of contrary motives, it is the same thing as his being unable through the want of an inclination, or the prevalence of a contrary inclination, in such circumstances, and UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF SUCH VIEWS."

Edwards thus dwells upon the distinction between natural and moral necessity and inability, as a thing which had been understood in discussions of this sort. He no more treats it as a novelty, than he treats the distinction between external and internal motives as a novelty. And the view of it which he presents is essentially one with that given by his predecessors.

We now propose to show that by moral inability Edwards and his followers meant a real inability, invincible by the sinner, and by any other power, except the Spirit of God. The

citations already made sufficiently evince this with regard to Edwards. We will, however, add another, which is, if possible, still more decisive as to this point. In his concluding chapter, on the *Freedom of the Will*, he goes through a summation of the principal Christian doctrines, which are confirmed by the views he had maintained on the subject. He says:

“The things which have been said obviate some of the chief objections of the *Arminians* against *the total depravity and corruption of man’s nature*, whereby his heart is wholly under the power of sin, and he is *utterly unable*, without the interposition of sovereign grace, savingly to love God, believe in Christ, or do anything that is truly good and acceptable in God’s sight.”

Smalley.—“*Moral inability* consists only in the want of heart, or disposition, or will to do a thing. *Natural inability*, on the other hand, consists in, or arises from, want of understanding, bodily strength, opportunity, or *whatever may prevent* our doing a thing when we are willing, and strongly enough disposed or inclined to do it.” p. 9.

After proceeding to illustrate this moral inability by the cases of God and Satan, the one morally unable to do wrong, and the other to do right, he says, p. 12—“Should we be afraid to say it is *impossible* for a man to love God or come to Christ while his heart is altogether wicked and full of enmity against God and Christ, people would be ready to think we imagined this might sometimes happen, and that there was no real impossibility in it of any kind. Whereas there is as real and as absolute an impossibility in this case, as in any supposable case whatever. To be more guarded, therefore, than the Scripture is, in this matter, would be to be unguarded.” p. 12.

As to the alleged ability to remove this moral inability by the power of self-determination or of contrary choice, he says: “Should we ever suppose a self-determining power in the will, those who are dead in sin would not be able to help themselves by it. For who is there to put such a power into action in the right way? They will not do it. And a self-determined determination, contrary to a man’s heart, were such a thing

possible, would be no more thanks to him, than the having his heart changed by divine power." p. 34.

"In these discourses, under moral inability to that which is good, is meant to be included all that impotency which consists in moral depravity; whether in principle or exercise, whether in privation, that is, the want of moral rectitude only, or in any positive lusts and corruptions, and whether native or contracted, whether removable by moral suasion, or not without a new creation." p. 60.

It will be difficult to mistake Smalley's views after viewing these extracts from a formal and thorough treatise on the subject by him. And no one has ranked higher than he as an acknowledged and able expounder of the true New England doctrine on the subject.

We will now cite a little from Andrew Fuller, as one who was confessedly more thoroughly moulded by Edwards than any other leading English divine.

"If the definition which I have heretofore given of natural ability be just, it (natural inability) must be either a defect in the rational faculties or bodily powers, or opportunity to put these faculties and powers in exercise. But neither purity nor impurity, come by them how we may, are any constituent parts of human nature. A defect, therefore, in that matter cannot be a natural defect. * * By the *sin of our nature* we mean not any thing which belongs to our nature as human, but what is by the fall so interwoven with it, as if it were, though in fact it is not, a part of it; and so deeply rooted in our souls as to become *natural* as it were to us." (*Works*, Boston edition, 1833, pp. 485, 6.)

"We suppose that the propensities of mankind to evil are so strong as to become invincible to every thing but omnipotent grace." (*Ib.* p. 486.)

"It is *natural* power, and that only, that is properly so called, and which is necessary to render men accountable beings. To constitute me an accountable being, it is not necessary that I should be *actually disposed* to holy actions, (which is the same thing as possessing a moral ability,) but barely that *I could do such actions if I were disposed.*" (*Id.* p. 523.)

We will not weary our readers by adding quotations from other divines of the Edwardean and New England schools. Beyond all question, Smalley and Fuller are fair representatives of these schools, and acknowledged to be among the most elaborate, successful, and reliable advocates and expounders of their views on the distinction under consideration. As to the school of Emmons, as they held that all moral exercises in man, holy and sinful, were the direct creation of the Almighty, they of course denied that holiness could be produced by man, of himself alone.

Similar sentiments abound in Bellamy and Dwight. It is sufficiently evident that, until a very recent period, those who have maintained the distinction of natural and moral inability, have intended by it not that the former meant a real, the latter a merely nominal or unreal inability; and so, inasmuch as man is subject only to the latter, that he has all the ability requisite to render obedience to the law of God really practicable without grace. They meant not an indisposition which it is at any moment in man's competency to remove by the power of contrary choice. They meant by it no mere act of such a power, which it is at any moment all powerful to reverse. They meant a rooted propensity to evil, and aversion to good; a moral bias, which man has not the requisite power to remove. To say that he could remove it if he were disposed to do it, is but saying he would remove it if he would remove it; he would be disposed if he were disposed; he would have moral ability if he had moral ability, the precise thing that he has not, and never will have till it is imparted by the Holy Ghost. As Fuller says, "this is no more than the power of being what they are." But it surely cannot avail to make them what they are not. Without this right disposition, mere natural power, as it is termed, the possession of the faculties requisite to humanity and free agency, can never renew or purify the evil heart. They fix responsibility. They make men guilty for their sins. They make it certain that so surely as the wicked man acts freely, he will sin, and sin only. But they never can make corrupt man a new creature in Christ Jesus.

John Swan Plummer.

ART. II.—*Is the Church of Rome Idolatrous?*

IDOLATRY consists in ascribing to creatures properties or honours which belong to God alone. Dr. Wiseman says it “is the giving to man or to anything created, that homage, that adoration, and that worship, which God hath reserved unto himself.” The question now to be considered is, whether the Church of Rome is guilty of this sin. We allege that she does openly, habitually, and systematically, give to creatures honours due to none but God, and so is guilty of idolatry. This is indeed a grave charge. No good man can make it without sorrow of heart. It is grievous to a pure mind to believe such things, unless compelled by an overwhelming weight of evidence. We ask our readers to weigh the evidence in the case, and judge righteous judgment. Charity rejoiceth in the truth.

In proof that the Church of Rome gives to creatures honours due to God alone, we may cite the titles and powers ascribed to the pope. In a great Lateran Council, one member called the pope “Prince of the world;” another, “king of kings, and monarch of the earth;” another said of him that “he had power above all powers of heaven and earth.” Bishop Newton says: “He is styled, and pleased to be styled, ‘Our Lord God the Pope, Another God upon earth, King of kings, and Lord of lords.’ The same is the dominion of God and the pope. The power of the pope is greater than all created power, and extends itself to things celestial, terrestrial, and infernal. The pope doth whatsoever he listeth, even things unlawful, and is more than God.” Bellarmine says: “If the pope could or should so far err as to command the practice of vice, and to forbid virtuous actions, the Church were bound to believe vices to be good, and virtues to be bad.” Nor was Bellarmine censured for this language. On the contrary, he was always a great favourite at Rome. If the pope receives such honours as these from his Church, is he not “that wicked one,” who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God?”

2 Thess. ii. 4. It is confessed that when a man calls a graven image a god, and does it seriously, he is guilty of idolatry. The pope is a worm of the dust, and if papal authors, such as Baronius, may be trusted, many popes have been monsters of depravity; yet these men, crushed before the moth, allow themselves to be styled God, our Lord God, &c. Is not this idolatry? In England it is treason to assume the king's titles; and is it not rebellion to arrogate the titles of the God of heaven?

But this idolatry does not stop here. In his turn the pope himself gives to a creature honours and worship peculiar to God. Hear pope Gregory XVI., who has not been dead many years. In his first Encyclical Letter, addressed to all patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, and printed in the Laity's Directory for 1833, and in various ways published all over this land, without one word of warning from any priest of Rome against its shocking idolatry, the pope calls upon all the clergy to implore "that she (the Virgin Mary) who has been, through every great calamity, our Patroness and Protectress, may watch over us writing to you, and lead our mind by her heavenly influence, to those counsels which may prove most salutary to Christ's flock." Could he, in this matter, have sought more from God himself? From the Scriptures we learn that He whose eyes never slumber nor sleep is a present help in trouble; but here the pope says that Mary is "our protectress through every great calamity." Could Jehovah himself do more than is here ascribed to a woman? He adds: "But that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most Blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of our hope." Surely this is plain. Whoever maintains truth by destroying heresies, whoever is our *greatest* hope, yea, the *entire ground* of our hope, is to us a God. What pious man ever put higher honour upon Jehovah himself than by making him his *greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of his hope?* Thus we have seen what idolatry is, with permission of the pope, paid to him, and what idolatry is, without her permission, paid to the mother of our Lord.

It is not therefore strange that in popish books of devotion,

Mary is called upon more frequently than the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. In the Catholic Manual, published by Fielding Lucas, a popish bookseller still living in Baltimore, with the approbation of Archbishop Whitfield, we find on pp. 38 and 39 the following language in the Confiteor: "I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary, ever Virgin, to blessed Michael the archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and to all the saints, that I have sinned," &c. How diverse from this was the practice of holy men of old! Daniel said: "O Lord, the great and dreadful God . . . we have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts, and from thy judgments." Chap. ix. ver. 4, 5. Addressing God, David said: "I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight." Ps. xxxii. 5, and li. 4. Ezra says: "I fell upon my knees, and spread out my hands unto the Lord my God; and said, O my God, I am ashamed, and blush to lift up my face to thee, my God: for our iniquities have increased over our head, and our trespass is grown up unto the heavens. . . . O Lord God of Israel, thou art righteous: for we remain yet escaped, as it is this day: behold, we are before thee in our trespasses; for we cannot stand before thee, because of this." Chap. ix. 5, 6, 15. The publican prayed, "God be merciful to me a sinner," and went down justified. Romanists say their religion is older than ours, but in no good sense is this true; for ours agrees with that of Daniel, and David, and Ezra, and the penitent publican. These all lived before any pope, and they confessed their sins to God alone, and did not address angels and men, in their solemn acknowledgments of their wickedness.

Having finished the confession of sin, a Christian would have thought that the application should have been first and alone to God. That was the course pursued by all Bible saints. But in the Catholic Manual it is different. There we read thus: "Therefore, I beseech the blessed Mary, ever Virgin, the blessed Michael the archangel, the blessed John the

Baptist, the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints, to pray unto the Lord our God for me." Who could have believed that in this age and land men were thus taught, if the evidence was not before the world? Then follow two short petitions to God, and then comes the following invocation: "O Holy Virgin, mother of God! my advocate and patroness! pray for thy poor servant, and show thyself a mother to me." In the Doway Bible we read, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Just." 1 John ii. 1. This is the Scripture doctrine. But the devotee of popery is taught to call Mary his advocate. Jesus Christ taught us to pray to our *Father* which is in heaven, but when did God ever direct us to pray to our *Mother* in heaven, and to ask her to show herself such to us? The inspired writers never teach such idolatry as that. How can the Romish religion be older than ours, when ours agrees with the Lord's Prayer, and with the teachings of the beloved John? Jesus Christ the righteous is our sole, able, willing, prevailing advocate with God. To name another is an indignity to him—an attempt to take away the glory from his crown, the honour of his Mediatorship.

The next thing in the Manual is in these words: "And thou, O blessed Spirit!" The word *Spirit* begins with a capital letter, and is followed by a note of admiration. One would have supposed that the being here addressed was the Spirit infinite, eternal, unchangeable. But it is not so. "And thou, O blessed Spirit! whom God in his mercy hath appointed to watch over me, intercede for me this day, that I may not stray from the path of virtue." If any ask the meaning of this, he may look back a little, and he will see it is an invocation of "your angel guardian." The words next following are addressed to "your patron saint." "Thou also, O happy Spirit, whose name I bear, pray for me, that I may serve God faithfully in this life," &c. In the Doway Bible, acknowledged by Romanists to be correct, we read thus: "There is one God, and one Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus." The Vulgate is no less explicit: "Unus enim Deus, unus et Mediator Dei et hominum, homo Christus Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5. There is no legitimate way of expounding this passage that does not make its teachings as direct and strong

against a plurality of mediators, as it is against a plurality of Gods. If the words teach that there is but one God, they as explicitly teach that there is but one Mediator. Yet in the Manual, men are taught to call upon creatures, an angel, or a saint, to make intercession in heaven, the very highest work of Christ's priestly office, and thus is the one Mediator superseded, and his honours divided among a countless multitude of creatures. To rob Christ of this high honour is as wicked as to rob God of the glory of creating and preserving the world.

In the Doway Bible (Heb. iv. 15, 16) are these words: "We have not an high-priest, who cannot have compassion on our infirmities: but one tempted in all things like as we are, yet without sin. Let us go therefore with confidence to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace in seasonable aid." This reasoning is as strong as it can be. We have a tender-hearted intercessor at the throne above; therefore we need not be afraid to come boldly. Thanks be unto God, who has taught us this best, this only way. Does it look like coming "*with confidence*," to stand off, and cry to Mary, to Michael, to John the Baptist, to Peter and Paul, to a guardian angel of whose very name we are ignorant, and to a patron saint whose name we bear, and ask them to intercede for us? Where is there distrust in the fulness and sufficiency of the work of Christ as intercessor, if it be not in going to this long list of mediators? It does seem strange; it must be wicked to cry to Paul, when he has so strongly recommended "looking to Jesus," or, as the Doway Bible has it, "looking on Jesus," and when he has told us to "flee for refuge to the hope set before us in the gospel." In Heb. vii. 25, in the Doway Bible, we read concerning this same Jesus, that "He is able to save for ever them that come unto God by himself, always living to make intercession for us." If we are to come unto God by Christ *himself*, then we are not to come by his *mother*, nor by one of his *apostles*, nor by an *angel*, nor by any one else. Blessed be God, that when Jesus was yet with us on earth, he said, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No man cometh to the Father, but by me." John xiv. 6. "All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me:"

[not to my mother, nor to the saints,] “and him that cometh to *me*, *I* will in no wise cast out.” John vi. 37. “Amen, amen, I say to you, *I* am the door of the sheep.” “*I* am the the door: if any one enter by *me*, he shall be saved; and he shall go in, and go out, and shall find pasture.” “Amen, amen, I say to you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber.” John x. 1, 7, 9. All these are the very words of the Doway Bible. Are they not clear? Should they not deter us from all attempts to approach God but through Jesus Christ alone?

It is but fair to say, that after all this invocation of a woman, of angels, and men, the Manual gives “the Litany to the holy name of Jesus,” but in the “Confiteor” his mother is addressed *three times before* him. So also in the Manual p. 44, are these words in *italics*: “*A prayer to the blessed Virgin;*” and under that prayer are these words: “*A prayer to invoke the life of Jesus Christ into ourselves.*” Here again the mother takes precedence of her Son, the Son of God. In this prayer to the Virgin are these words: “O Holy Mother of God, deliver us from all dangers.” As a Protector and Redeemer, could God himself do more than to “deliver us from all dangers?” To those who use and love this Manual, is not Mary put before God himself, before the *one* Mediator of God and men?

On the 45th page of the Manual is an address to Mary, in which she is styled, the “Bright Queen of Heaven.” The title “Queen of Heaven” is found in Scripture, but not applied to Mary. See Jeremiah xlv. 17, 25, 26. The whole connection is alarming. God there declares his displeasure against the people for “making vows to the Queen of Heaven.” In the Doway Bible is a note saying, that by the Queen of Heaven is meant the moon. Grant it; but Mary is as truly a creature as is the moon, and it is as dishonourable to God that we should pray to her, as that we should make vows to the moon. On the 46th page of the Manual we find this address to Mary: “O Holy Mother, my Sovereign Queen.” We all know that there is no power higher than a sovereign power. The heart over which any creature is sovereign, can-

not call Christ Lord, cannot esteem Jehovah as the only Judge of all the earth. Let us read further: "Receive me under thy blessed patronage, and special protection, and into the bosom of thy mercy, this day, and every day, and at the hour of my death. I recommend to thee my soul and body. I commit to thy care all my hopes and comforts, all my afflictions and miseries, my life and my death, that by thy intercession, and through thy merits, all my actions may be directed and disposed according to thy will and the will of thy blessed Son. Amen." We solemnly declare, that in our lives we never read a more idolatrous prayer, nor could we frame any sentences of the same length that should more effectually ascribe the whole of salvation, in life and in death, to the protection, mercy, care, intercession, and merits of a creature; for all these words are used. Christ, as man, never offered higher honour and worship to God than when in death he said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Luke xxiii. 46. Christ in glory never received higher honour or worship from a holy martyr, than when dying Stephen said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Yet, in the Manual, all this honour and all this worship are offered to Mary. If any doubt, let them again read the prayer just quoted. In this Manual, Mary is called upon page after page. In one litany (pp. 51—53) she is invoked *forty-seven* times, and the three persons of the Trinity but *nineteen* times.

On page 56 of the Manual are these directions for going to sleep: "Compose yourself to rest in the arms of your Saviour, piously invoking the names of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph." Here the entire "holy family" are "piously invoked." On pp. 101, 104, and 109, devotion to the Blessed Virgin is put down among the preservatives and remedies against sin. And on p. 103 she is thus addressed; "Thou art the Mother of grace and mercy, thou art the refuge of sinners." The Bible says that God is the FATHER of mercies, but it is silent about any MOTHER of grace and mercy. To be the Father of mercies, is to be their original and fountain. Is Mary the original and fountain of mercy? How very different are the teachings of Rome from those of Isaiah, (xxxii. 1, 2,) "Behold, a King [not a Queen] shall reign in righteousness. . . . and a man

[not a woman, but a man, the man Christ Jesus] shall be as a hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest, as rivers of water, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." Could a wider, a more striking difference between truth and error, true worship and idolatry, be found, than that between the Catholic Manual and the teachings of holy Scripture?

Nor is this shocking idolatry confined to one book of devotion in use among Romanists. In all that are in our possession, new and old, European and American, the same glaring error is found. One of the most favourite books of devotion among Papists is entitled "The Glories of Mary, Mother of God," &c. Its author is St. Alphonsus Liguori, who was canonized less than *forty* years ago. Our copy was published by Eugene Cumiskey, of Philadelphia, and is approved by Dr. Kenrick, then Bishop of Philadelphia, now Archbishop of Baltimore. The translator dedicates the work to Mary, "the Queen of angels and of men," "with all veneration and respect," and says it is "designed to increase the number and fervour of her clients." The table of contents is as follows: "Chapter I. How great should be our confidence in Mary, *Queen of mercy*. How great our confidence should be in Mary as our Mother. Mary is the refuge of repentant sinners. Chapter II. Mary is our life, since she obtains us the pardon of our sins. Mary is our life, because she obtains our perseverance. Mary renders death sweet to her servants. Chapter III. Mary is the hope of all the children of Adam. Mary is the hope of the sinner. Chapter IV. Mary's readiness to assist those who invoke her. The power of Mary to defend those who invoke her in temptations. Chapter V. Necessity of Mary's intercession in order to obtain salvation. Continuation of the same subject. Chapter VI. Mary is a powerful advocate. Mary is a compassionate advocate. Mary is Mediatrix of peace between God and sinners. Chapter VII. Mary is ever watchful to succour our miseries. Chapter VIII. Mary preserves her servants from hell. Mary succours her servants in purgatory. Mary conducts her servants to heaven. Chapter IX. The greatness of Mary's clemency and goodness. Chapter X. The sweetness of the holy name of Mary in life

and in death." Some tables of contents give but a poor idea of the book. Not so here. The filling up of these chapters in sections corresponding to each sentence above given, fully carries out all the idolatrous sentiments suggested by reading the contents. Indeed, the book abounds in stories and interpretations of the most idolatrous type. Yet this book is one of the most popular of the day, we mean, among Romanists.

Another book of devotion in general use in this country and elsewhere among Romanists, is the Ursuline Manual. It is published by Dunigan, and sent out by authority of Bishop Hughes.

On page 64 we read as follows:

"O happy Mary! chosen to be
The Mother of grace and clemency,
Protect us now; and at the hour of death,
O bear to heaven our parting breath. Amen.

Holy Mary, Mother of God,	}	Pray for us.
St. Joseph,		
St. Patrick,		
St. Augustine,		
St. Charles,		
St. Angela,		

St. Ursula and all your holy companions, all you angels and saints of God, *make intercession for us.*"

On p. 186 are these words: "Mother of God! Mother of Mercy! and Refuge of sinners! intercede for me." Just after: "Holy angel, to whose care I am committed, do not leave me, now that I so particularly require your charitable assistance." Indeed, what devotional book in this corrupt communion does not teach the same idolatrous practices? In the Catholic Manual, p. 188, it is said: "The psalters now in use among devout Christians are three. The first, David's, which contains thrice fifty psalms. The second is that of our Blessed Lady, commonly called the rosary, or beads, composed of thrice fifty Hail Marys. The third is the psalter or invocation of Jesus." Here the psalter of Mary is put before that of Jesus Christ. In the psalter of the Virgin, as given by some, we find the last two psalms of David thus thrown into parody, and applied to Mary instead of Jehovah:

“Sing unto our Lady a new song; let her praise be in the congregation of the just,” &c. Again: “Praise our Lady in her holiness, praise her in her virtues and miracles; praise her, ye choirs of patriarchs and prophets; praise her, ye army of martyrs; praise her, ye crowds of doctors and confessors; praise her, ye company of virgins and chaste ones; praise her, ye orders of monks and anchorites; let every thing that hath breath praise our Lady;” and in that form of devotion, which, it is audaciously pretended, was revealed by an angel to St. Bernard, offering worship to many members of her body, we find these among other words: “Adoro et benedico beatissimos pedes tuos.” I adore and bless thy most blessed feet.

The worship of saints and angels in the Church of Rome has for centuries fixed the mark of idolatry upon her. Thus, in the “Collects and Hymns to the Saints,” published in 1520, we find such petitions as the following: “May the holy assembly of the angels, and the illustrious troop of the archangels, now blot out our sins, by granting to us the glory of heaven. . . . O George, renowned martyr In our soul and inmost heart we beseech thee, that with all the faithful, we, being washed from our sins, may be joined to the citizens of heaven: that so, together with thee, we may joyfully be in glory, and that our lips with glory may render praises to Christ. O martyr Christopher, make us to be in mind worthy of the love of God. . . . O William, thou good shepherd, father, and patron of the clergy, cleanse us in our agony; grant us aid; remove the filthiness of our life, and grant the joys of a celestial crown. . . . O ye eleven thousand glorious maids, roses of martyrdom, defend me in life, by affording to me your assistance; and show yourselves to me in death, by bringing the last consolation.”

Well has it been said, that “as in the ancient heathen mythology, there were gods who presided over particular countries and districts, and gods who presided over particular trades and professions, so it is in the calendar of popish saints. We are all familiar with St. George of England, St. Andrew of Scotland, St. Patrick of Ireland; and in like manner we have St. Sebastian of Portugal, St. James of Spain, St. Denis of France, St. Ambrose of Milan, St. Barbara of Ger-

many, and St. Mark of Venice; again, St. Luke is the patron of painters, St. Catherine of scholars, St. Austin of divines, St. Ivo of lawyers, St. Crispin of shoemakers, St. Magdalen and St. Afro of prostitutes; St. Anthony has the charge of swine, St. Eulogius of horses, St. Vendeline and St. Gallus of geese and sheep."

The effect of this state of corruption is manifest in all papal countries. Even pirates and robbers are often great worshippers of the saints. In Graham's "Three Months' Residence in the Mountains East of Rome," pp. 155 and 161, we read: "Every robber had a silver heart, containing a picture of the Madonna and child, suspended by a red ribbon to his neck, and fastened with another of the same colour to his side. . . . They talked pretty freely with their prisoners about themselves and their habits of life, which they maintained arose from necessity, rather than choice. They showed them the heart and picture of the Madonna, which each had suspended from his neck, saying, 'We know that we are likely to die a violent death, but in our hour of need we have these,' touching their rifles, 'to struggle for our lives with, and this,' kissing the image of the Virgin, 'to make our death easy.'"

All this is sometimes acknowledged by the priesthood itself. In his "Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome," pp. 104, 105, Seymour tells us of the defence given to himself by one of their learned men. He said: "The feeling of devotion to the Virgin has a mysterious something in it, that will ever linger about the heart of the man who has ever felt it. It is one of those feelings that, once admitted, can never afterward be totally obliterated. There it still clings around the heart; and though there may be coldness to all other religious impressions; though there may be infidelity or even scorn upon all our faith; though there may be the plunging into the wild vortex of every sin, yet still there will not unfrequently be found, even among the very worst of our people, a lingering feeling of devotion to the blessed Virgin. It is as a little thread that still keeps hold of the soul, and it will yet draw him back. All else may be broken, but this thread, by which the blessed Virgin holds him, still clings to his soul. Even in the most wild, wicked, and desperate men—even among the bandits in

their worst state—there is always retained this devotion to Mary.” How strange, that men do not see that adoration, which allows men to give their lives to murderous wickedness, can be of no avail! When Mary and sin may both be loved and served at the same time, how can it be good and wholesome to call upon her?

But besides ascribing titles and powers to the pope, which belong to none but God, and worshipping saints and angels without number, giving a woman great prominence therein, Romanists go further, and render to the cross the worship which is due to God alone. Bossuet admits that Thomas Aquinas says that the cross is to be worshipped with *Latria*. The Roman Pontifical expressly says, that “*Latria* is due to the cross.” The Missal enjoins on clergy and laity, “on bended knee to adore the cross.” In the mean time the whole choir sing, “Thy cross, O Lord, we adore.” Again, “O venerable cross, that hast brought salvation to the wretched, by what praise shall I extol thee?” In the service for Good Friday in the Roman Missal, a hymn to be sung to the cross is given. It begins thus:

“O Crux, ave spes unica,
Auge piis justitiam,
Reisque dona veniam.”

“O Cross, hail thou only hope. Increase righteousness to the pious. Give pardon to the guilty.”

The Church of Rome also requires the worship of the elements in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, or in the mass. The Council of Trent expressly says: “There is, therefore, no room to doubt that all the faithful in Christ are bound to venerate this most holy sacrament, and to render thereto the worship of *Latria*, which is due to the true God, according to the custom always observed in the Catholic Church. Neither is it to be less adored, because it was instituted by Christ our Lord, as has been stated.” Here is the very highest authority of the Church of Rome on the subject. The very highest worship [*latriæ cultum*] which is due to God, [*qui vero Deo debetur*], is to be rendered to the sacrament of the Eucharist. That Papists carry out this decree, none will dispute. Accordingly the people prostrate themselves when the host is elevated

or carried in procession. To justify all this, Trent teaches and Romanists believe, that the bread and wine are converted into the body and blood, the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, thus maintaining idolatry by the grossest absurdity—an absurdity which contradicts the testimony of four senses—for our sight, our taste, our smell, our feeling, all declare that these elements are still bread and wine, and nothing else. Thus Rome requires that a wheaten cake and the juice of the grape are to be worshipped with the very worship which we offer to God, and that under the most fearful anathema.

The Church of Rome is also guilty of idolatry in worshipping the relics, images, and pictures of saints, and images and pictures of Christ, and pictures of the Trinity. The Council of Trent enjoins the invocation of saints, teaches that to ask them to pray for us is not “idolatry,” “nor opposed to the honour of Jesus Christ,” nor “contrary to the word of God.” It strongly condemns those “who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of the saints.” It further teaches “that the images of Christ, of the Virgin, mother of God, and of other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in churches, and due honour and veneration paid to them,” and that “great advantages are derived from all sacred images.” Sir Edward Coke informs us, that in England at one time, when Popery swayed that land, a law was passed, “that any persons who affirm images ought not to be worshipped, be holden in strong prison until they take an oath and swear to worship images.” In all countries where Romanism is established, the devotees are found kneeling or prostrating themselves before images. This is notorious. Even in the United States, Romanists have used a picture of the Trinity. There is now before us a printed engraving, copied from an original painting, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the Virgin Mary. This picture was recently, and no doubt still is, in the Jesuits’ College at Georgetown, District of Columbia. That it is not slander or fiction thus to assert, is proved by the certificates of the artist who sketched the copy of it, and by three clergymen, all of whom are still living, and two of whom still reside in Washington, District of Columbia. The

whole account of this shocking idolatry was published in the Protestant Vindicator of November 22, 1843.

All this is according to the teaching of the great doctors of the Church of Rome. Peter Dens discusses the question, "Are images of God and of the Most Holy Trinity proper?" He replies, "Yes; although this is not so certain as concerning the images of Christ and the saints, as this was determined at a later period.

"But it is to be observed that the divinity cannot be depicted, but those forms are depicted, under which God has sometimes appeared, or to which divine attributes are paid in some similitude; thus God THE FATHER is represented under the form of an old man, because (Dan. vii. 9) we read that he appeared thus: *And the ancient of days sat*; and the Holy Ghost under the form of a dove, because he appeared thus, (Matt. iii. 16): *He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove*; or under the form of cloven tongues, such as he appeared on the day of Pentecost, (Acts ii. 3): *And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, as it were, of fire*. Therefore, images of this kind are not to be painted according to any one's will, but only under those forms in which they have sometimes appeared."

He afterwards discusses the question, "With what worship are the images of Christ and the saints to be worshipped?" He replies, "It is to be premised, with St. Thom. in corp. that images may be regarded in a two-fold manner.

"I. In so far as they are any thing or certain matter, any gold, or sculptured or painted wood; and in this respect they cannot be honoured.

"II. In so much as they are images or representations of Christ or the saints; and in this respect they may be honoured with relative or respective worship; so, doubtless, that they may not be honoured for the sake of a dignity intrinsic in themselves, but on account of the dignity of the prototype or pattern; and consequently the honour shown to an image redounds to the prototype as the formal reason of the worship, although the object which the representing image itself is, is not the reason why it is worshipped.

"III. Therefore St. Thomas replies to the question, that

images may be honoured with the same worship with which their prototype is honoured, but only with a relative or respective worship; therefore, the images of the saints are worshipped with the respective worship of *dulia*; of the Divine Virgin with the relative worship of *hyperdulia*; and of Christ and of God with the respective worship of *latria*; almost just as if by the same virtue we love God and our neighbour on account of the goodness of God in himself."

He then notices the decrees of the Seventh Synod against offering the worship of *latria* to images, and attempts some explanation, and thus concludes: "However this may be, it is sufficient for us against sectarians, that all Catholics teach and prove that the images of the saints are to be worshipped."

Nor is it at all a very modern usage to paint the Trinity. Cramp quotes from the "Catechism," p. 360, these words: "To represent the persons of the Holy Trinity by certain forms, under which, as we read in the Old and New Testaments, they deigned to appear, is not to be deemed contrary to religion." He says: "Hence, in the engravings found in some editions of the breviary, God the Father is represented as a venerable old man, (the Ancient of Days, Dan. vii. 13;) on his right hand the Saviour stands, in human form; above is the Holy Spirit, in the shape of a dove; at a little distance the Virgin Mary," &c.

We doubt not the feelings of pious men must be greatly shocked at the recital of such forms and figures used in the worship of Him, who is a Spirit, and requires that he be worshipped in spirit and in truth. Against all such practices the word of God is clear and explicit. Here are the very words of the Holy Ghost. In Deut. iv. 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, Moses says, "And the LORD spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice. . . . Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves, (for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb, out of the midst of the fire): lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female, the likeness of any beast that is on the earth, the likeness of any winged fowl that flieth in the air, the likeness

of any thing that creepeth on the ground, the likeness of any fish that is in the waters beneath the earth." Clearer, stronger, more specific prohibitions to represent Jehovah, or any person of the Trinity, by statues or paintings, could not be well conceived.

In this worship of images may be found the secret of the opposition of Romanists, especially of the priesthood, to the second commandment. Their hostility is so great, that in their catechisms they often omit it altogether, so that their children are often not taught to say, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them, for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." This is found in Exodus xx. 4—6. Romish catechisms, published in purely Roman Catholic countries, seldom contain it. It is frequently omitted in catechisms published in this country. We recently saw two such. The editor of the *Comprehensive Commentary* says that he has in his possession a Latin, an Irish, and an English catechism, in each of which the second commandment is omitted. But even where the second commandment is given, it is put as a part of the first, and not as the second commandment. In this country, and in England, of late years, the catechisms are more apt to contain the words of the second commandment. This is quite a desirable improvement. Yet in none do we find it stated that it is wicked to bow down to images, or to prostrate ourselves before them.

Of course, any visible representation of the true God is forbidden by the second commandment. To represent God by the figure of an old man, is to make for religious use the likeness of something that is on the earth, and so is forbidden. Isaiah denounces all visible representations of God as utterly inadequate and impossible. After an appeal to the works of nature, as showing the greatness of God, he says, "To whom will ye liken God, or what likeness will ye compare unto him?"

Isa. xl. 18; and then the prophet proceeds to describe the making of an idol, or graven image, (the word is the same as in Exod. xx. 4,) out of metal or wood, as a futile and ridiculous effort to represent God. After another sublime appeal to nature, God says, ver. 25, "To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal, saith the Lord?"

That Protestants give the right translation to the word rendered "bow down" in Exod. xx. 5, is most evident to a scholar. Even the Doway Bible elsewhere renders the word in the same way. In like manner, the word "serve" is properly given in our translation, as the Doway Bible admits, by using the same word. The only question is, what did a pious intelligent Jew understand by serving an idol? Calling upon it, making offerings to it, praying to it, trusting in it, prostrating himself before it, &c., were infallible signs of service.

The attempt to set aside the clear teachings of the second commandment by a note in the Doway Bible, is a mere contradiction of the text. The note says, "All such images or likenesses are forbidden by this commandment, as are made to be *adored* and *served*; according to that which immediately follows, *thou shalt not adore them nor serve them*. That is, all such as are designed for *idols, or image gods*, or are worshipped with *divine honour*. But otherwise, images, pictures, or representations, even in the house of God, and in the very sanctuary, so far from being forbidden, are expressly authorized by the word of God." In proof of this, reference is made to Exodus xxv. 15, and xxxviii. 7. What the staves or bars of satin wood, or the rings in the ark, have to do with image-worship, requires more ingenuity to discover than we possess. The other texts cited are Num. xxi. 8, 9, where the brazen serpent is spoken of, and 1 Chron. xxviii. 18, 19, and 2 Chron. iii. 10, where the cherubim are spoken of. But as these were never designed as objects of worship, and are never called by the same name as the graven images mentioned in Exod. xx. 4, it is obvious that no verse cited in the note has the slightest reference to the subject of image-worship.

The foregoing proofs of the idolatry of the worship of the church of Rome could easily have been multiplied fifty-fold. But we will not weary our readers. Yet something more

should be said concerning the idolatrous nature of the invocations, bowings, and worshippings, in the cases already stated. Papists themselves acknowledge that the pagan invocation of demons was idolatry. These demons were commonly dead men. And who are the saints in the Calendar? Commonly dead men and women. Where is the difference? The Pagan prayed to dead men. The Papist prays to dead men and women. The Romanist may say, I call upon *holy* creatures, whereas the Pagan called upon wicked ones. To this it is sufficient to reply that a *holy* creature is still a *creature*, and therefore it is idolatry to give divine honours to such. It is as truly idolatry to worship a holy as a fallen angel, a man saved as a man lost. Worshipping and serving the creature rather than the Creator is the great sin. To prove that all whose names are in the Calendar are holy beings, or that they all are or ever were in existence, is simply impossible. As to some of them, we know that they were regenerated, pardoned, justified, and glorified. Such were Joseph, Mary, John the Baptist, Paul, and Peter. Until the day of final judgment, we cannot *know* that any man is saved, unless God's word says so, or unless we are admitted to heaven, and see him there.

No one is canonized at Rome until he has been dead a long time, during which a superstitious people may conjure up any kind or amount of legend. The evidence on which the title to saintship is made to rest, is in many cases, of the slenderest kind. We may indeed entertain very strong hopes concerning the salvation of those who have led apparently pious lives on earth. But till God shall pronounce upon their characters, either by revealing to us on earth that they are saved, or by admitting us to glory, or by the sentence of the last day, how can we be sure that they are in glory? Therefore, there is danger that in invoking the saints in the Calendar, men may be calling on those who are not in heaven, never were there, and never shall be there. Nor is this fear uncharitable. Every one acquainted with the history of canonization, knows that nothing enters more largely into the claims of any one to that distinction, than reputation for miracles. Even if these miracles were genuine, they would not prove saintship. Christ himself said, "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord,

have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name have cast out devils, and in thy name have done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Matt. vii. 22, 23. Men may be prophets and yet not saints. They may cast devils out of others, and let pride and malice reign in their own hearts. They may work miracles, and yet work iniquity, and so perish in their sins. Balaam's prophecies were as true and as sublime as those of Moses, and there is as much evidence that before Christ's death Judas wrought miracles, as that any other disciple of Jesus did; yet neither Protestants nor Romanists believe that Balaam was a holy man, nor that Judas has gone home to glory. "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord."

But some of those named in the Calendar cannot by any possibility be proved ever to have existed. No mortal can prove that there ever was such a person as St. Veronica. The course of reasoning by which such a thing should be attempted, would as well suit to establish the wildest fancies of heathen mythology. In his letter from Rome, Conyers Middleton gives the following account of the fabulous personage named above: "They pretend to show us at Rome two original impressions of our Saviour's face on two different handkerchiefs; the one sent a present by himself to Agbarus, Prince of Edessa, who by letter had desired a picture of him; the other given by him, at the time of his execution, to a saint or holy woman, Veronica, upon a handkerchief, which she had lent him to wipe his face on that occasion; both which handkerchiefs are still preserved, as they affirm, and now kept with the utmost reverence; the first in St. Silvester's church; the second in St. Peter's; where in honour of this sacred relic, there is a fine altar built by pope Urban VIII., with the statue of Veronica herself, with the following inscription:

SALVATORIS IMAGINEM VERONICÆ
SUDARIO EXCEPTAM
UT LOCI MAJESTAS DECENTER
CUSTODIRET URBANUS VIII.
PONT. MAX.
MARMOREUM SIGNUM
ET ALTARE ADDIDIT CONDITORIUM
EXTRUXIT ET ORNAVIT.

“There is a prayer in their book of offices, ordered by the rubric, to be addressed to this sacred and miraculous picture, in the following terms: ‘Conduct us, O thou blessed figure, to our proper home, where we may behold the pure face of Christ.’

“But notwithstanding the authority of this pope, and his inscription, this VERONICA, as one of their best authors has shown, like Amphibolus, before mentioned, was not any real person, but the name given to the picture itself by old writers who mention it; being formed by blundering and confounding the words VERA ICON, or true image, the title inscribed perhaps, or given originally to the handkerchief, by the first contrivers of the imposture.” And he quotes Mabill. Iter. Ital. p. 88, as saying, “Hæc Christi imago a recentioribus Veronicæ dicitur: imaginem ipsam veteres Veronicam appellabant.”

But suppose all the saints named in the Calendar were in heaven, and we knew it, what then? If they are in heaven, they are not upon earth, and how can they hear, or help, or see, or save us? “Cease from man, whose breath is in his nostrils.” Isa. ii. 22. If even a living man can give us no effectual aid, what can the dead do? If these saints are holy, they are yet finite. God’s people, when glorified, are still creatures, and possess not the attributes of Jehovah. For instance, they are not omnipresent. If they were here upon earth, no one of them could be in Rome, Vienna, Calcutta, Lima, Mexico, and Montreal, at the same time. If they are in heaven, they cannot at the same time be on earth. Such ubiquity belongs to but one being, the infinite, eternal, uncreated God. Therefore, to say or do anything which implies that the saints, like God, are or can be present everywhere, is to ascribe to them one of the incommunicable perfections of Jehovah, and that is idolatry.

Their knowledge is also limited. No finite creature (and all creatures are finite) could, even if upon earth, know all the wants, and fears, and sorrows of all the pious in the church militant. Nor is it more possible for them in heaven to know these things. Mary would need to have millions of ears and of understandings; she would require the possession of *infinite* intelligence; that is, she must be God, in order to know the

wants and wishes of all who now address her. But unlimited knowledge is one of the highest attributes of the God of heaven. To say, or do, or think anything which ascribes such knowledge to any creature, however exalted, is idolatry.

This praying to saints and begging them to intercede for us is founded upon the presumption that they pity us more tenderly and love us more strongly than the Lord Jesus Christ himself. That such is the tendency of the practice of invoking saints, might naturally be inferred. If the child presents its petition to its father through its mother, it must be because it regards the mother as most inclined to listen to its requests. That such is the actual belief of many Romanists does not admit of a doubt. It is also based on the presumption that God will hear the saints sooner than his Son. A learned priest, holding a high position at Rome, distinctly declared to the Rev. M. H. Seymour, "*that God hears our prayers more quickly when they are offered through the blessed Virgin, than when offered through any one else;*" and that "*even Christ himself was not so willing to hear our prayers, and did not hear them so quickly when offered simply to himself, as when they were offered through the blessed Virgin.*" See "Mornings among the Jesuits," pp. 101, 102, 106, &c. Now the Scriptures teach that Jesus Christ is infinitely condescending and kind, and that it is impossible any should be more compassionate and approachable than this "one Mediator." They say: "Greater love hath no *man* than this, that a man lay down his life for his *friend*; but God commendeth his love to us, that while we were yet *enemies*, *Christ* died for us." What wickedness it must be even to suppose that the compassions of any creature can compare with those of the glorious Son of God! When on earth, Jesus said: "Come unto *ME*, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and *I* will give you rest. Take *MY* yoke upon you, and learn of *ME*; for *I* am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For *MY* yoke is easy, and *MY* burden is light." In what contrast with this is the celebrated prayer to the Holy Virgin quoted at the end of "The Glories of Mary," and now in so common use in this country: "Remember, O meek and merciful Virgin Mary, that it was never heard of, that you abandoned those,

who, in their affliction or necessities, have placed themselves under your powerful protection, implored your aid, or solicited your assistance; therefore, animated with the same confidence, O Queen of Virgins, our tender Mother, I have recourse to you though a miserable sinner, I, sighing, prostrate myself at your feet. Refuse not, august Mother of my God, to listen favourably to my prayer; I humbly solicit your powerful intercession; deign to grant it to me, be propitious to the supplication of a wretched creature, who hopes to obtain every thing through your mediation. Amen." The poor publican said, "God, be merciful to me a sinner." Poor Romanists are taught to say, "O Mary, to thee we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping in this vale of tears." Dying Stephen said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." The Papist is taught to say, "Holy Virgin . . . grant that I may never forget to invoke you, especially during my last combat, the most terrible of all." For these and other things like them, see "Glories of Mary," pp. 149, 150, 151, and 288. No contrast could be more striking than that between the Bible and Romish books of devotion. All this is the more monstrous, as Mary, when on earth, confessed herself a poor helpless sinner, like other humble servants of God. Listen to her words: "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." Luke i. 46, 47. The translation of this passage in the Doway Bible is identical with that in our version. Now, if Mary had a Saviour, it was because she needed one, and if she needed a Saviour, it was because she was a lost sinner. That she felt her need, and felt that need supplied, we learn from her own lips.

The Romanist may ask if the Scriptures do not teach that all nations shall call Mary blessed. Certainly they do. They also say, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, Blessed are the pure in heart, Blessed are the meek," &c. Indeed, unspeakable blessings are pronounced on all the pious. But how can this prove that we are to call upon them, and not upon God alone? God has indeed conferred great blessings upon the pious of earth. In heaven those blessings are perfected, and others are bestowed. This should encourage us to go to God, and ask him to bless us, but it ought not to lead us to put our trust

in the grace, power, or intercession of those, who, though in heaven, are themselves but redeemed sinners. If any should ask if Mary was not the most highly favoured among women, the answer is, that when upon this earth God did put more honour upon her than upon any other woman, by making her the mother of his holy child Jesus. In this respect, she was the most highly privileged of her sex. But when Christ was upon earth, he was told, "Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." Christ could not more emphatically have declared that in his kingdom a new heart, leading to a holy life, infinitely exceeded in value all affinities of blood, even with himself. As to the Romish doctrine that Mary is queen of heaven, and has the highest throne of any of our race, it is a mere imagination, unsupported by God's word. Our Lord Jesus expressly declined saying who should be the greatest in his kingdom, stating, that to sit on his right hand and on his left hand should "be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father." There is nothing in all God's word intimating that Mary, or Peter, or any other particular saint, personally or historically known to us, should be preferred before all the rest of the redeemed. But if we knew that Mary was and ever should be the most highly honoured of all the blessed in heaven, that would not make it lawful to invoke her; for her blessedness alone does not deify her. She would still be a helpless, dependent creature; and as it is as truly idolatry to worship the sun and moon, as it is to worship a candle or a glow-worm, so it is as truly idolatry to call upon the most exalted creature in heaven, as to offer our prayers to the weakest of all God's creatures on earth.

When an angel appeared to John, (Rev. xix. 10,) the apostle mistook his appearance for a manifestation of God, and fell at his feet to worship him; but the angel said, "See thou do it not; I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that

have the testimony of Jesus. Worship God." We were curious to see how Romanists would dispose of this passage. Peter Dens says that "the angel refused this on account of the great holiness of John;" and the authors of the Notes in the Doway Bible say that he refused it "in consideration of the dignity to which our human nature had been raised by the incarnation of the Son of God, and the dignity of St. John, an apostle, prophet, and martyr." But the angel assigns no such reason, but a very different one: "I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren," &c. This reason was sufficient for John. He required no other.

In Col. ii. 18, 23, are these words: "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind. . . . Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body," &c. To this 18th verse the Doway Bible has a long note, in which it attempts to direct the force of what is here said against those philosophers who worshipped demons, and then against the Jews. But if it was wicked for Jews and Greeks to pay worship to demons, why is it not so for Romanists to do the same?

Protestants sometimes refer to Eccles. ix. 5, as discouraging our addresses to the dead: "The dead know nothing more." To this Dens says: "The best solution is, that these are the words of the foolish, and of those who say that the soul perishes with the body." But the note on this text in the Doway Bible is far more safe and reverent: "*Know nothing more*, viz., as to the transactions of this world, in which they have now no part, unless it be revealed to them; neither have they any knowledge or power now of doing any thing to secure their eternal state, (if they have not taken care of it in their lifetime;) nor can they now procure themselves any good, as the living always may do, by the grace of God." That is right and good. But why should we ask them to procure good for us by the grace of God, when they cannot do it for themselves? He who is not able to help himself, cannot be a very safe reliance for his fellow-creature.

To set aside all charges of idolatry brought against the

Church of Rome, her doctors have invented various devices and distinctions. One is, that worship is of three kinds: *Dulia*, *Hyperdulia*, and *Latria*. These are again distinguished into absolute and respective or relative. So that we have six grades of worship, viz., Absolute *Dulia* and Respective *Dulia*, Absolute *Hyperdulia* and Respective *Hyperdulia*, Absolute *Latria* and Respective *Latria*. It must be obvious to the intelligent, that whatever some speculative minds may imagine, these distinctions are to the masses wholly unintelligible and impracticable. The great body of worshippers are confounded by any attempt to explain these distinctions. The plain people neither know them, nor understand them, nor practise them. Nor are these distinctions preserved in Romish books of devotion which have fallen under our notice. Not only is no warning given to the devotee that he is to use the Litany to Mary with less exalted feelings of piety, than those he exercises when using the Litany of the name of Jesus; but in many cases petitions are presented to mere creatures to do for us things which none but God can do. There is on earth no higher act of worship than committing our souls to God in death; yet in a prayer, sanctioned by the Pope in 1807, his followers are taught to say, "Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, assist me in my last agony." So that these refinements are of no practical use; and Popish writers admit as much, as we have seen in a passage already quoted from Peter Dens. Ask any plain man to tell you whether the worship he is offering to a relic, an image, a cross, the Virgin, or God, be of any one of the six kinds before described, and he cannot tell you. Ask him what he understands by Respective *Hyperdulia*, and he has no answer to make. Besides, these distinctions are unnoticed in the Bible. It says, "Worship God." It says, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Matt. iv. 10. The distinction of worship into civil and religious is plain and clear. A child can make it. All men do make it. Civil worship is the respect and reverence we pay to civil authority or to worth in man. But religious worship belongs to God only—the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. One is performed with the common sentiments of re-

spect, esteem, and good will. The other is only performed with heartfelt piety, humility, and love.

But Papists are very anxious to defend their worship of images, of saints, of the cross, and of the host, by some argument drawn from Scripture. In Heb. xi. 21, we read, "By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph; and worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff." In the Doway Bible it reads thus: "By faith Jacob, when he was dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph; and worshipped the top of his rod;" and then there is a note, saying that Jacob paid a relative honour and veneration to the top of the rod or sceptre of Joseph, as to a figure of Christ's sceptre or kingdom." Any one can easily understand the reason of this translation, and the note is a bold assertion.

In his Defence, pp. 129, 130, Gallitzin adopts another method of defending the practice of Rome. He says: "St. John the Baptist venerated the very latches of our Saviour's shoes. Mark i. 7."

He puts this remark in a paragraph by itself, showing that he attaches great weight to it. Now the whole verse referred to, reads in the Doway Bible, "There cometh after me one mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and loose." The plain sense of which is, that Christ was so glorious and exalted a person, that John did not esteem himself worthy to do for him the most menial office. This is the whole grammatical sense of the passage. Yet Gallitzin quotes this verse to vindicate the practice of the Church of Rome respecting "images, pictures, and relics." But he gives us another Scripture proof. He says:

"The Israelites venerated the brazen serpent, a type or figure of Christ, Numb. xxi. 9."

This also is put in a separate paragraph, as though it was a weighty affair. In the Doway Bible, Numb. xxi. 9, reads thus: "Moses therefore made a brazen serpent, and set it up for a sign; which, when they that were bitten looked upon, they were healed." If Romish idolatry can find support in such a verse, we see not why it should not also from Gen. i. 1. But we are not done with this serpent. Some of the ancient Israelites were of Gallitzin's mind, and thought it should be vene-

rated. In 2 Kings xviii. 4, we read of Hezekiah that "he removed the high places, and broke the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it." The Doway version has it, "and broke the brazen serpent which Moses had made: for till that time the children of Israel burnt incense to it." If Hezekiah were alive and had his way, papal images would fare as this brazen serpent. He was a great iconoclast.

A portion of Scripture sometimes brought forward to show that we may pray *to saints in heaven*, is that where Paul says, "Brethren, pray for us." But Paul never called on dead men and women to pray for him, nor did he say, Brethren, pray to dead men or women for me. The sense of what Paul said evidently is, "Pray to God for us;" and Romanists will admit as much, but then they say, if Paul asked men and women to whom he spake and wrote on earth to pray for him, we may ask the saints to do the same for us. The answer is, that if we and the saints whose prayers we solicit, are on earth, as Paul and those to whom he wrote were, we may safely do as he did. But how can the dead hear us when we cry? They are in the land of silence. They no longer hear the earthly wail of woe, the voice of the oppressor, or the cry of friendship. To say that they in heaven can hear us all over the earth, is to deify them.

If any ask how Romanists suppose that saints in glory become acquainted with their prayers, one of their greatest doctors, Bellarmine, shall answer. He says: "Concerning the manner in which they know what is said to them, there are four opinions among the doctors:

"1. Some say that they have it from the relation of the angels, who at one time ascend to heaven, and at another time descend thence to us.

"2. Others say that the souls of the saints, as also the angels, by a certain wonderful swiftness which is natural to them, are in some measure everywhere, and themselves hear the prayers of the supplicants.

"3. Others, that the saints see in God all things, from the beginning of their beatitude, which in any way appertain to

themselves; and hence even our prayers which are directed to them.

“4. Others, lastly, that the saints do not see in the Word our prayers from the beginning of their blessedness, but that our prayers are only then revealed to them by God, when we pour them forth.”

It is not our purpose to examine at length these several particulars. The first would make the employment of angels very different from any thing taught in Scripture. The second contains the absurdity that there is a limited kind of omnipresence. The third supposes a limited kind of omniscience. The fourth shows a very singular kind of process to be going on, and, if true, should lead us first to ask God to tell the saints what we wish them to ask God for us. The whole four are thoroughly fanciful, and without the shadow of support from any portion of Scripture.

But some say, Jacob wrestled with an angel, and would not let him go till he got the blessing. Let us look at this whole case. Where the history of this event is first given, in Gen. xxxii., this angel is called a man, that is, he had the appearance of a man. But no sooner did he leave Jacob than it is added: “And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel, (*i. e.* the face of God,) for (said he) I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved.” This appearance of a man, then, was a manifestation of God, and Jacob knew it was God before he left the place. Indeed, the angel said: “As a prince thou hast power with God.” As this was a memorable event in the life of the patriarch, he afterwards referred to it. When dying, he said, “God of my fathers, the God which fed me all my life long to this day, the *angel* which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads.” Gen. xlviii. 15, 16. And in Hosea xii. 4, 5, an explanation yet more full is found: “Jacob had power with God, yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed; he wept, and made supplication unto him: he found him at Bethel, and there he spake with him, even thē Lord God of hosts: the Lord [Jehovah] is his memorial; therefore turn thou to thy God.” Nothing could be more clear than that Jacob spake that night with God. These passages infallibly determine who this man, this angel was; it was the angel

of the covenant, Jehovah, the Son of God, "the Lord God of hosts," who before his actual incarnation, more than once assumed the appearance of a man. And yet this praying to the angel, who by Hosea is called Jehovah, is brought forward by the great modern champion of Romanism, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Milner, in his "End of Controversy," to establish the lawfulness of worshipping created angels. On p. 210 of Lucas's edition, he says: "That it is lawful and profitable to invoke the prayers of the angels, is plain from Jacob's asking and obtaining the angel's blessing, with whom he had mystically wrestled, Gen. xxxii. 26, and from his invoking his own angel to bless Joseph's sons, Gen. xlvii. 16."

Romanists adduce other texts to evince the lawfulness of their idolatrous practices, such as this: "Render to all men their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour." Having quoted these words, the author of the preface to "The Glories of Mary," says that God "thus expressly sanctions our doing homage to the exalted dignity and transcendent splendour of his servants in heaven." p. x. But how does this prove that we should pray to saints or angels? Render to all men their *dues*. Religious worship is no man's due. That belongs to God alone. There are more than five hundred passages of Scripture in which religious worship, prayer, and supplication, are spoken of, and yet not in one of them is any such command given or implied as this: "Pray to the angels, call upon the saints for help or mediation." Learned Papists of high authority rely very much on other things than the word of God for most of their idolatrous practices. Thus Peter Dens says, "Prove that the images of Christ and the saints are to be worshipped. *Ans.* It is proved in the first place by the Council of Trent." The rest of his argument is of the same character.

That Romanists in the United States do approve of what their bishops and pope elsewhere appoint and enjoin, there is no room for doubt.

Enough has been proved to justify us in saying to all who would make salvation sure: "Come out of this Babylon and flee to Christ alone. Come out of her, that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. xviii. 3. "For the rest of the men, which

have not been killed by her plagues, have not repented of the works of their hands, but worship idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood: which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk. Rev. ix. 20. Come out of her and flee to Christ. Forsake the pope and embrace the Lord Jesus. Leave the city of the Seven Hills, and escape to the mountain, to Calvary.

John Henry Green.

ART. III.—*Ebrard on the Apocalypse.*

The Revelation of John, Explained by Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard, etc. etc. 1853. 8vo. pp. 667.*

OUR readers have already been notified of the appearance of this volume. The evangelical sentiments of Dr. Ebrard, coupled with the ability, originality, and thoroughness which he has displayed in his former publications, particularly his Commentary on the Hebrews, his treatise on the Gospel History, and his Systematic Theology, naturally create an interest in his views upon the Revelation. It shall be the aim of this article merely to report, without commenting on them, the contents of the volume before us.

The introduction discusses in one hundred pages the authorship of the Apocalypse, the history of its interpretation, the principles upon which it ought to be interpreted, and those points of Old Testament prophecy which here find their fuller expansion. Ebrard maintains, in opposition to Lücke and others, that this book is from the pen of no other John than the apostle, to whose gospel it stands related, somewhat as the Acts of the Apostles to the Gospel by Luke, of which it is the continuation. The pretended lack of unison between the spirit and teachings of the Apocalypse and those of the Gospel and Epistles of John, from which a diversity of authorship has been

* Die Offenbarung Johannes, erklärt von Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard, Consistorialrath und Hauptprediger zu Speyer, Mitglied der historisch-theologischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig und der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

argued, is answered by denying its existence. Alleged linguistic differences between this book and the other productions of the same apostle, are disposed of by pointing out their actual and striking coincidences of style,* while the diversities that remain are accounted for by the new point of view under which, from the altered character of the composition, things are necessarily regarded, or by the hebraic style naturally adopted in a prophecy in imitation of the great and only existing models of the Old Testament.

The testimony to its apostolic origin is abundant and decisive. Papias, for twenty years a cotemporary, and, according to Irenæus, a pupil of the apostle John, is quoted by Andreas of the fifth century, to the effect that the Apocalypse is "worthy of credence." And although no specific testimony has been preserved from him that the apostle John was its author, rather than a presbyter of that name, (whose existence Ebrard admits, though Hengstenberg denies it,) yet as it was according to the unanimous voice of antiquity, the apostle John, who was banished to Patmos, Rev. i. 9, leaves it no longer an open question who wrote it, if it be a genuine and credible book. In the second century, to come no further down, witnesses can be brought from every region, and from all parties in the Church, from Chiliasts and Anti-Chiliasts, from Montanists and Anti-Montanists, from Syria, from the banks of the Rhone, and even from the bosom of the Apocalyptic churches themselves. This book is cited by Theophilus of Antioch, by Apollonius, by Clement of Alexandria, in the epistle of the churches of Lyons and Vienne. It was the subject of a special work by Melito of Sardis. Justin Martyr says expressly that its author was one of the apostles of Christ. Irenæus appeals in behalf of the correctness of the reading

* Peculiarities common to the Apocalypse with the Gospel and Epistles of John are such as the nominative with the article in place of the vocative, ἔρχεσθαι for ἔσεσθαι, apposition instead of a genitive or adjective, ἐκ as a circumlocution for the partitive genitive, repetition of the possessive, e. g. John ii. 12; Rev. vi. 11, instrument denoted by ἐν, future with ἵνα in place of the conjunctive, οὐ μὴ with the indicative, ἵνα more frequent than ὅπως, καί in place of δέ or οὐν, nominative in apposition with an oblique case, lack of agreement between the adjective or relative and its noun, etc.

666 to the testimony of men who had seen John himself. Polycrates says that John, who lay on the breast of the Lord, became a priest with the breastplate; that is to say, he was privileged, like the high-priest bearing the Urim and Thummim, to enter the holy place, and receive divine communications.

There is repeated testimony also to the apostolicity of the Apocalypse in that barbarous and almost unintelligible fragment which goes under the name of the Canon of Muratori, an anonymous list of ecclesiastical, rather than of inspired writings, drawn up, it would seem, about A. D. 160. The omission of this book from the old Syriac version does not require the assumption of any doubts as to its inspiration or apostolic origin. It was omitted simply because it was not thought generally edifying, or adapted to the ordinary uses of public worship. For the same reason, it was passed over without mention in the Laodicean Canon, and in that of Cyril, both of which were designed to guide the private reading of catechumens, and the public reading of the churches; and there is evidence from Cyril's other writings that he regarded this book as canonical. The rejection of this book by an insignificant body of heretics, known as the Alogiani, is of no critical weight, as all admit. Dionysius of Alexandria was led, in his zeal against the Chiliasts, to deny the apostolic composition of this book; but that did not prevent Eusebius, also an Anti-Chiliast, from ranking the Revelation among the books whose inspiration was universally acknowledged; though there were some, as he afterwards adds, who (on grounds like those of Dionysius) counted it spurious.

As our author regards the history of apocalyptic interpretation from a point of view different from that which prevails among ourselves, his remarks on that head may not be devoid of interest. The earliest commentators upon the Revelation, set out with the presumption, that, as a book of prophecy, it must contain a summary of Church History, on to the end of time. They may, with their successors who adopt the same fundamental idea, be denominated the historiological school. The Revelation is made to tally throughout with the history; not by taking large and comprehensive views of its whole course,

investigating its true spirit, and determining the epochs and events which really mark the progress of the kingdom of God; but the book is treated as though its only design were the gratification of a prying curiosity, and the prophecy is linked with its fulfilment by no surer bond than that of a casual external similitude. The Abbot Joachim (1180) was one of the most distinguished among the earlier representatives of this school. He divided the history of the Church, up to the time in which he lived, into six periods, symbolized respectively by the first six seals, and repeated again substantially in the trumpets and the vials. Nicolaus de Lyra (†1340) explained the seven seals, of the history as far as the time of Julian; the trumpets, of the period from Julian to Mauritius; chapters xii. and xiii. brought the prophetic narrative down to Charlemagne, the vials to the Emperor Henry IV., &c. Vitringa, though addicted to the historiological method, combined with it idealizing tendencies. The seven epistles represent, according to his view, seven main periods in the history of the Church; the seals disclose the fate of the Church, the trumpets the fate of heathen Rome, and of Rome in the middle ages, the vials the final judgments upon Rome, as the mystic Babylon. The strangest mal-interpretations follow as of course upon the adoption of such a method, even to explaining the fifth vial of the removal of the Papal See to Avignon, and the horses of the sixth trumpet, from whose mouth issued fire, and smoke, and brimstone, of the invention of cannons and of gunpowder.

One branch of this school have busied themselves with attempted calculations of the mystical numbers with which this book abounds. So Whiston, Bengel, and many others since, unintimidated by the palpable failures in the reckonings of those who have preceded them.

The Reformation is an important epoch in Apocalyptic interpretation, though it gave rise to no school of commentators. The gain then effected was due, not so much to the direct application of exegesis to this book, as to the light which events shed upon the connected scheme of Providence and of prophecy. And the progress made is to be looked for, not so much in commentaries specially devoted to clearing up the

mysteries of this book, as in the more general Christian writings of the period. As the Reformers became increasingly sensible of the meaning and character of the times in which they lived, the conviction took irresistible hold of their minds that the great antichristian power which oppressed them was the beast of Rev. xiii. In this sentiment they were entirely unanimous: it was even by some Churches inserted among their articles of faith; and this must be regarded as a settled point in the exposition in all time to come. With this substantial correctness, however, of the conviction entertained by the Reformers upon this point, there was an error easy to be accounted for in the form in which it was commonly presented. The scheme of Providence was unfolded sufficiently to reveal the identity of the Roman hierarchy* with the beast of Rev. xiii. But the indications were wanting then, which have since appeared, that this was to be succeeded by another power which in a new form should raise a yet more terrible opposition to the Church of God, the scarlet-coloured beast of Rev. ch. xvii, identical, or at least its head identical, with the man of sin, of whom Paul forewarned the Thessalonians, and with the personal antichrist in whom Satan becomes, so to speak, incarnate, spoken of in the epistles of John, whose appearance is immediately to precede the second advent, and who shall be directly destroyed by Christ at his coming. They were mistaken in confounding the Romish Babylon with the last and highest concentration of antichristian power. Their mistake, however, naturally grew out of the fact, that the developments of history had as yet cast no light upon what lay beyond their own times. This cannot vitiate the substantial correctness of the view then opened up to the consciousness of the Church.

The progress of the Reformation period was followed by a retrocession or a reaction, originating in two quite distinct quarters, viz., the hierarchy and unbelief. The champions of

* The Reformers, as Ebrard adds here in a note, never regarded the Roman Catholic Church as antichrist, but only the Papacy in that Church. They always carefully distinguished between the hierarchy and the people composing its communion. Viewed under this latter aspect, they never denied that the *ecclesia Romana collectiva* was a part of the *ecclesia universalis visibilis*, or that it was *ecclesia vera quamquam impurissima*. Comp. Calv. Inst. IV. 2, 12. *Quum ergo ecclesiæ titulum non simpliciter volumus concedere Papistis, non ideo ecclesias apud eos esse infamiamur, sed tantum litigamus de vera et legitima ecclesiæ constitutione.*

the hierarchy thus sturdily attacked, were compelled to stand on the defensive. In order to maintain their ground, they were forced into an error directly opposite to that of the Reformers. Assuming, in common with their adversaries, the identity of the beast ch. xiii. with the scarlet-coloured beast ch. xvii., and the man of sin, 2 Thess ii. 3—9, they referred them all to the personal, individual antichrist of the future; the apocalyptic periods were regarded as literal chronological dates, and the fulfilment of the whole was expected in the three years and a half next preceding the second advent.

The retrocession of unbelief began with the Arminian Grotius and culminated in Rationalism. The Apocalypse was stripped of its proper prophetic character, and its sublime predictions were converted into dreamy anticipations or safe conjectures as to the triumph of Christianity over Judaism and heathenism. The only question was, whether its subject was the downfall of the Jewish state (Wetstein, Herder, Züllig,) the downfall of heathen Rome (Semler, Ewald, De Witte,) or that of both (Herrensneider, Eichhorn, Matthäi.)

The events of the French revolution opened the eyes of the Christians on the continent to the meaning of another part of this book. Since that time there has been a general agreement among the children of God in Europe as to the proper interpretation to be put upon the two beasts, Rev. xiii. and xvii. This, however, has not been expressed so much in commentaries as in other ways, and it has not been wrought up into the form of a systematic exegesis. As far as the commentaries of the present are concerned, this may be denominated the period of confusion. Principles, methods, and results are all unsettled. Even the boundaries between the symbolical and the literal have not been definitely drawn. The old Jesuitical view has been revived of late among Protestants (Hofmann, Hebart,) by which the whole is thrown into the future as a detailed account of three years and a half preceding the advent. The opposite rationalistic extreme also survives, by which every thing is explained of the very origin of Christianity, as "ideas" respecting the fall of Jerusalem, or that of heathen Rome, which did or did not meet their realization. Whilst the intermediate space is occupied by the

historiological school which continues its search after all the details of ecclesiastical history. The school which finds in the Revelation a disclosure of the grand epochs of the Church of God, and of the elements out of which its development should proceed—which finds in it not conjectural ideas, nor the barren details of Church history, or of eschatology, but true, real prophecy, is yet in its infancy.

Many of the disclosures of the Apocalypse are already anticipated with greater or less distinctness by the Old Testament prophets. There are predictions uttered by both Isaiah and Jeremiah, which did not meet their full accomplishment at the coming of Christ, and which shall not, until he comes again. It was not disclosed to them when the events which they foresaw were to be accomplished, nor by what long intervals they were to be separated. Up to the time when the visions were granted which are recorded in the book of Daniel, the people of God may not have known but that the termination of the exile would be immediately followed by Messiah's advent, and by the consummation of all that had been promised of the glories of his reign. To Daniel was first revealed, in their chronological succession, the four great empires of the world, whose character and fortunes were symbolized by the metallic image, and again by the four beasts of a later vision. And here our author presents us with a very original interpretation of the prophecy of the seventy weeks. These are weeks of years, and are to be reckoned from the close of Jeremiah's seventy years, over which Daniel had just been meditating and fasting, that is to say, from B. C. 538, when the captivity was terminated by the decree of Cyrus. "From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks:" where an error is assumed, on the authority of the text of the Septuagint, in the Codex Chisianus, which reads, seventy and seven weeks, (=539 years.) The year of the nativity would consequently fall in the 77th week, reckoning from B. C. 538. "Threescore and two weeks the street shall be built and the wall," *i. e.*, Jerusalem shall have been built up again for 434 years when Messiah comes. This complete rebuilding of Jerusalem is dated from the visit of Nehemiah, in the 20th year of Artax-

erxes Longimanus, B. C. 445. The 62 weeks would accordingly expire B. C. 11; and as Christ was born six years before the vulgar era, the advent falls within the very next week after the predicted term had elapsed.

Then follow Messiah's death, and the overthrow of the Jewish State; after which it is added, "He shall confirm the covenant with many in one week." This week does not commence when the threescore and two terminate, nor is it like them susceptible of computation. It is a mystic week of indefinite length, commencing at the death of Christ, and extending over the conversion of the Gentiles. This week is divided into two halves of unequal length, by the cessation of sacrifice and oblation at the destruction of Jerusalem, which took place just the half of 70 years after the death of Christ.* The second half, of unknown duration, extends on from that point of division to the end of the present dispensation. This semi-septenary period is identical with the time, times and a half, of Israel's dispersion, Dan. xii. 7, and reappears as the $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, or 42 months, or 1260 days of the Revelation. It is not to be confounded, however, with another prophetic period, also semi-septenary, but briefer, described Dan. vii. 25, as a time, times, and the dividing of time, which marks the persecution of the post-Roman enemy of the Church, and which is identical with the $3\frac{1}{2}$ days of Antichrist's triumph in the Revelation.

The Revelation is divided into four visions: the first containing the epistles to the seven churches; the second the seals and trumpets; the third the woman persecuted by the dragon, the beast from the sea, and that from the earth, with the judgment upon them; the fourth the vials, and all that follows, to the end.

The angels of the seven churches to whom the epistles are addressed, were simply the messengers and representatives of those several churches, who visited John in Patmos, and were made by him bearers of these divine communications. That these epistles have not barely a historical, but, in addition, a

* So p. 76. But on p. 334 the birth of Christ is made the beginning of this mystic week, and on pp. 494 and 583, his ascension is spoken of as the point of division.

typical and prophetic meaning, is argued from the prophetic character of the entire book, from their being addressed by Christ seen in vision to the churches which he holds as stars in his hand, as he in fact holds the universal Church; from the charge, repeated afresh in each epistle, "He that hath ears, let him hear," implying not only that all may gather instruction from them, but that they are directly addressed to all; and from the mystic character of the number seven. These churches were selected as apt types and representatives of the universal visible Church, not in all of its possible conditions, with the view of exhibiting the various forms of excellence or of degeneracy to be emulated or to be shunned; but they are a prophetic picture of actual conditions or states of the Church, and that not during seven successive periods, reaching from the ascension to the second coming of Christ, (Vitringa,) nor seven co-existing phases to be presented by the Church, immediately preceding the second advent, (Hofmann,) but partly consecutive, partly co-existent. The Old Testament allusions in the first four epistles are regarded as intimations of their successive character: in the first, paradise; in the second, temptation by Satan; in the third, the manna, and Balaam, both belonging to the times of the Exodus; in the fourth, Jezebel, and the kingdom of David, referred to in the "rule with a rod of iron." As this last is a prediction extending into New Testament times, and even to the latest period, and the only scriptural allusions in the epistles that follow refer to the same period—the book of life—the New Jerusalem—sitting on the Saviour's throne—this is held to be an intimation that the states of the Church therein set forth are cotemporaneous, extending side by side to the end of all things. In determining the particular periods or phases of the Church here represented, the names and the scriptural allusions are held to be significant, as well as the condition portrayed in each epistle. Ephesus is the representative of the apostolic Church, of which it was also in fact a part, and hence in this alone of the epistles a real name is introduced, that of the Nicolaitanes. Smyrna is the martyr Church, from the death of John, the last of the apostles, to Constantine, (A. D. 100—325); the ten days of tribulation are the ten general persecutions. Perga-

mos is the Church from the fourth to the ninth century; its characteristics are, possession of the imperial throne once Satan's seat, and consequent corruption, while nevertheless the true faith was carefully defined and rigidly adhered to. Thyatira is the Church of the middle ages. The remaining epistles represent phases of the Church springing from the Reformation: Sardis is the high Lutherans; Philadelphia the Reformed Churches of Britain, America, and the continent of Europe; Laodicea has no proper antitype in existing church organizations, but if the extreme Schleiermacher party were to form themselves into a separate body, it would answer precisely to them.

In the second vision, as is shown by its exordium, Christ no longer appears in his relation to the Church as its Shepherd, but in his relation to the world as its Sovereign Lord, who has already, as the slain Lamb, potentially vanquished his and his people's foes, and under whose omnipotent sway all the powers of nature shall be made to contribute to the advancement and final triumph of his kingdom. The four and twenty elders before the throne are the twelve patriarchs and twelve apostles, representing the Church of both dispensations. The thunders and lightnings proceeding from the throne betoken not the divine wrath, but the infinite glory and almighty power of the Lord of nature. The sea of glass before the throne in contrast with the turbulent sea symbolizing the restless, heaving nations of this world (Rev. xvii. 15) denotes the pure and peaceful multitudes of heaven, creatures in their true normal relation to the great Creator, the calm, unruffled mirror of their Maker's glory. The four living creatures set forth the Creator's power in the various modes of its manifestation in the universe.

The opening of the first four seals discloses not particular events to occur consecutively in the order there indicated, but general facts repeatedly recurring in the divine administration. Christ riding forth to victory upon the white horse, the same that is seen returning (Rev. xix. 11,) does not meet its accomplishment in any single historical event. The figure upon the white horse must be taken also not by itself, but in conjunction with those that come after upon the red, black, and pale horses. Christ rides forth to victory, to gain for his Church

the victory over the world: war, famine, and death follow in his train, are employed by him as instruments to effect the intended subjugation. These are not judicial inflictions upon the ungodly alone, but calamities sent in the ordinary course of Providence, from which both the righteous and the wicked suffer, but whose aim and actual result is the furtherance of the kingdom of the Redeemer. The fifth seal is likewise not an individual event, but a manifestation of the truth, that by such judgments as the foregoing, the blood of the martyrs is not yet avenged. It is thus far the period of the divine forbearance, a time of gracious respite to the unconverted, a time of trial to his believing people.

The sixth seal contains premonitions of the approaching judgment, the same precisely that our Lord himself foretold as antecedents and signs of his second coming. Matt. xxiv. 29–31. The opening of the seventh seal reveals the judgment itself expanded into seven distinct scenes, the seven trumpets. Before the last seal is opened, however, and the judgment has actually come, the people of God are set in safety from its effects. The vision of the seer is first directed to the Church militant on earth, then to the Church triumphant in heaven. The former appears under the form of the tribes of Israel, because at the period contemplated Israel shall be converted, and the heathen shall be incorporated into their communion. All the tribes named are now in actual existence: not that the ten tribes are for the present concealed in some undiscovered region, whence they shall at some future time be brought forth and recognized. The ten tribes returned to Palestine, in as full a sense as they ever are to return, when leave was granted them in common with the Jews by Cyrus. The name of Dan is missing from the list of the tribes (Manasseh being substituted in its place) simply because that tribe is no longer in existence: it had perished before the return from Babylon, as is shown by the circumstance that no registers were preserved of that tribe as of all the others. 1 Chron. iv.—vii. The sealing of the Israel of God denotes that those of his people who are living on the earth when the judgments of the Most High break in upon an ungodly world, shall be effectually protected from all harm. For this reason they are accurately numbered,

that every individual of them may be known and kept safely. The twelve thousand of each tribe is the mystic number of the patriarchs and apostles multiplied a thousand-fold. The innumerable multitude from all nations who next appear, are those who have died before the judgment is inflicted. They are seen already possessed of all the felicity and glory of heaven. God's true people, both those who are alive and remain and those who have fallen asleep, being thus provided for, the last seal is opened: for half an hour all heaven waits in breathless expectation, and then judgment is let loose.

The contents of the seventh seal are unfolded under the seven trumpets. It might be supposed, therefore, that the judgments symbolized by them were chronologically subsequent to the sixth seal. This, however, is not the case. In the sixth seal were seen the immediate precursors and signs of Christ's second coming, and the whole world was trembling before the wrath of the Lamb: and yet even under the sixth trumpet men are still living on in obduracy and sin. Is it possible to bring in six events, one of them of five months' duration, however that period be reckoned, between the sixth seal and the coming of Christ, which must be in fact simultaneous? Besides, in the sixth seal the sun and moon were already completely darkened in a literal, physical sense; and yet in the fourth trumpet the third part of the sun and moon is smitten. If this is to be taken in a literal sense, it cannot of course succeed their total obscuration; still less if it is to be figuratively understood, for it is a law of prophecy, that figurative and spiritual accomplishments precede the literal and full accomplishment, but never the reverse. The first six trumpets must consequently precede the sixth seal. The hands of the apocalyptic clock are not, however, here set back. The first four seals contained general calamities wrought by means of natural causes, and consequently have not the character of a judgment for the shed blood of the martyrs. The fifth contained a call for such a judgment; and in the sixth the day of the Lamb's wrath opens, in the mode predicted by Christ himself, by those great catastrophes in nature visible alike to good and bad, which are not themselves the judgment, but its heralds and precursors. In the first six seals is thus brought to a close every thing that

befalls the righteous in common with the wicked. For the seventh seal, or in other words, for the seven trumpets is reserved the whole of what is inflicted on the enemies of God alone and as such. The chronological order is not the thing regarded, but only the announcement of what those penalties shall be which are specially to overtake the haters of Christ and the enemies of his people; and in this announcement is included not barely the ultimate judgment to be inflicted at his second coming, but all that has been inflicted upon them from the very first. The distinction between the first six seals and the first six trumpets is thus not chronological, but qualitative: the former are calamities befalling good and bad alike; the latter appertain to the wicked exclusively.

From this it will be seen that the sealing which follows the sixth and precedes the seventh seal cannot be, at least as regards the earlier trumpets, a single event whose chronology is fixed by its place in the vision. But while there is in the eschatological period a particular event signified by it, it must in the case of the earlier trumpets merely indicate the altered relation in which the saints of God stand to the seventh, from that in which they stood to the other seals. They are secured against these judgments as they were not against the others.

In order to connect the judgments that follow more clearly with hostility to the saints, of which they are the righteous retribution, an angel appears with a censer and incense, which he is to "give to the prayers of the saints," *i. e.*, those prayers have ascended, but have not yet been answered; they are now to be made effectual, and to obtain a hearing. The incense is offered with fire from the burnt altar, beneath which the souls of the martyrs had been heard, vi. 9, 10, crying for vengeance, and on which they had been sacrificed. Coals are cast from that altar to the earth; thunderings, lightnings, and an earthquake follow, and then seven angels with trumpets prepare to sound.

As the first four seals were general in their character, portending not single events, but classes of events, not individual calamities, but kinds of calamities which were repeatedly to recur, so the first four trumpets are predictive of as many

generic forms of judgment upon the ungodly, and in each case the physical stands as a symbol of the spiritual. The first trumpet is followed by a terrible storm of hail and fire like that of Egypt, whose terrors are enhanced by blood, the blood of the martyrs which those visited by it have shed, and which destroys the means of subsistence. The thing intended is the spiritual famine with which they are visited who resist the truth, and persecute its adherents: witness Spain, Italy, France. By the second trumpet, the medium of intercourse, and the sources of commercial wealth, are converted into a mass of corruption, and become a curse instead of a blessing. By the third, the springs of life and enjoyment are embittered and poisoned. By the fourth, the centres of light are struck with darkness; and intellectual power and culture, forsaken of God, instead of elevating and refining, only blinds, bewilders, and misleads. That it is the third, not the whole, which is every time affected by these judgments, intimates that the withdrawal of spiritual blessings, however alarming, is not yet absolute nor total.

The fifth and sixth trumpets portend individual events, both future, and both occurring under the instigation of evil spirits. The falling of the star from heaven, under the fifth trumpet, simply represents, under a visible symbol, that a sudden and supernatural effect is wrought on the earth, or the bottomless pit, by a potency proceeding from God out of heaven. The abode of Satan and his angels is opened, and demoniac locusts pour forth, with the commission, not like natural locusts, to devour grass and trees, but to torture men, and for a continuous period, for five months. Its precise chronological duration cannot be determined, as this, like other notes of time in the Apocalypse, is a mystical period. The interval between the ascension of Christ (destruction of Jerusalem?) and the entrance of the eschatological period, marked by the conversion of Israel, the fall of Babylon, and the setting up of the kingdom of Antichrist, is a mystic $3\frac{1}{2}$ years; the dominion of the ten kings is to endure for one hour, xvii. 12; the triumph of Antichrist lasts $3\frac{1}{2}$ days. As this plague endures for five months, it must precede, at least in its commencement, the reign of Antichrist, though its close may and does extend into the $3\frac{1}{2}$

days. It is to be looked for, therefore, before the final fall of the Romish power. It lies still in the future, and its character cannot as yet be accurately defined. By the sixth trumpet, fresh hosts of infuriated demons are let loose, not to torture merely, but to slay. The hour, and day, and month, and year for which they are prepared, does not express the duration of their ravages, but only that the very hour when they shall commence is definitely fixed in the divine purpose. The four angels under whose leadership they rush forth, are spoken of as bound in the great river Euphrates, because it was upon that Babylon was situated. The mystic Babylon is the birth place of these wild and revolutionary hordes. Infidelity is the child of superstition. The might of Babylon still holds them bound; its fall shall be the signal for their being let loose. These judgments are the last, though still an ineffectual means to bring men to repentance.

Before the sounding of the seventh trumpet, there is an episode, whose aim is to set forth those means employed for the conversion of men which were not ineffectual. The little book in which these were revealed was first sweet, then bitter; sweet, because of the result, that men were to give glory to God; bitter, because of the sufferings through which the pious must first pass before that end is reached. The temple, with its worshippers, *i. e.*, the Church of Christ, as the true Israel, is to be saved from destruction, while Israel after the flesh, and their capital city, Jerusalem, are to be given up to the gentiles, and trodden under foot of them 42 months, a mystic period, extending from the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, to Israel's conversion and return. Meanwhile God's two messengers, the Law and the Gospel, continue to give their testimony during the whole of this period, calling a wicked world to repentance, bringing down upon them blessings and curses, torturing their consciences, and disquieting them in their sins; until, in the $3\frac{1}{2}$ days of Antichrist's sway, their testimony shall no longer be endured nor listened to, but laughed to scorn. But suddenly the despised, rejected volume of eternal truth shall retake its power to work on obdurate hearts, and fill them with anguish and dismay, and then it shall be immediately taken up from them. Simultaneously a fearful judgment, of what nature

can be known only from the event, shall overthrow a tenth part of the kingdom of Antichrist. The remainder of men shall be affrighted, and give glory to the God of heaven. With the seventh trumpet follows the end. Christ comes, and his triumphant kingdom is erected over all the earth.

The third vision exhibits the hostility of Satan and the world against the Church; first against Israel, before and after their conversion, chap. xii., next against the Church in its gentile form, chap. xiii. The woman seen in the vision is the literal Israel, not in so far as they have sinned, and still sin, by the rejection of Christ, under which aspect they are a synagogue of Satan, but in so far as in spite of their present unbelief they yet possess the promise of a future restoration, and are by consequence hated of Satan. She is clothed with the sun, and wears a crown of twelve stars, as the destined light of the world, and has the moon beneath her feet, as the conqueror of night. Her child is the Messiah, born to rule all nations with a rod of iron. The dragon, who stood ready to devour him, is Satan. His tail draws a third part of the stars of heaven, and casts them down, in allusion to his seducing great numbers of angels to their fall. He appears with seven heads and ten horns, as the prince of this world, whom the kingdoms of the world obey. The Messiah, whom he sought to destroy, was caught up from the cross to the throne. His rage was then turned against Israel. But an asylum was prepared for them in the wilderness of their present exile, where for eighteen centuries their preservation has been a standing miracle, and where they are still kept for what is yet in reserve for them. At the end of the appointed 1260 days of their banishment, Michael, Israel's guardian angel, Dan. xii. 1, shall make war upon the dragon who is in heaven as their accuser. He is able to continue those accusations as long as Israel remains in their guilt and unbelief. Michael's vanquishing him implies that he has no longer any right to accuse the people, that their guilt has been removed. See Zech. chap. iii. The meaning is therefore that Israel is now converted. Satan, no longer able to pursue his hostility by accusing them in heaven, persecutes them on earth. From this persecution the woman is shielded by receiving two wings of a great eagle to

bear her into the wilderness. This eagle is identical with that, viii. 13,* which announced the woes at the sounding of the fifth trumpet. This is held to intimate a relation between that trumpet and the persecution of the woman. The fury of the abysmal locusts is for five months directed upon the enemies of God: toward the close of the period to which their duration is limited, the conversion of Israel takes place; and now, at Satan's instigation, the locusts turn their rage against them, or rather against the entire Church, which from the moment of the return to God of his ancient people, puts on the form of Israel, into which the believers from other nations are incorporated. The shelter afforded to Israel from this attack of Satan and his emissaries, is the event denoted in the second vision by sealing the twelve tribes. In the case of the earlier judgments, that sealing had simply an ideal character, representing the truth that the people of God were kept in safety. But now the sealing takes on an outward form, and is incorporated in the act of providing for them a secure retreat, probably Palestine. There they shall be guarded from every assault for a time, times and a half: this is not the longer, but the briefer semi-septenary period; not the $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, or 1260 days of their present dispersion, but the $3\frac{1}{2}$ days of Antichrist's triumph. Continuing his impotent hostility, Satan casts a flood out of his mouth after the woman, to reach her if possible in her asylum. This flood is the armies of Antichrist, or the vast ungovernable host of the sixth trumpet, which immediately precedes and partakes of the character of Antichrist. The earth opening her mouth to swallow up this flood is the same event as the cleaving of mount Olivet, Zech. xiv. 4, like a second Red Sea, for the escape of Israel, and the destruction of their foes, immediately consequent upon which is the coming of the Lord.

Baffled in his attempts to injure the woman, the devil goes to make war with the remnant of her seed, which as distinguished from the woman herself denotes the gentile believers who are also the seed of Israel in a spiritual sense. This hos-

* The received text has "angel" in this passage, but the preponderance of critical authority seems to be in favour of "eagle."

tility against the gentile Church is described, not by continuing the account of the dragon's movements, but by opening a new scene: and as in two similar instances before (the trumpets, ch. viii., and the little book, whose contents are given, ch. xi.,) in which fresh scenes were introduced upon a vision already begun, the prophecy goes back and commences its portraiture of the new element from the beginning. A beast rises from the troubled sea of nations. It is a mixture of the leopard, the bear, and the lion, the beasts of Daniel's vision (Dan. vii.) to intimate that it combines them all in itself. It is the empire of this world in an absolute sense, of which the various empires which have in succession played their part upon the stage of history are but different phases. Its seven heads are the seven great empires which have been, or are to be, as explained xvii. 10, the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Macedonian, Syrian,* Roman, and that of the ten kingdoms in their future separate existence. For the present these last are but the ten horns upon the sixth or Roman head, subsisting with it and regarded as a part of it, in the same way as the toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image still formed part of the feet. The beast is here represented as persecuting the Church in its gentile form, that is to say, prior to Israel's conversion, when it puts on an Israelitish form: it must consequently be the Roman power, or that phase of the empire of this world indicated by the sixth head, which is especially intended. The same thing appears from the duration of its power being forty-two months, the mystic period from the destruction of Jerusalem to the conversion of Israel, during all of which Rome is to subsist. Hence there are crowns upon the ten horns of the sixth head to denote that the sovereignty is resident in that head for the time. The dragon, on the other hand, had crowns on all his seven heads, to indicate that he ruled in all the empires of the world, and that his hostility to Israel was exercised, not during the continuance of one empire alone, but during the whole of them. The head wounded to death and healed is the reigning head of the period, the

* This is inserted on the ground of Zechariah's predictions relating to this empire. Hengstenberg leaves this out, and begins the list with Egypt.

Roman empire overturned by the incursions of the barbarians, but reviving again and rising to its former greatness, so that Rome under the pontiffs became the seat of as powerful a despotism as Rome under the emperors. It is to all intents and purposes the old empire revived. The distinction between secular and ecclesiastical dominion is merely formal, not essential, and is consequently not recognized by the prophecy. The Papacy was a worldly power, exercised over the kingdoms of the world, and on worldly principles. The beast from the sea is not the Papacy; but it represents, as already said, the kingdom of this world in its form as the Roman dominion, in which it subsists from the time of Christ to the future conversion of the Jews. The fulfilment shows that since the thirteenth century this dominion has been concentrated in the Romish See. The Papacy, therefore, is not excluded; but there is included with it everything that belongs to the kingdom of this world. The Papacy is only one of its phases.

This particular phase is now set forth under an additional emblem, that of a beast coming up out of the earth, *i. e.*, not out of the tumultuous agitation of the nations as the one before it had risen, but out of a firm and settled state of political relations. As it is called "the false prophet," xvi. 13 and xix. 20, it must be, in pretence at least, a spiritual power. Nothing is said of its form or appearance, except that it had two horns like a lamb. The horn is the symbol of power. It possesses, therefore, or rather claims to possess, the same power which belongs to the Lamb, or to Christ. That there are two horns may even find its explanation in claims like those of Gregory VII. *Sedes apostolica . . . spiritualia decernens dijudicat, cur non et saecularia?* echoed by Bernard, *Uterque ergo ecclesiae (est) et spiritualis scilicet gladius et materialis*. It does not appear that the beast resembled the Lamb in any other respect; he spake like the dragon, xii. 9, or Satan. Pretending to be Christ's vicar, he seduces men away from Christ, using dragon-like (Gen. iii. 5, Matt. iv. 4, etc.) God's words in perverted senses or for ungodly ends. The pseudo-lamb exercises all the power of the first beast before him, not merely similar or equal to his, not a co-ordinate, much less a rival power, but the very same. The pope has

taken into his hands the identical sceptre of the Cæsars. The papal supremacy is further set up as the image of the empire with all the *prestige* attached to its remembered greatness. Not only salvation, but the enjoyment of civil rights and privileges, is made dependent on receiving the name of the beast. Its number 666—*Λατίνος*,* or *לטיני*, may have been intentionally so selected as to admit of interpretation from both the Greek and Hebrew, while the three figures of which it is composed are but the triple repetition of 6, Rome's number in the list of empires, xvii. 10.

This description of the enemies of the Church is followed by two consolatory scenes. First, the vision of the whole body of the persecuted saints in glory, to which they are translated immediately after death, without needing to wait for their recompense until their enemy is overthrown. Second, just judgment is inflicted on their great adversary. Three precursors are heralded by angels of the coming of Christ, which is to reap this harvest, ripe for vengeance, and to tread to overflowing the winepress of Almighty wrath. These are cotemporaneous with the three final woes inflicted under the trumpets on the ungodly. They are (1) the rapid and unprecedented spread of the gospel among the heathen, which, as the fulness of the gentiles is to come in before Israel's conversion, Rom. xi. 25, must take place before the expiration of the five months of the fifth trumpet. (2) The fall of Babylon, or of the Roman phase of the kingdom of this world, the sixth head of the beast. The beast itself is not yet finally destroyed. It is still in existence when the following angel makes his announcement, xiv. 9, in the form of the power represented by the seventh head, or that of the ten kingdoms in their separate and independent state, and after that the eighth or Antichrist, xvii. 11, 17. The Roman dominion, however, falls, and with it the Papal see. This overthrow of the kingdom of superstition is effected by the "infidel and democratic" hordes of the sixth trumpet, or second woe. (3) Warning is given of the approaching judg-

* It is suggested in explanation of the use of *Λατίνος* rather than *Ῥωμαίος* to designate this power, that the latter in the age of the apostle would suggest a sway over the entire world, while the dominion intended was not to cover the East, but to be specifically Occidental, and Latin.

ment. Then Christ comes, and terrible vengeance is taken upon the realm of Antichrist.

The fourth vision winds up the affairs of the Church and the world, revealing their ultimate issues. It opens with a view of the saved triumphing in heaven. Then follow the seven vials, which are poured out during the mystic $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, and produce not such calamities as affect both the righteous and the wicked like the seals, nor such judgments as are visited upon an ungodly world at large like the trumpets, but such as are inflicted specially upon the seat of the beast, upon his conscious and decided adherents. The last three vials are identical with the last three trumpets, differing only in the sphere within which they are regarded as operative. The first four vials cannot be identical with the corresponding trumpets, inasmuch as these do not represent specific and individual judgments, but kinds of judgments which are sent again and again. They are, however, analogous to them, only of heightened intensity. The trumpets were of a negative character, deprivations; these are positive inflictions. Under the first vial there is not merely the loss of spiritual food, there is spiritual torture. The second marks a more dreadful corruption than that of the second trumpet. The third gives them blood to drink who have shed blood, and it has met its accomplishment, as often as a people trained to a thirst for blood by scenes like that of Bartholemew's day, satisfy their tiger-cravings upon those by whom they were first excited. By the fourth, a perverted science is not quenched in darkness, but heated to fanaticism. From the fifth, it appears that the evil spirits of the fifth trumpet proceed from the seat of the beast, and make it their first object of attack. In the sixth vial, three foul spirits, political, ecclesiastical, and Satanic, Mobocracy, Pantheism, and God-defying Blasphemy, shall gather the hosts already seen under the sixth trumpet, first for the assault of Babylon, and then they shall arm themselves against God Almighty, to meet the fate of the Canaanites under Sisera at Megiddo, Judg. v. 19. The drying of the Euphrates signifies the capture of Babylon, with allusion to the expedient adopted by Cyrus, and foretold by Isaiah. The kings of the East are the captors of Babylon, they are so called because the literal

Babylon was taken by invaders from the East, as prophecy had repeatedly declared that it should be, Isa. xli. 2; xlv. 11, etc. They are identical with the four angels, the leaders of the host under the sixth trumpet.

As the seventh vial was poured out, the great city was divided into three mutually hostile parts. This great city, (the same with xi. 8, but not xvii. 18,) is not Babylon, but the realm or sphere of all that sets itself in opposition to Christ and to his people. The three parts correspond with the three foul spirits by which this mass of wickedness had been gathered, the three heterogeneous elements of which it is composed; the political shall be at war with the ecclesiastical power, and both in conflict with a power direct from the abyss, or that of Antichrist. Babylon sinks and Antichrist rises. This is more fully expanded and expounded in two special scenes, occupying respectively ch. xvii. and ch. xviii. In the former, the Roman dominion or the Papacy appears no longer identical with the kingdom of this world, but is reduced to a weak, defenceless woman, supported by an empire no longer hers. The crowns have fallen from the sixth head. It is now the dominion of Antichrist. The colour of the beast is that of blood freshly shed; the raiment of the woman that of blood shed long since. This beast is not compounded, as its predecessor was, of a leopard, bear, and lion. The former beast had names of blasphemy upon its heads; this beast is full of them. This beast was and is not; it had already existed and perished in the time of John; what this means shall be explained presently. It shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, not like the others out of the sea or earth, but directly from Satan out of hell. The seven heads, considered with relation to the woman who sits on them, are seven mountains; the woman is therefore unmistakably the seven-hilled city, Rome. The same heads, considered with relation to the beast, are seven kings, *i. e.*, seven successive empires. Five of these had fallen in the time of John; one, the Roman, was then in existence; and the other, not yet come, is that of the ten kingdoms, which, after subsisting for a while alongside of the Roman power as constituents of it, ultimately, for a brief space, rise into its place as a separate phase of the world's

kingdom. The beast that was and is not, *i. e.*, the one which John saw, the scarlet-coloured beast is both an eighth empire, and one of the previously existing seven. The key to this mystery is furnished by Daniel, who in ch. xi. of his prophecy, predicts a tyrant to arise after the Macedonian monarchy, Antiochus Epiphanes. In ch. vii. he predicts another tyrant to come after the fall of the Roman monarchy, and to continue until destroyed at Christ's second coming. The descriptions of the two tyrants run completely parallel. The post-Macedonian tyrant is a type and prefiguration of the post-Roman; the post-Roman is, as it were, the post-Macedonian risen again. The Syrian monarchy of Antiochus Epiphanes is, as stated above, the fifth of the seven heads: it shall rise again as the kingdom of Antichrist. This is true, not geographically, as though Antichrist were to rise in Syria, for according to Dan. vii. 20, he is to arise from the midst of three of the ten kingdoms; nor personally, as though Antiochus Epiphanes were to be identically raised as the Antichrist; but the spirit and character of the two are the same.

The woman, the ten horns, and the scarlet-coloured beast, correspond with the three parts into which the great city was divided; the Papacy, now impotent, no longer holding the reins of empire, the ten kingdoms dominant for one hour, and the Satanic empire of Antichrist. The ten kingdoms shall destroy the Papacy, then submit to Antichrist, and with him make war upon the Lamb, and be overcome in the unequal contest. In chap. xviii., Babylon's fall is more particularly described, and in the first verses of chap. xix., heaven's exultation at her overthrow.

After the fall of Babylon must be supplied from xi. 7—11 the $3\frac{1}{2}$ days of Antichrist's supremacy. During this time, the Lamb's wife is dressed in white, safely sheltered in the asylum which has been provided for her against the double attack of Antichrist, xii. 13—15. Then follows the coming of Christ, and the destruction of his foes, which completes the contents of the seventh vial.

Satan is next confined to his prison for a thousand years, a mystic period, not calculable, but immensely longer than the $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, not to say the $3\frac{1}{2}$ days, which preceded it.

That will be the Messianic period proper, in comparison with which the present preparatory stage shall be not worth mentioning in the insignificance of its duration. Christ's kingdom shall be set up in visible glory over all the earth. The martyrs, and all the true worshippers of every age, shall be raised from the dead, and the members of the Church then living shall be changed. 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 17. These reign with Christ, not in heaven, but on earth, over the nations which had not been included in the kingdom of Antichrist, but which shall now be christianized. The seeming incongruity of having the earth thus tenanted at once by the glorified saints, and by nations in their mortal state, is thought to be relieved by the fact of our Lord's continuance in the world for forty days after his resurrection. When the term of his confinement has expired, Satan shall deceive the unglorified nations once more, and gather them to war against the saints, and be with them miraculously overthrown, and cast into the lake of fire. Consequent upon this is the final judgment upon all the occupants of Hades, of whom there are two classes, those who died ignorant of Christ, and those who positively rejected him. This is succeeded by the physical renovation of the universe, and the coming down out of heaven of the New Jerusalem, in which shall dwell the reigning saints of the millennium, while the new earth generally shall be tenanted by such of the heathen dying ignorant of Christ as are found capable of healing by the leaves of the tree of life. What becomes of those among the nations who were converted during the thousand years, no intimation can be found. They are certainly not among those judged according to their works; for believers are not so judged. Perhaps they die, and are translated to heaven; perhaps they are successively changed as they live on earth.

In conformity with our design announced at the outset, merely to exhibit, not to discuss the views of our author, we leave them without remark to the judgment of our readers.

L. Addison Alexander.

ART. IV.—*Inaugural Address, delivered at the Danville Theological Seminary, October 13, 1853.* By Edward P. Humphrey, D. D. Cincinnati: 1854.

OF the eloquent discourses at the late inauguration of the Danville Faculty, the one before us has especially arrested our attention at this moment, as affording the occasion for a few remarks upon the Method of Church History. The Discourse itself, without affecting learned or profound discussion, either on the general subject, or on any special topic, gives a gratifying augury both of the spirit and the principles by which the historical instructions of this new Church School are to be characterized. The sound discretion, liberality of sentiment, elegant culture, devout spirit, scholarly and felicitous expression, by which different parts of this address are distinguished, conspire with a coincidence of judgment upon most of the points touched, to make us wish for something still more elaborate and professional from the same pen. To this meagre account of a performance which we may suppose to be already in our readers' hands, we take the liberty of adding some reflections of our own, upon the same or kindred subjects, partly suggested or recalled by its perusal.

There is something remarkable in the actual condition of the study of Church History. While it seems to be receiving more and more cultivation from a few among us, it fails to command the general attention of the educated public in the same proportion. There is even some disposition to depreciate it theoretically to excess, but chiefly on the part of those who, in the very act of doing so, betray their own need of the discipline which nothing but such studies can afford. The raw and blustering polemic, who mistakes every fresh reproduction of exploded heresies for something peculiar to his own church or village, is very apt to sneer at the only pursuits which could have taught him better; and the self-inspired prophet or interpreter of prophecy, as well as the transcendental dreamer and declaimer, may be pardoned for their natural antipathy to History, as the science of facts and actual events. Of such she is sure to be avenged, sooner or later, when their own

history comes to be written, or what is far more likely and more dreaded, left unwritten. But apart from these sporadic cases of avowed contempt for history, there is certainly a general indifference to historical theology, even among such as cherish no such prepossessions; an indifference which shows itself by negative rather than by positive expressions, or not so much by any expression at all, as by simply letting it alone, and failing to derive either pleasure or sensible advantage from the study. We are strongly of opinion that, beyond the requisitions of academical or professional examination, there is very little reading of Church History in any way, and that little rather as an irksome task, though only self-imposed, than as a congenial intellectual employment or indulgence. This fact is the more worthy of remark, because it is only in the way of copious continued reading *con amore*, that a real knowledge of history can be acquired. In the sciences, properly so called, whether physical or moral, much may be accomplished by mere dogged perseverance, under proper guidance, and with due attention to fixed laws and principles, even, so to speak, against the grain of taste or inclination. But historical knowledge, practical or permanent, to have any value, must be gained by laboriously yet willingly sifting grains of gold from heaps of sand, with this important difference between the literal and figurative process, that the gathering and assorting and laborious separation of the crude material is not, in the latter case, a necessary evil, to be gladly avoided by ingenious contrivances and labour-saving arts, but an absolutely necessary good or means of good, without which the product, gained by such economical or indolent expedients, would be altogether worthless, not in itself, but relatively to the intellectual improvement of the person thus securing it. What we mean to express by this perhaps ill-chosen illustration is, that the dry details of history, the proper names and dates and technical divisions, furnished by the cheap compendium or the table of contents, so far from being the quintessence of the subject, to which copious reading only adds a mass of superfluous rubbish, is itself of little value to the individual student, except as the result of his own collective and constructive labour. This view of the matter has nothing to do with what is often falsely

called the philosophy of history, but is strictly a lesson of experience, which all have learned for themselves, who have attained to any clear and satisfactory acquaintance, not with notions or theories of history, but with its bare and stubborn facts.

We do not think it necessary to enlarge upon the grounds of this opinion, or the causes of the fact alleged, or to attempt a demonstration of its truth, which is sufficiently attested by the actual experience of all successful history-readers, who are well aware that they must read much in order to learn even a little, and that no attempt to get at the little by itself can possibly succeed, because, for some cause, known or unknown, the laborious separation of the dross from the ore, and of the chaff from the wheat, seems in this case necessary to the value of the product or residuum. The utmost that the best historical instructor can contribute to the success of his disciples is incitement and direction, not abridgment of labour. He may stimulate attention and awaken curiosity, and suggest new combinations, and indeed new aspects of the truths acquired; but they still must be acquired by the pupil's patient yet spontaneous industry, which can no more be dispensed with or superseded by the teacher's combinations and arrangements, than a *catalogue raisonné* can answer for a library, or a glass case, with its shelves and pigeon-holes, supply the place of the specimens which ought to fill it.

If this be so, a want of interest in the study of Church History, not as a part of every modern theological curriculum, but as a favourite subject of professional and general reading, must be fatal to its influence and cultivation; and assuming, as we may do without much offence to any whose concurrence we are anxious to secure, that this is a result by no means desirable, especially in this age and country, where precisely such correctives of ignorant conceit and narrow bigotry are needed, we propose to offer some suggestions in relation to the probable causes of the existing state of feeling, which will be at least one step towards the discovery of a remedy.

The cause cannot be a want of interest in history, as such; for, in one form or another, it commands more readers than all other subjects; a fact sufficiently attested by the experience of

“the trade,” as it is technically called, and by the records of all lending libraries. Nor can it be the want of something to awaken curiosity and interest the cultivated mind, in the peculiar nature of the subjects treated; for they are the very subjects as to which men’s intellects and passions are most easily excited, when presented in a certain way, and which, in fact, do interest the great majority of sensible and well-informed readers, under any other shape than that which they assume as part and parcel of Church History. Discussions and intelligence, connected with church organization or with points of doctrine, are by no means unacceptable to multitudes of unprofessional readers of our public prints; while, to a more select and cultivated class of laymen, there is a peculiar attraction in the history of literature and opinion. Now, as these all enter largely, as constituent elements, into the structure of Church History, the almost universal want of taste for it must spring from something, not in the essential nature of the subject, but in the conventional and customary mode of treating it.

This goes at once to the root of the evil—if it be an evil—and enables us to state, in general terms, as the occasion of the prevalent distaste for this kind of reading, the neglected but unquestionable fact, that Church Historians have, for some mysterious reason, thought it necessary to depart from the usages of historiography in general, and to adopt a method as distinctive as the dialect and dress of the Society of Friends. That this has not arisen, by a natural or logical necessity, from the religious nature of the subject, is certain from the simple fact, that it is just as real a departure from the scriptural as from the classical models, which indeed, with all their minor variations, are entirely alike in that exquisite simplicity, which is always the fruit either of consummate taste or of divine inspiration.

Without going much into detail, it may not be unacceptable or useless to state a few historical facts, as to the form or method of Church History. Its wildest, rudest, and least artificial form, like that of history in general, is the purely chronological or annalistic, the exact enumeration of events in the order of their actual occurrence, without attempting either to distribute or connect them. This is not so much historical

composition, as an aggregation of historical materials, to be wrought and moulded by the minds of others. The absence of all literary merit, in such cases, is not always made good by exactness and fidelity in point of fact, as is known from many of the medieval chronicles.

The first departure from this lowest species of historiography—we do not mean the first in time, for the examples just referred to are posterior by ages to Tacitus, Herodotus, and Moses—is the clothing of the calendar or table of chronology, in narrative costume, so as to admit of being read connectedly, but still without attempting to combine or group the homogeneous events, and still adhering to the order of time, as the only known law of arrangement, going back to the same topics as they reappear, however often, or however sudden the transition, till the series is exhausted. This, though not in its extreme form, is a fair description of the earliest Church Histories with which we are acquainted, and of which Eusebius is at once the most familiar and most noble type. This second stage, unlike the first, does not necessarily imply the absence of artificial and ambitious rhetoric, an attribute by no means wanting in the venerable Father of Church History, though still more frequent and offensive in some of his Byzantine continuators.

Next to this in quality, though not in time, is the pragmatic method of historiography, in which the topics are selected and combined with a deliberate view to some specific purpose, but without necessarily departing from the strictest accuracy as to facts. This mode, of which Polybius was long regarded as the author and great classical example, is supposed by many modern writers to be also exemplified in one of the four Gospels, that of Matthew, which is now very generally reckoned, not a mere chronological recital of events, but a historical argument, intended to establish the Messiahship of Jesus, by showing the coincidence between his life and the Old Testament prophecies.

It is only perhaps a more ambitious and elaborate variety of this same species that is honoured, by itself or others, with the questionable name of philosophical or scientific history. Or if there be a more decided difference, it is, that in the latter case,

the purpose which gives shape to the whole composition, is more abstract and recondite, an adaptation of the narrative, not to some practical design, but to the general principles or laws by which it is supposed the sequence of events is governed, and by which the form of their recital ought to be determined. Both these modes of composition, however available for good in competent and faithful hands, are evidently liable to great abuse, not only from the *mala fides* of a Baroni-
nius or a Pallavicini, but even from the honest zeal of a Sarpi, much more from the self-deified infallibility of a Hegel. It is, therefore, likely that the general suffrage of intelligent and unbiassed men, in full possession of the knowledge necessary to a sound decision, would be quite unanimous in rejecting both extremes of this ascending series—that of a rude inelegant simplicity, as well as that of artificial and extreme refinement.

What we have now said has been often better said before, and is as true, in its essential parts, of one kind of history as of another. We have introduced it only as a basis, or a fulcrum, or an entering wedge—or any other metaphor of equivalent import that the reader pleases—for the main fact in this history of historiography, to which we wish to call attention, and in which we hope to find a key to the mysterious distaste with which the friends both of History and of the Church so frequently regard Church History, as if the combination of these factors—to employ the modish modern term—were like some chemical mixtures which evolve a product wholly unlike both ingredients.

The fact from which we undertake to draw so much is closely connected with the very birth of Ecclesiastical History, as a modern science. It is a very interesting circumstance, that this branch of theological literature sprang not from the old trunk, Greek or Roman, but from the wild olive bough grafted in by Luther. Besides the bare fact of paternity or pedigree, which is intrinsically full of meaning, there are several collateral considerations coupled with it, and directly bearing on the end for which it is here cited. The origin of Church History, in its modern form, was not only Protestant and Lutheran, but, in the highest degree, controversial and polemical. In no case, probably, before or since, has the prag-

matical character been stamped so legibly on any history as on that noble monument of industry and learning reared by Matthias Flacius the Illyrian and his fellows, and for ages even popularly known by the name of the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses*.* It was in fact the first Church History that deserved the name, and it derived a large part of its worth and power from the definite avowed design with which it was composed—that of proving the corruptions of the church of Rome and the consequent necessity of the Reformation. Besides the influence which such a purpose may have had upon the temper of its authors, and of which we are by no means disposed to complain, it had an influence upon the form and structure of the work, which we think has not attracted due attention. As the purpose of the writers was to show the changes for the worse that had occurred, it was important that these changes should be rendered singly as distinct as possible, and presented in the boldest and most prominent relief. This could hardly be accomplished by the ordinary methods of historiography, which call for some harmonious blending of the lights and shades, and some attention to the rules of perspective, in this as in every other kind of painting. But such a process, however agreeable to taste and usage, would have failed to answer the pragmatic and polemic purpose of these brave old partizans and champions. In the true spirit of reformers, therefore, they invented a new method, such as the world had never seen before, but such as it has seen too often since. For it is literally true, that from the days of Flacius to those of Schaff, this great thesaurus of invaluable documents and facts, which but for it would have been lost, has served not only as a spur to the ambition of all subsequent historians, and an exhaustless storehouse of materials, but as a literary norm and model, not to be sure in style or diction, but in structure and arrangement, even as to points in which the Magdeburg Centuriators differed from the whole world of historians besides, throughout all ages, from Melanethon up to Moses.

The grand peculiarity of this new method, thus entailed

* The real title is: *Ecclesiastica Historia, integram Ecclesiæ Christianæ ideam complectens, congesta per aliquot studiosos et pios viros in urbe Magdeburgica.* Bazel, 1559—1574. (13 centuries in 13 volumes.)

upon Church History, we fear for ever, is the destruction of its unity, by breaking it up into a system of co-ordinate or parallel histories, or rather of lines radiating from a common source, and afterwards converging to a joint conclusion, but in the mean time quite distinct, or only so far connected as to make "confusion worse confounded." This innovation in historiography, the final cause of which has been already hinted, was effected by a system of rubrics or categories, under each of which the narrative was to be successively drawn out, so as to constitute a little independent history, connected with the rest by a federal rather than an organic union. But as the separate history of doctrine, of church government, &c., carried through a millennium and a half, was too much even for the patience of old Flacius himself, the continuity was broken by dividing the whole work into centuries, and then applying the Procrustean framework to each century in turn. By this arrangement the great work in question acquired not only its distinctive name, but a complex synthesis of vertical and horizontal subdivisions, not unlike those of a chess-board or a multiplication table.

The substantial truth of this description, and its relevancy to our purpose, would remain unshaken, even if it could be shown that subdivisions of the same essential kind had been often used in history before. Even granting that they had been, it was never on so great a scale; or, even granting that, it was never in a work destined to exert so powerful an influence on subsequent historians. The main fact of the case is, not that Flacius or his collaborateurs invented this device, but that they perpetuated and immortalized it, giving shape and complexion, more or less, to almost every book since written on the subject, and practically teaching men to think that the history of the Church is so specifically, nay, so generically different from every other history, not only in its facts, but in its principles or essence, that it cannot be written on the same plan, and as a necessary consequence, so far as the immense majority of readers is concerned, cannot be read on any plan at all. For we do conscientiously believe that this peculiarity of form, indelibly imprinted on Church History, by men of mighty intellect and prodigious learning, and of a noble zeal for

truth and godliness, but wholly swayed by controversial motives, and entirely destitute of anything like taste in composition or arrangement, has done more than any other cause whatever, to make this branch of history insipid, not to say repulsive, even to those who have a strong partiality for history in general.

We are well aware that one part of this statement would be charged with inexactness, not to say with falsehood, by the Germans and their indiscriminate admirers. We mean the statement that the method introduced, or rendered current, by the Magdeburg Centuriators, has been since retained by all church historians of any note, especially in Germany. In seeming inconsistency with this, we know that almost every German book upon this subject, even in the very act of giving due praise to the Centuriators, as sources and authorities, professes to repudiate their faults of method, and to go far beyond them in all that relates to form and structure. But profession and practice are not more invariably connected in the making of Church Histories than in the more common walks of life, and we must take the liberty of looking somewhat closely into this pretension of the late historiographers.

The plan of the Centuriators, as we have already seen, is complex, and includes two distinct methods of division, which might be presented to the eye by the vertical and horizontal columns of a table. One of these is the division into centuries, the other the division into heads or rubrics. The first may be called the Chronological, the second the Topical part of the arrangement. Although intimately blended in the actual structure of the work, these methods are entirely distinct and independent of each other, inasmuch as either of them might have been employed without the other; that is to say, each rubric might have been continued through the whole without distinguishing the centuries; or on the other hand, the history of each century might have been chronologically stated, without any classification of topics. It is the formal combination of these methods that gives character externally to the great standard work of which we have been speaking.

Now in reference to both these features of the plan, the later German writers claim to have made great advances on the

ground assumed and occupied by the Magdeburg Centuriators. Let us see in what this improvement consists. In the chronological arrangement it consists in having professedly discarded the division into centuries, and substituted for it a division into periods of unequal length, determined, not by arbitrary measurement, but by the salient points or epochs of the history itself. There is no alleged improvement in historiography, on which the German writers seem to dwell with more complacency, and fuller persuasion of its reality and value, than on this. It is no longer spoken of as something that admits of doubt or question, but as an admitted or established truth, to be assumed in every new advance towards perfection. It is in this spirit, although not precisely in this form, that the centurial arrangement is referred to, as an obsolete absurdity, by the two latest writers on the subject in this country, Dr. Schaff and Dr. Humphrey. This weighty and unanimous prescription, in behalf of the new method, makes it all the more incumbent upon those who venture to dissent from its conclusions, to inquire into the specific grounds on which they rest for their validity.

The favourite objection to the old arrangement is, that it is arbitrary and mechanical. But so, to some extent, are all expedients to assist the memory, not arising necessarily from something in the very nature of the subject, but the fruit of "art and man's device," however rational and well contrived. Their being contrived at all, subjects them to the charge of being arbitrary, and, in some degree, mechanical, since every periodical arrangement that has ever been proposed is after all an artificial frame-work, which requires some effort of the understanding to insert it in its proper place, and still more effort of the memory to keep it there. The mere degree, in which it can be justly called mechanical or arbitrary, is not now in question. The essential fact is, that these qualities do not belong exclusively, even admitting that they do belong pre-eminently, to the old division into centuries.

Sometimes this vague charge is made more specific by alleging that the centurial arrangement already presupposes all the various series of events, and sequences of causes and effects, to be simultaneously wound up at the end of every

hundred years; whereas the threads are of unequal length, and while one falls short of the century, another overruns into the next. Besides the false reproach thus cast upon the old arrangement, which professes to be only an approximation and a practical convenience, this plausible objection quietly ignores the fact, that the very same thing may be said with equal truth, though not of course true to the same extent, of every periodical division that can be imagined. However nearly such divisions may approximate to the ideal standard, it will not be seriously alleged, that any of them has succeeded in making all the threads of history coincident in their commencement and their termination, so that nothing overruns the mark or falls below it. That this is peculiarly the case with the centuries, because they are more numerous and uniform, is true, but may be made good by peculiar advantages of other kinds.

Another reason for believing that this boasted change in the chronological method of Church History is not so philosophical in principle or useful in practice as its advocates imagine, is the endless diversity of periodical divisions, which have been proposed to take the place of the exploded centuries. It seems as if there would be no end to the process of invention on the part of the prolific Germans, so that really there may be ground to fear that it will soon defeat itself by making all points salient, and every notable event an epoch. Instead of striving after uniformity, and trying to let well enough alone, each new competitor for fame in this department seems to think it necessary to attempt a fresh improvement in the period and epoch manufacture. The extent to which it has already gone, may be learned by a glance at Dr. Schaff's concise and clear account of the most important schemes, prefixed to his own ingenious schedule, which we look upon as much the most complete and beautiful of all these modern chronological arrangements. To avoid technical minutiae, we refer the reader to that passage, with the simple additional suggestion of a mode in which the information there afforded may be brought to bear, in a concentrated form, upon the question now at issue. For this purpose, let the reader take some noted event of ecclesiastical importance, and observe into which

division and subdivision it will fall according to the several arrangements there described. We must also add, in order to complete the statement there made, that Kurtz, in the latest of the many forms through which his valuable history has passed, not contented with the changes he had made already in the periodological arrangement of the subject, makes another, by establishing the year 692 as a great epoch, with an evident assurance that instead of adding a new element of strife to the existing chaos, he has brought the whole affair perceptibly and measurably nearer to perfection. Now the practical question to be solved is, how are we to choose between these various schemes of periodology, and after we have done so, how are we to keep the chosen scheme in mind, amidst the constant variations, not of others only, but of the very man, perhaps, by whom it was discovered and revealed at first.

In opposition to this picture of the discord which prevails among the periodologists, it may be said, that there is now a very general agreement as to the division of the whole subject into three great parts, the Ancient, the Medieval, and the Modern; and that this agreement vindicates the new school of historians from the sweeping charge of endless and incurable diversity. We answer, first, that some of those who thus agree as to the three divisions, in defining the limits of the first and second, differ by two centuries. Neander, for example, makes the middle age begin at the close of the year 590, Kurtz in 692, Hase in 800! Yet they all agree in the general assumption of three great divisions. We answer, in the next place, that this general division, far from being the invention of the new school, is, even in its modern form, as old as Mosheim, and is perfectly consistent with the old division into centuries, by grouping which it is in fact obtained. Apart, then, from this obvious and general division, which is common to all recent schemes and methods of Church History, we hold that the interminable variations of the modern periodology are proofs that it is founded upon no just principle, but in its measure as "mechanical and arbitrary" as the old 'centurial arrangement, which, with all its stiffness, has the merit of being just what it pretends to be; and at the same time, from its very uniformi-

ty, is perfectly intelligible, readily available, and easily remembered.

A further confirmation of these views may be derived from the notorious fact, that even those who clamour loudest for the Periods and against the Centuries, are after all obliged to make the latter the substratum of their own arrangement, so that while they parade periods of their own invention in the running title, they tell us in the body of the page that such and such events belong to such and such a century, and even indicate the characteristic features of whole centuries, as such; so that instead of superseding the old method by a new and better one, they spoil both by mixing and entangling them together.

Besides all this, we have another serious objection to the disuse, whether theoretical or practical, or both, of the centurial arrangement. It is this, that it inevitably tends to widen the already yawning chasm between ecclesiastical and civil history. It seems, indeed, to be regarded by the modern German school as an advantage to increase this separation, and so far from seeking to avail themselves of epochs and divisions previously familiar, they endeavour to avoid such synchronisms, and to plant their stakes as far as possible from those already in the ground for other purposes. Even in the *History of Doctrine*, which is really a large part of Church History, they seem to make a merit of drawing lines of demarcation wholly different from those already drawn in other parts of the same general field. This preposterous passion for variety and novelty has no doubt been fomented by the artificial and excessive division of literary labour in the German school, which, while it tends to make the treatment of each minor subject more exhaustive, at the same time tends to rob the whole of uniformity and unity. And this is not a mere esthetical defect or fault, but a practical aggravation of the evil into which we are inquiring, that of too great a diversity between the forms and methods of ecclesiastical and other history. No wonder that the general reader, even the most cultivated, feels himself repelled from this great subject, when he finds that at the entrance he must leave behind him the

familiar and time-honoured methods of remembering dates, with which all his other historical studies are associated.

Our conclusion, then, as to the modern chronological improvements in the method of Church History, is, that they are, to a great extent, illusory or only nominal, and, so far as they are real, rather injurious than useful to the clearness, unity, and beauty of the compositions, whose distinctive form and structure are determined by them. The true use of these numberless and endless periodologies is not to shape the history itself, but to indicate its salient points, and aid the understanding and the memory, by furnishing an adequate number of convenient epochs. There is no more need of cutting up our books to match them, than there is of marking the meridians or parallels of latitude by furrows in the soil, or fixing the imaginary lines of the terrestrial globe by hedges, ditches, or substantial walls. The taste which would incorporate all such divisions into the very structure of a history, is similar to that which used to make, and often still makes, the title page of books a table of contents, if not a laudatory puff into the bargain. The proper place for such contrivances is in the index or synoptical table, not in the body of the book itself.

We venture, somewhat timidly, to add, that in this, as in many other points relating to the outward part of literary labour, we regard the Germans as still far behind the very nations who depend upon them for things more substantial. To evince this, we need only refer to the continued practice of some German writers, preposterously copied by their slavish imitators here and elsewhere, of dividing the same matter into large and small type, often without the least discoverable principle to regulate the process; or the still more objectionable habit of appending all additional matter to the text as notes, instead of working it into the appropriate portion of the text, as the best English writers, and the French, almost without exception do. This practice, frequently occasioned by the stated periodical revision of the lectures, out of which most learned German works are made, is sometimes carried to a length almost incredible to English readers; every afterthought, however unimportant or essential, being thrown into the margin in a manner perfectly mechanical, and utterly unworthy of the intellect and

learning of the author. Another instance of inferiority in taste as to externals, more immediately connected with our present subject, is the almost puerile gradation of divisions, subdivisions, and sub-subdivisions, which even the most celebrated German writers seem to think conducive to the clearness and completeness of their books, but which only serve to make them repulsive to the eye and burdensome to the memory. Let any one compare such a nest of puzzles, with its endless systems of concentric circles, to the simple series of consecutive chapters, in which Gibbon or Thiers presents a complex history to the reader's eye, with perfect ease and clearness, and without the least confusion or asperity. The two things are as different as a public building, so symmetrically planned and ordered, that the stranger can scarcely lose his way if he would, and one in which he is directed or restrained at every step by sign-boards, hand-bills, barriers, and other marks of division, which may all be theoretically in the right place, but, so far as comfort and convenience are concerned, are very clearly in the wrong one, being much better suited to the architect's design, or to the map of the building hung up in the vestibule, than to the interior of the house itself. Even Dr. Schaff's volume, the literary excellence of which is so generally and justly praised, would have commanded still more admiration, if its formal structure, no less than its words, had been translated out of German into English.

We may be thought, however, to have lost sight of the end which we proposed to accomplish, that of showing that the later Church Historians have adhered unduly to the model set before them by the Magdeburg Centuriators; whereas we have really been showing that they have departed from it for the worse. But this is true only of the chronological part of the arrangement, in which they have indeed exchanged one simple, well-known, and effective method, for a number far more complex, and at variance with each other. In the topical arrangement, on the other hand, they have adhered, with still more unfortunate results, to its essential principles, although they are entitled to the praise of having simplified its outward form. This improvement lies in the reduction of the number of distinct heads or categories to a smaller number, and in the more

symmetrical adjustment of these few to one another. The essential principle retained is that of carrying the history through each of these divisions under every period, and then recommencing with another topic. So far from being relieved by the alleged chronological improvements before mentioned, the inconveniences of this arrangement have been aggravated. For if the history is thus to be divided into shreds or slices, the more they are limited in length the better; for the sooner then can we return to the point of departure, and connect the various shreds together. It is far less tiresome, after going through the history of Church organization during some one century, to go back and enter on the history of its doctrinal disputes or changes, than it is to go through the same process in relation to a period of several hundred years. With all that is attractive in Neander's great work, there are probably few patient, persevering readers, who have not felt something like a faintness of spirit, when, after reading a whole volume on the controversies of a certain age, and notwithstanding the instruction and delight afforded, feeling pleased that they have finished it at last, they find, on taking up the next part, that they are to go back to the same distant, half-forgotten starting point, and travel over the same ground in search of something else before neglected; that after having gathered all the flowers through a hundred or a thousand miles, they are to start afresh and gather all the pebbles, and then make the journey for a third time, catching all the butterflies. If history, as some have represented it, is really a mighty river, down which the historian is conducting a company of travellers, how distressing is the very thought of first descending one bank, then the other, then the middle of the stream, then the channels upon either side, throughout the whole course, from its rising to its estuary! How much more delightful, and more useful too, to make but one descent, surveying both banks and the stream itself, passing from one side to the other, with irregular, but, for that very reason, less fatiguing changes, and receiving every moment the entire impression of the undivided landscape! The first named method may be best for the surveyor or the engineer, but surely not for the great crowd of voyagers in search of health and of general improvement. The

other may be difficult to manage well: but so is everything intended to secure, by complex means, a great harmonious result. If possible, it surely is worth trying. Let the Church Historian, in his own preliminary studies, act the engineer or the surveyor; but before he undertakes to pilot and to entertain a great mixed multitude of pleasure-seeking passengers, he ought to be prepared to take a less professional and more attractive course.

Dropping these figures, which we have not strength or skill to manage, let us briefly compare this favourite method of Church History with the general usage of historiography. Why has it been so much confined to the school of the Magdeburg Centuriators? Why do we find so little trace of it in classical or sacred history? How have the most eminent historians of other kinds been able to dispense with it? If the life of Washington or Bonaparte, each really the history of an age and nation, can be skilfully and powerfully written on the old and simple plan, without continually going back to start afresh and run a parallel to what we have already done; if, with a few insignificant exceptions, wholly or partly generated by this bad example, no one thinks of giving us the life of Washington, from end to end, first as a man, then as a soldier, then again as a statesman; if, should any one be able so to write it, no one save himself could read it; why is it utterly impossible to write about the Church and its vicissitudes, except in the peculiar form impressed upon the subject several centuries ago, by men whose strength lay not in taste and form, and that too for a temporary purpose, which has long since been accomplished? It is equally curious and provoking to observe, that the contemporary Germans, with all their characteristic scorn for old opinions, and spontaneous preference for what is new as to substantials, should philosophize and reason about this venerable relic of the Magdeburg Historians, as an axiomatic principle, to be assumed in all their reasonings and plans, without the least doubt or discussion of its truth or its necessity. We wish that, in America at least, while every lawful use is made of their researches and accumulations, a return may take place, in the mode of exhibition, to the primitive and

simple method sanctioned by the usage of the Bible, the Classics, and Historians in general.

But what is this method? Leaving out of view all peculiarities, personal or national, and looking at the great authoritative models just referred to, as a class, we have no hesitation in answering that the only genuine historical method is that which aims to exhibit the ingredients as elements of history, not in independent strata, but in one homogeneous composition; not as separate pictures, but as figures in the same; and this not merely with a view to more agreeable effect, but as essential to the highest intellectual and moral end to which history itself can be conducive; and which no detached and desultory inspection of the topics can secure, without a simultaneous and harmonious view of all together.

If it be still asked how these views are to be realized, and put in practice, we reply, first, by discarding all traditional, unnatural, and peculiar methods, and by bringing Church History back into connection with its kindred branches of the same great subject. In the next place, we suggest, as highly probable at least, that this is not to be effected by the use of any one expedient, any more than medical empiricism can be remedied by simply substituting one patent nostrum or quack doctor for another. What we most desire for this department of theology among ourselves, is freedom and variety of form with unity of substance; a wise dependence upon those who have gone further than ourselves in the discovery or illustration of historical truth, with an equally wise independence of the same men, as to things in which we are at least their equals. In realizing this idea, we should not regret to see different experiments conducted by the hands of native authors, not excluding those of foreign birth and education who have freely made this their adopted country. One such corrective might be tried by following the example, set already both in Germany and elsewhere, of giving history a more biographical or personal character, exchanging rigid chronological or topical divisions for the living individuality of great men, into whose lives contemporary history might easily be wrought, without either violence or undue refinement. Another equally desirable experiment would be to let the chronological arrangement

be entirely superseded by the topical, or rather absorbed in it; that is, by treating in succession the great subjects of history in the order of their actual occurrence; now a council, now a controversy, now a critical event, now a typical or representative man, without applying the same set of stereotyped rubrics to each period in succession. This would, it seems to us, approach most nearly to the form and usages of history in general; but as some might find it difficult to navigate the stream without a fixed point to steer by, we would also recommend an improvement on the Magdeburg method, which might still retain whatever advantages it really affords. This modification of the system would consist in substituting for the several co-ordinate topics of inquiry, one alone to which the others should be incidental and subservient. But which would be entitled to this preference? On this point, we propose to say a few words in conclusion.

We have said already that the later German writers have reduced the categories of the old Centuriators to a smaller number, and to better relative proportions. The crude mass has been boiled down, as it were, to a more manageable size and shape. According to the views of the best modern writers, Church History exhibits Christianity in three great aspects—as an Organization—as a Doctrine—as a Life; and as these three phases are produced by the revolving of the same orb in its orbit, we may add a fourth important topic, as included in all recent exhibitions of the subject. This is the area or sphere within which Christianity has operated. Under this head is included the extension of the Church, and, as a kindred topic, its relation to the world, society, and human government. This covers the whole history of persecutions, church establishments, and missions. Under the head of Christian Life is comprehended all that relates to its public or private manifestations, *i. e.*, to worship, and to Christian morals, or practical religion. Under the head of Doctrine is included the history of controversy and opinion, together with that of theological literature. Under the head of Organization are included the two topics of Church Government and Discipline.

Now, in order to determine which of these four phases of the subject is entitled to the preference as the leading topic of

Church History, we have only to inquire which is the least dependent on the others for its own existence or importance, and at the same time most essential to theirs. If this test be applied to the external relations of the Church, it cannot be sustained at all, for it is evident that these derive their very being from the Church itself, and that the Church itself might have existed as a self-contained or esoteric institute, without any such relations at all.

The same is true, though in a less degree, of Organization, *i. e.*, government and discipline, which derive their value from the ends which they secure, namely, purity of doctrine and holiness of life. We can conceive, indeed, of an organization existing for its own sake, without reference to any thing exterior or ulterior to itself. But no one will pretend that the Church, as depicted in the word of God, is such a system.

The choice must therefore lie between the two remaining topics of Church History, corresponding to the two great aspects of the Christian system as a Life and as a Doctrine. With respect to the relation between these, there has occurred a very marked change in the prevailing modes of thought and expression. It has become a favourite idea, with the Germans and their followers, that Christianity is not a Doctrine, but a Life; by which they do not mean, of course, to deny its doctrinal contents or substance as a system of belief, but simply to decide the question now immediately before us—what is the grand distinctive character of Christianity, to which all others may be made historically incidental? The answer given by the class in question is, that it is not a Doctrine, but a Life. This admits of two interpretations. It may mean that the Church has a personal life of its own, in which its members must participate. Thus understood, it is a mystical and dangerous conceit, to which we have sufficiently done justice upon other occasions. Or the words may mean that the great end of Christianity is, not to communicate the truth and stop there, but to engender and promote the spiritual life of its professors. This is true; but it is only true because it represents experimental or practical religion as the fruit or the effect of truth: and as the cause, whether primary or secondary, must precede the effect, it follows that the history of

Christianity, considered as a Life, presupposes its existence as a Doctrine or a system of belief.

On the other hand, this system of belief, though really designed to stand connected with an outward government and discipline on one hand, and with a religious experience and practice on the other, and to be maintained within certain definite external limits, and in certain relations to the world around it, is perfectly conceivable apart from each and all of these concomitants, and yet, as we have seen before, essential to the being, and, of course, to the historical description of them all. It follows, therefore, that the priority, in such a scheme as we have been considering, is due to this great aspect of the subject; or, in other words, that a complete Church History must be a history of the true faith, as rejected or received, expounded or corrupted, by the men to whom it has been sent, and as producing, in various degrees of purity, according to the mode of its reception, a system of government and discipline, adapted to preserve it and enforce it, and a definite religious life and character, both inward and outward, individual and collective, within certain limits, both of time and space, and under certain definite but varying relations to civil rulers and society at large.

If this result of our induction be a just definition of Church History, it suggests a very practicable method of determining its form and structure, by making it a history of Christian doctrine, and subordinating all the other topics to it, not as separate subjects of historical inquiry, but as elements of one unbroken narrative. It is true the Germans have made "*Dogmengeschichte*" a thing by itself; but that is no more a reason for denying it its just place in a system of Church History, than any man or number of men choosing to recount the history of Washington's administration, or his history as a statesman, without any reference to the rest of his life, would require or authorize his subsequent biographers to pass this most essential portion of their subject by in silence, or to slur it over as of small comparative importance.

We are glad to see that this correct view of the place due to the doctrine of the Church in the construction of its History, is recognized, not only by Professor Humphrey, in the excellent

address which has occasioned these remarks, but likewise, if we may rely upon the somewhat vague and irresponsible reports which we have seen of his inaugural discourse, by Professor Shedd of Andover, the two most recent additions to the corps of Church Historians in America. We use the title in the wide sense of historical instructors, whether from the chair or through the press, in which more permanent and extensive mode of influence we hope to welcome and to learn from both hereafter.

Matthew S. Ballsteron.

ART. V.—*Pamphlets issued by the Chinese Insurgents at Nanking*, to which is added a *History of the Kwang-se Rebellion*, gathered from public documents, and a sketch of the connection between Foreign Missionaries and the Chinese Insurrection; concluding with a Critical Review of several of the above pamphlets, compiled by W. H. Medhurst, Senr. Shanghai, printed at the office of the “North China Herald,” 1853.

THE attention of the Christian world has lately been directed to China in a greater degree than ever before, by the remarkable revolution now going on in that most populous of empires. We propose in the present article to give a brief synopsis of all that we know, from the sources of information within our reach, respecting the origin, progress, and character of that revolution which has convulsed a great nation, and threatens the overthrow of a once powerful dynasty. Definite and reliable information concerning the true character of this revolution, and the views of the insurgents, was first obtained by the visit of the English steamer “Hermes” to Nanking in May, 1853. Previous to that time, indeed, rumours were current among the Chinese at the ports open to foreign commerce, that the insurgents destroyed the idols in the places taken by them; but such rumours were not generally considered worthy of much confidence. It was also said that the leader of the insurrection, who adopted the title T’ienteh, was a professed believer in Christianity, and had been baptized in Hong Kong

by Mr. Gutzlaff. The information obtained at Nanking confirmed the truth of the rumours previously in circulation regarding their iconoclastic practices, and their belief in the doctrines of the Christian religion. It was then found, too, that the insurgent chiefs had set forth their peculiar religious and political dogmas in a series of pamphlets, copies of which were freely furnished to the officers of the *Hermes*. These pamphlets were translated by Dr. Medhurst, and published in the *North China Herald*. They have since been republished in a pamphlet form, in connection with other documents relating to the revolution. They are eleven in number, bearing the following titles:—1. The Book of Religious Precepts of the T'ai-ping Dynasty. 2. The Trimetrical Classic. 3. An Ode for Youth. 4. The Book of Celestial Decrees, and Declarations of the Imperial Will. 5. The Book of Declaration of the Divine Will made during the Heavenly Father's Descent upon Earth. 6. The Imperial Declaration of T'ai-ping. 7. Proclamations issued by Imperial appointment from the Eastern and Western Princes. 8. Arrangement of the Army of the T'ai-ping Dynasty, 9. Regulations for the Army. 10. A new Calendar for the third year of the T'ai-ping Dynasty. (1852.) 11. Ceremonial Regulations.

Besides these, they have printed the first twenty-eight chapters of Genesis, and it appears by the last accounts, that they have also printed Exodus, Numbers, and the Gospel according to Matthew. It appears to be their intention to republish the whole of the Old and New Testaments, using Gutzlaff's version.

Two hundred years have now elapsed since the present race of Tartar Emperors obtained possession of the throne of China. It was not until after a long and arduous struggle that they succeeded in bringing all the provinces into subjection. The resistance to their rule was prolonged by their attempt to impose upon the Chinese the Tartar costume. They required not only a change of dress, but the tonsure of the head, and the braiding of the hair in the form of a long queue. The people of the southern provinces, especially, long resisted this degrading badge of servitude; but northern valour and prowess at length prevailed, and the refined and polite Chinese were brought under the yoke of their more rude, but also more war-

like neighbours. The revolutionists now sweeping over the country restore the ancient costume, and wear the hair long, using neither the razor nor the shears in making their head-dress, but a more feminine implement, the hair-pin. The Chinese have never forgotten that they are under a foreign yoke, and secret societies have long been in existence, the avowed object of which has been the expulsion of the foreign princes, and the re-establishment of a native dynasty. In the mountain districts of the province of Kwangsi, are a number of tribes of hardy mountaineers, known collectively as the Meaoutsz, who still maintain their independence.

A long period of quiet domination has had the effect of gradually enervating the Tartar conquerors. The weakness of the government has long been manifest in various difficulties between the people of small districts and their local magistrates. Foreigners resident in the country were led years ago to anticipate the overthrow of the Tartar dynasty at no very distant period. If this weakness was so perceptible before the war with England, it became much more so after that war. Government officers were not slow to perceive this effect of their collision with their powerful adversary. Wurantai, Lieutenant-General of the Manchu garrison at Canton, brings the fact to the notice of his Imperial master in a memorial dated in May, 1851. We quote it the more readily because it gives the opinion of a man high in office near the seat of war, and a Manchu, as to the causes which led to the revolution. He says:—"In both the Kwang provinces there are large numbers of robbers and numerous confederated banditti, who upon every occasion, and at a moment's notice, flock together and create disturbances. This is all the result of their observation of the proceedings of the government forces, during the time they were employed in the affair with the barbarians. *Regarding them once as the tiger, they have of late regarded them as the sheep.* Besides this, among the tens of thousands of militia who were disbanded after the pacification of the barbarians, there were some bearing arms for purposes of their own. Of this description of unemployed vagabonds very few set about seeking any lawful calling, but large num-

bers banded together to commit robbery." *Chinese Repository* vol. xx. p. 495.

The operations of this war not only made manifest to the whole empire the inefficiency of the government, but increased very greatly its actual weakness by draining the public treasury. The people were encouraged more frequently to assert their rights with arms in their hands, and to resist the oppression of their immediate rulers—the local magistrates—who are the tax-collectors also. Numerous petty insurrections occurred, in which the people generally secured their point, and then quietly laid down their arms.

The immediate occasion of the outbreak which has led to consequences so serious to the present rulers of the empire, was religious persecution. The Christian religion has been persecuted before in China. The motives which have led to such persecution have always probably been political rather than religious. The hostility has been directed against foreigners and foreign influence, rather than against Christ. Religious rancour seems not to be one of the traits of Chinese character. They are characterized rather by indifference to all religion. It is to be hoped that this long unruffled apathy is about to give place to sentiments that shall produce a deep-seated upheaving of this inert mass. In the wonderful providence of God, China's curse will prove to be China's blessing. Opium has been, under God, the indirect means of opening the empire to Christian influences. The appetite of the Chinese for opium, and that of Western nations for tea, are of modern date, and would seem to have been designed for a special purpose. They have brought China into communion with Christian nations, and chiefly Protestant nations. By means of this intercourse with other nations, some rays of light have penetrated the moral darkness in which the nation is enveloped. The labours of Morrison and Milne produced a complete translation of the Bible. They were followed by others who acquired the language and engaged in similar labours. Tracts and portions of the Scriptures, prepared by them, were widely distributed from Canton. When practicable, advantage was taken of the literary examinations held triennially at that city, to scatter Christian tracts over the province by distrib-

uting them among the students attending the examinations. Canton being at that time the only port open to foreign trade, strangers from all parts of the empire resorted thither for commercial purposes. These often became not unwilling instruments of conveying the written instructions and exhortations of the missionary to remote places, to which he could not have personal access. The effects produced by this means were never supposed to be very great, and whatever they were, they can never be known till eternity shall reveal them. There can now be little doubt, however, that to a cause apparently so trivial, to means so utterly inadequate, may be directly traced this mighty wave of revolution and religious reform, which has swept the land with irresistible power.

In the latter part of 1852, a Chinese gentleman called on a missionary at Hong Kong, avowed his connection with the rebellion in Kwang-si, and gave some account of its origin. This account he committed to writing, and a translation is given in the pamphlet before us. From it and other sources we gather the following particulars.

Hung Siu-tsiuen in his boyhood gave proof of the possession of extraordinary talents. He made great proficiency in his studies, and when fifteen or sixteen years of age attended the examination for his first degree. While attending an examination at Canton, a man "with large sleeves and a long beard" gave him a book entitled, "Good Words Exhorting the Age." Dr. Medhurst thinks this was in 1833, and that the man "with large sleeves and long beard" was the native evangelist Liang Afah, then labouring in the employment of the London Missionary Society, and who at that time distributed large numbers of books to the students at the door of the examination hall. Hung Siu-tsiuen, like many others, carried his book home, ran hastily over its contents, and then laid it on the shelf. There it seems to have rested, unnoticed and unthought-of, for several years. At length, in the year 1837, Hung was brought down by a severe fit of sickness. During his convalescence he had a dream, or vision, in which he supposed himself taken up to heaven. He there received certain communications, in which there was something that reminded him of the long forgotten tract. He immediately brought the book

down from its resting-place, and carefully studied its contents. He found so striking a similarity between the doctrines taught in the book and what he had heard in his vision, that he at once concluded both were revelations from God. He acted in accordance with this belief, and began immediately to communicate what he had learned to others. He set forth his views both orally and in writing—sometimes in prose and sometimes in verse. Among his verses composed at that time we find the following:

“Confessing our transgressions against Heaven,
 Our dependence is on the full atonement of Jesus.
 We should not believe in devils, but obey the holy commands;
 Should worship only the true God with full powers of the mind.
 We should think on the glories of heaven,
 And on the terrors of hell, and pity the wicked.”

“Besides the God of heaven there is really no God:
 Why therefore do simpletons take the false for the true?”

One of Hung's first acts was to take the picture representing Confucius, which hung in his school-room, and throw it away. In this he was soon imitated by others, who had been convinced of the truth of what he taught; and it was not long before he succeeded so far as to induce a number of his neighbours to receive the new doctrine, and destroy the images which had previously received their idolatrous homage.

At this point there is a hiatus in the history, and we are not informed in what way the following years were occupied. Whether Hung's zeal flagged, or whether his efforts proved ineffectual in spite of his zeal, does not appear. He probably continued his labours in his school, endeavouring to recommend his new doctrines to others as he had opportunity. It would seem, however, that up to the year 1846 the number of those brought to submit to his teaching was not great. In that year we find him in Canton, for two months a guest of the Rev. J. J. Roberts, a diligent student of the Scriptures, and an applicant for baptism. He was accompanied by a friend, who remained however but a few days. Before Hung gave satisfactory evidence that he possessed the qualifications necessary for baptism, he left Canton.

Returning to Kwangsi, he preached more zealously, or at

least more successfully, than before. Many believed, renounced their idols, and met together for religious worship. By these meetings the suspicions of the authorities were excited. Some of those who were in the habit of attending the religious services were seized, beaten, and thrown into prison. No resistance was made to this persecution, until two of the new religionists were so far persecuted as to die in consequence of the cruel treatment to which they were subjected. Much sympathy was felt by the people for the sufferers, for they were known to be upright men, who had committed no offence to justify such severity. Thousands of sturdy arms were volunteered for the protection of this little band of worshippers. Their friends were perhaps all the more ready for this, in consequence of injury and oppression which they themselves, or their acquaintances, had experienced. "Tens of thousands of people," says the narrator, "were assembled for our protection. How could we but esteem these fathers and brethren as sent by Heaven, to whom the true policy would be to join ourselves?"

The above account is, beyond all doubt, in the main correct, for it is confirmed, as to all important details, by a document emanating from Chan Tientsieh, the acting Governor of the province of Kwangsi. It is dated in May 1851, and published in the *Peking Gazette*. We find a translation in the *Chinese Repository*, (vid. vol. xx. p. 498.) The Governor states that while he was at Wersien, for the purpose of repressing the seditious bands, he was informed of a club organized by Fung Yun-shan, Tsang Yuh-ching, and Lu Luh. Fung and Lu had been seized, together with the papers of the club, by a literary graduate named Wang. Lu died in prison, and Fung was released, in consequence of heavy bribes paid by Tsang. The Governor goes on to say:

"It appears that Fung is from the district of Hwa in Canton, and came to Kwei-ping hien in Kwangsi in 1844. He lived in Lu Luh's house, teaching youth, in 1845, and during the next two years in the house of Tsang Yuh-ching, in the same occupation. On the 28th December 1847, this graduate Wang, aided by the constables and headmen, arrested Fung, because that he and Tsang had been *propagating magical arts*

to seduce the people, and forming cabals and bands to destroy altars and images in the temples, and handed him over to the head elder, Tsang Tsu-Kwang. But his accomplices, Tsang Asun and others, rescued him by force."

The matter was brought before the prefect and district magistrate, but they acquitted Fung of "being a seditious person, and of all illegality," and only sent him to his native place, to be detained there. This did not satisfy the Governor. His excellency says:—"I examined Kü, the prefect, and Wang Lieh, who had before been district magistrate, to learn why they had not extirpated seditions, and supported loyal persons; and also, when this villain Fung was forming cabals during a number of years, and swearing persons into it, within a few miles of the city, in the house of Lu Luh and Tsang Yuh-ching, why he had heard nothing of it. When the graduate Wang had informed them of it, what hindered them from going to the village and personally examining, so as to be perfectly sure whether the altars and temples with their images had been destroyed or not, and whether the vagabonds possessed heretical books, in which Jesus, a false god (*sié Shin*) of the Europeans was spoken of, and had themselves seditiously worshipped, and honoured him; and whether too, Fung had himself written or taught these books in a guileful way, and had planned sedition in so doing?" Further on, the Governor descants on the state of the province at that time. He says: "I find that the rule of the officers in this whole province of Kwangsi has been very negligent. Indeed, I have seldom heard of or seen a place where matters have come to such a pass. It has thence resulted that this Fung Yun-shan in his perverse heart has not had the least fear of them, but privately returning to the province, has stirred up the rustic people, some of whom have suddenly come out in their seditious conduct, and we know not how many have secretly joined them."

Such is the Governor's account of the origin of this movement, and it agrees so entirely with the accounts derived at different times from the insurgents themselves, that no room is left to doubt that religious persecution was the immediate occasion of this rebellion. This Fung Yun-shan is the person who now figures at the court of T'ai-ping as the "Southern King."

That there were at that time causes of discontent in the province entirely distinct from the persecution of Hung and his followers, cannot be doubted. Local insurrections were frequent in different parts of the province. Whether these were the effect or the cause of the success of Hung's party, we have no means of ascertaining; but many of them were evidently independent of the insurrection excited by the persecution.

From the Peking Gazettes, as given in Dr. Medhurst's pamphlet, we have compiled a sketch of the progress of the revolution. In August, 1849, disturbances are reported in the village of Yung-fuh. In November of the same year, other disturbances were reported, and the district city of Sin-ning in Hu-nan was captured. The rebels, it is said, were immediately driven out, but in May, 1850, we find it still in their possession. Their chief assumed the title of "The Prince who tranquillizes the River Regions." The viceroy of Hu-kwang marched against the place, captured it, and sent the chief to Peking. In November, 1850, matters had assumed so serious an aspect that the Emperor called out from his retirement his old and faithful minister Lin Tsih-sü, so famous as the imperial commissioner who demanded the surrender of the opium in the hands of foreign merchants—the act which led to the war with England. Lin had retired to his native place in Fuhkien on account of his health, but obeyed the call of his master, and set out for the seat of war. After travelling eighteen days, he was too sick to proceed on his journey, and ended his days at Pu-ming, in the province of Canton. Lí Sing-yuen was ordered to take his place.

About this time various disturbances were reported in the province of Canton. Several cities in the central parts of Kwangsi also were captured, and held for protracted periods. The scenes of these acts of violence were so widely separated, while in many cases also simultaneous, that they could hardly have been under the control of any one directing authority. An imperialist officer, speaking of them in a memorial to the throne, says: "Should the several gangs unite themselves in one body, their extermination would be even a more difficult task than at present." These disturbances, then, were probably in many instances isolated acts of robbery, rather than

rebellion. Hung Siu-tsiuen probably had no connection with them, though they all tended to aid him, by distracting the attention of the authorities, and causing the dispersion of the imperial forces over a wide extent of country. His forces, too, were doubtless augmented by the remnants of the bands dispersed by the attacks of the imperial troops.

At what precise time Hung Siu-tsiuen ceased to aim merely at security from local oppression, and determined to set up the standard of a new dynasty, does not appear, but it must have been some time in the year 1850. In 1851 it was given out that the insurgent chief in Kwangsi had assumed the title of T'ienteh; but there is every reason to believe that this was the chief of another party, entirely independent of Hung. The latter assumed the title, T'ai-ping wang, or King of Peace.

During the year 1850, the insurgents made rapid progress. City after city fell into their hands, and they seem to have maintained themselves within their walls as long as it was convenient, or suited their own plans, in spite of the efforts to dislodge them. We find them in the course of this year occupying Wu-siuen and Kwei-ping, district cities of Kwangsi, about two hundred miles from Canton. Their position there gave them the command of the Pearl river in this part of its course, and enabled them to control the trade of the interior with the city of Canton, and to levy a tribute on all articles passing to and from that port. Here the insurgents long maintained themselves, sending at the same time expeditions to distant places, in which they were generally successful, though meeting with occasional reverses.

On the 12th of April, 1851, the viceroy Li Sing-yuen died in the camp, having first delivered his seals of office to Chau T'ien-tsiuh. This is the person who in the following month wrote the despatch quoted above, giving an account of the origin of the insurrection.

On the 27th of August, 1851, Hung Siu-tsiuen captured the superior district city of Yung-gnan, in the eastern part of the province of Kwangsi. The Peking Gazette mentions the name of Hung Siu-tsiuen for the first time, in connection with the capture of this place. The other cities were taken by subordinate or by independent chiefs. A number of chiefs are men-

tioned in the Gazette, whose names do not now appear among the officers of T'ai-ping wang. One named Ling Shih-pah held possession of Lo King, in the province of Canton, from August 1851 to September 1852. Another, named Yen Ping-yau, held several cities in the north of Kwangsi.

Hung retained Yung-gnan until until the 7th of April, 1852, when, according to the Gazette, it was recaptured by the Imperialists. It is more probable that it was voluntarily abandoned by the insurgents. It is said that three thousand of the rebels were slain, and their general, Hung Ta-tsiuen, was taken prisoner. Two Tartar generals and sixteen inferior officers also fell in the engagement.

Hung Ta-tsiuen was sent to Peking, where he was sentenced to be cut to pieces. Before the execution of this sentence, he made a confession, in which he declared that he was a fellow-conspirator with Hung Siu-tsiuen, and had assumed the title, T'ien-teh. After this date, we hear no more of T'ien-teh, and it may be true, therefore, that this was the person who assumed that title. It is evident, however, that T'ien-teh was the head of an insurrectionary movement. It is equally evident that Hung Siu-tsiuen has been, from the first, at the head of the movement of which he is now the chief. All the proclamations issued from the earliest date are in his name, and the whole history shows that he has never acted in a subordinate capacity. The only way of reconciling these facts is to suppose that T'ien-teh headed a separate movement, and had no connection with T'ai-ping. Such a supposition is entirely in accordance with what we know was the state of the province at that time. This is stated to be the fact, too, on the authority of a son, or adopted son, of one of the insurgent princes or kings, who has lately been baptized and received into the communion of the church by the Baptist missionaries at Shanghai. He gives good evidence, it is said, of being a sincere and humble follower of Christ.

On leaving Yung-gnan, the insurgents directed their course northward, and entered the province of Hunan. On the 2d of May they took Chin-chau. On the 15th they attacked Kwei-ling, the capital, but abandoned the siege on the 19th of the same month. They made their quarters at different times in

several of the district cities. They then proceeded toward the north, and laid siege to Chang-sha, the capital of Hupih, on the 11th September. They were followed at a safe distance by the imperial troops, under Sae Shanga, a Tartar general, who had been a minister of State. He was soon afterward degraded, because he allowed the rebels "to do just as they pleased." Sü Kwang-tsin, Governor-General of Kwang-tung and Kwangsi, was appointed his successor.

The siege of Chang-sha was prosecuted during a period of eighty days, but without success. On the 30th of November they abandoned Chang-sha, and on the 13th of December took Yoh-chau, an important town situated at the junction of the Tung-ting lake with the Yang-tsz kiang. The insurgent army had now the broad surface and rapid current of the "Son of the Ocean" to carry them to Nanking. This was now the goal to which they directed their steps. They felt strong enough to abandon their former cautious warfare, and boldly push forward through the midst of their enemies to the seat of empire.

The Emperor Hien-fung now began to tremble for his throne. He fulminated anathemas against the robbers. He exhorted, encouraged, and punished his officers. So often did it become necessary to deprive generals of their rank, that they could not be spared from the field, and the sentence of degradation was generally accompanied with the reservation, "let him be retained in his command." The imperial forces were everywhere struck with panic, and fled on the approach of the enemy; in many cases without making even a show of resistance. In fact, the imperial grand army was left behind, and did not seem anxious to overtake the foe. The insurgents moved down the Yang-tsz, and on the 23d December we find them at Han-Yang, and at Wu-chang, the provincial city of Hupih. These two cities, lying at the mouth of the Han river, on opposite sides of the Yang-tsz, constitute one of the most important commercial marts of the interior of the empire. At Wu-chang, the insurgents met with a vigorous resistance, but took the city by storm on the 12th January 1853. For the loss of this city, Governor Sü was ordered up to the capital for punishment. He was sentenced to be beheaded; the sentence to be carried into execution in the autumn of 1853.

General Heang Yung, who had before been degraded and restored, was now degraded again.

The insurgents tarried at Wu-ch'ang only long enough to collect supplies and money, of both which they procured abundance. The Viceroy of Nanking now sailed up the river with a large force, to meet the enemy, and arrest their progress. He did not, however, succeed in retarding their onward course. Kiu-Kiang, Gnan King, and other important towns on the line of the Yang-tsz, fell in rapid succession into their hands, and were abandoned to the following—though not pursuing—imperialists. On the 8th of March, the insurgent host appeared before the walls of Nanking.

On the 10th of March, the Emperor at Peking announced his intention of presenting special prayer, with fasting, to the Supreme Ruler. In making the announcement, he blames his ministers for wrong measures, and acknowledges his own sins against High Heaven. He implores the forgiveness of his sins, while he supplicates for peace in behalf of his suffering people.

On the 19th of March, the insurgents, having effected a breach in the wall by means of a mine, took the city of Nanking by storm. The whole Tartar population, estimated at 20,000, was put to the sword. Chinkiang-foo, an important place at the intersection of the grand canal with the Yang-tsz, forty-seven miles from Nanking, was taken on the 31st of March. A large imperial force arrived from the north a few days subsequent to the fall of Nanking, but has not been able to accomplish anything for the recovery of the city. Immediately on obtaining possession of Nanking, the insurgents began to strengthen the fortifications, with a view to make it the seat of the new dynasty. It will probably be made their permanent capital.

About the end of May we hear of an insurgent army at Fung-yang, within six hundred miles of Peking. At what time this army set out from Nanking we are not informed. It laid siege to K'ae-fung-foo, in Honan, but did not capture it. Crossing the Yellow River at that place, they proceeded rapidly toward the north; and though unsuccessful in some of their sieges, not in any case very protracted, they do not appear to

have sustained a single defeat in the field. Their onward progress at least has not been seriously checked. They are often indeed reported by the imperial generals as having "fled and made their escape," but unfortunately for His Majesty, Hienfung, they always "fled" in the direction of Peking. They soon "trespassed on the imperial domain," and overran the province of Chih-li. On the 30th of October, they reached T'ien-tsing, the seaport of Peking, and at the head of the grand canal. It is a strongly fortified city, and its defence was of the utmost importance to the capital; yet it has fallen into the hands of the insurgents. Peking cannot long withstand their assaults. The march of this army in the face of numerous foes, to so great a distance from their associates, was a bold measure, and shows their confidence in their strength, and their contempt of their opponents.

On the 18th of May, Amoy was seized by a band of men connected with the secret societies, and on the 7th of September, Shanghae was taken in the same way. Both these bands profess subjection to T'ai-ping, but there is no evidence that he has ever recognized them. Amoy has been retaken, but Shanghae is still in possession of the rebels.

Such is the history of this remarkable revolution—of its beginning. But who can say what shall be the end? Its most extraordinary feature is the religious element which enters into it. It is not only a Revolution, but a Reformation. It aims not only at the overthrow of an ancient dynasty, but at the subversion of an ancient religion. Taking its rise in religious persecution, the religious element was not swallowed up in the political when it assumed the latter form, nor did success diminish the religious enthusiasm with which the movement began. This feature of the revolution is so unexpected—we had almost said incredible—that it has been looked upon by some with great doubt and suspicion. Many are slow to believe that there is any thing good in the religious part of the movement. It is thought in some quarters that the insurgent chiefs have assumed the profession of Christianity as a cloak to further their designs. This supposition is obviously contradicted by all the facts of the case. It is evident that the profession of Christianity was long prior to their first conception of

the idea of rebellion. It is not easy to understand, either, how they could imagine that the assumption of the Christian name would favour their design of seizing the supreme power. Would they not have rather regarded it as an insuperable obstacle to the accomplishment of such an object? For such a purpose, among such a people, to assume Christianity as a mere cloak, without any belief in its verity, would be strange indeed. Had they asked the assistance of foreigners, on the ground of their Christianity, there would have been room for such a suspicion. But they have never shown any desire for such assistance. Had they been hypocritical deceivers, aiming to accomplish mere projects of ambition, they would have endeavoured to conciliate the prejudices of their countrymen. But they have not done so. On the contrary, they have set themselves in avowed and uncompromising hostility to the traditions of the empire—to the recondite speculations of its learned philosophers, and also to the most revered opinions, the most rooted superstitions, and the most solemn and universally practised religious ceremonials of the whole nation. They at the same time denounce and oppose the prevalent vices of their countrymen, and inculcate a system of rigid morality—the morality of the Bible. Moreover, they do what deceivers would not be prone to do, they make the Bible the standard of truth. They print it, and freely distribute it, and require it to be taught to their followers, and in their schools. They have even made a knowledge of its contents necessary, it is said, to a literary degree.

At the same time, it is true that they have fallen into some serious errors. Whether many or any of them are truly converted men we do not know. But when we consider how much of their knowledge of Christianity has been derived from books, we cannot but think that some of their writings give evidence of the teaching of the Spirit of truth. Time alone, and a more intimate acquaintance, can enable us to judge of their real character. We shall, however, endeavour to place before the reader the means of forming a judgment for himself, so far as can be done from their books.

The first question to be considered is, “What is their rule of faith? Do they, or do they not pretend to a new revelation?”

In examining their publications we see no evidence of a claim to any such special revelation as would furnish a title to speak with divine authority as a religious teacher. There is nothing in the books to lead us to suppose that any of the chiefs lay claim to such authority—nothing that would suggest a resemblance to Mohammedism or Mormonism. The Bible alone, and common sense, are appealed to in their reasoning on religious subjects. Hung Siu-tsiuen himself does indeed profess to have had some communications directly from God, and fancies himself to have been on one or two occasions taken up to heaven. Other communications are said to have been made by the “Heavenly Father and the Celestial Elder Brother Jesus,” to the whole assembled army. These communications, however, all have special relation to the conduct of the present war. The religious instruction communicated is incidental and subordinate. Hung regards himself as having received a special commission to exterminate the Tartars in China and assume the throne himself, and he believes himself guided by the Heavenly Father in his military operations. This idea he evidently endeavours to impress on his followers, and he no doubt sincerely believes it himself. We subjoin one of these supposed divine communications as a specimen:

“On the 14th day of the 3d moon (19 April) of the Sin k’ae year (1851) in the village of Tung-heang the Heavenly Father addressed the multitude, saying, ‘Oh! my children, do you know your Heavenly Father and your Celestial Elder Brother?’ To which they all replied, ‘We know our Heavenly Father and Celestial Elder Brother.’ The Heavenly Father then said, ‘Do you know your lord* and truly?’ To which they all replied, ‘We know our lord right well.’ The Heavenly Father said, ‘I have sent your lord down into the world, to become the Celestial King: every word he utters is a celestial command; you must be obedient; you must truly assist your lord and regard your king; you must not dare to act disorderly, nor to be disrespectful. If you do not regard your lord and king, every one of you will be involved in difficulty.’”

The most remarkable instance of divine interposition is that

* The “lord” here refers to the chief of the insurrection.

detailed in the pamphlet which records the Heavenly Father's descent upon earth. In this it is related that one of the chiefs meditated treachery, and his treachery was revealed by the Heavenly Father to his associates. The culprit was summoned at night to the house of the Eastern King. There the Heavenly Father came down and closely questioned him as to his plans and his accomplices, just as a *man* would conduct such an examination. There was, however, no visible appearance of the Heavenly Father. The traitor at first denied his guilt, but perceiving at length from the nature of the questions that his examiner knew all his intentions, he confessed his guilt, and was sentenced to be cut to pieces. The whole army was much impressed with this display of omniscience, and offered pigs and oxen to the Heavenly Father as thank-offerings.

The object of this book is evidently to produce the conviction that the revolution is under the special protection of God, and to impress upon the army a wholesome dread of the certainty of detection in case of treachery. It is obviously a piece of deception, wholly without excuse. By whomsoever this scene was got up, the head of the insurrection must be held responsible, as it could hardly have been done without his sanction, and it is not likely that he could have been deceived. In the circumstances of danger in which they were placed, it is not surprising that men with their previous training and habits in regard to deception, should have yielded to such a temptation when they thought it advantageous to their cause, and when perhaps circumstances had occurred which rendered something of the kind, in their opinion, necessary. They might perhaps justify the means by the end, and regard it as a mere military stratagem. We cannot, however, but regard it as of evil import, showing as it does a moral obliquity not easy to be reconciled with the possession, in any measure, of Christian simplicity and honesty. It does not follow, however, that Hung and his associates are not sincere believers in the truth of Christianity, and sincerely desirous of extending it among their countrymen.

Their views of the being and attributes of God are as correct as could be expected from men with no better opportunities of learning the truth. His omniscience, omnipotence, and

omnipresence are distinctly stated and dwelt upon. They frequently speak of Him as the Creator and sole Governor of the world; and their views of divine providence are unexceptionable. They speak of God as the disposer of all events according to his own sovereign pleasure. Their religious views are more particularly brought out in the two books entitled "The Book of Religious Precepts," and "The Imperial Declaration of T'aiping." In the former we have the ten commandments with comments, together with prayers to be used on several occasions. The latter is the production of Hung Siu-tsiuen himself. The elevation of its style, and the general correctness of its sentiments, prove its author to be a man of no mean ability. Their views of God will appear from the following extracts. We would premise that in transcribing we substitute the word "God," "gods," where Dr. Medhurst in his translation has written "Spirit" or "spirits." The former is obviously the meaning of the author, as Dr. Medhurst himself admits by writing the word God or gods in brackets. They give the first commandment thus:—"Thou shalt honour and worship the Great God."

In the comment the author says:—"The great God is the universal Father of all men in every nation under heaven. Every man is produced and nourished by Him: every man is also protected by Him: every man ought therefore, morning and evening, to worship Him with acknowledgments of his goodness."

In the other works mentioned the following sentiments occur:—"Taking a general view of the men of this present world, I consider that though they amount to great multitudes, they are all created and produced by the great God. Having been produced by God, they are also supported by God. For every article of food and clothing they must depend upon the great God, who is the universal Father of all mankind. Life and death, happiness and misery, are all determined by Him. Whatever men eat or wear is produced by Him. When I look up to heaven, I perceive that the sun and moon, the stars and planets, the thunder and rain, the wind and clouds, are all the wondrous effects of his mighty power. When I survey the earth, I perceive that the hills and fountains, the rivers and

lakes, with the birds and beasts, plants and fishes, are all the marvellous productions of his mighty energies; all plainly exposed to view; all easy of discernment. For this he may be considered the true God." Again he says:—"We would also ask you, if the great God at the beginning had only created heaven and not earth, what place would you have had to stand on, and what fields would you have had to cultivate? Certainly none whatever. We would further ask you, when you have been made the recipients of God's favour, in making the heavens and the earth for you, if he had not likewise made the ground to yield the mulberry, the hemp, the rice, the wheat, the millet, and the pulse, together with plants and trees, fire and water, gold and iron; or if he had not made the water to produce fishes and prawns, the air to contain the flying fowl, and the hills the roaming beast, together with domestic animals, and such like, what would your bodies have had to wear, or your mouths to eat? What materials would you have had wherewith to provide your breakfast and supper, and what implements would you have had for your daily use? None whatever. * * * Finally, we would ask whether all the inhabitants of the world could for one hour or one minute exist without the favour of the great God? Certainly they could not exist. Seeing, then, that the inhabitants of the world could not exist for one hour or one moment without the favour of the great God, it appears clear beyond all contradiction that the great God protects and preserves all men. And if it be so clear that the great God protects and preserves all men, why do you, forsaking Him, set up your idols, and go and pray to them for protection, for food and for clothing?"

On the subject of the Trinity their views do not seem to be very clear, though the doctrine is distinctly enough stated. In one place it is expressed in a metrical doxology.

They speak of Jesus, however, in a way that implies inferiority to the Father. They deny to him the title *Ti*. This has been from the remotest ages applied to the emperor. The insurgents, however, do not appropriate it to any mere human ruler. Writing on this subject, they say:—"Even the Saviour Jesus, the first born Son of God, is only called our Lord. In heaven above and earth beneath, as well as among

men, none can be considered greater than Jesus: and yet Jesus was not called Ti."

The necessity of the influences of the Holy Spirit for changing the heart is distinctly acknowledged. In one of their forms of prayer this petition occurs:—"I also earnestly pray thee, the great God, our Heavenly Father, constantly to bestow on me thy Holy Spirit and change my wicked heart."

In reference to the unity of God, they leave no room to mistake their views. They denounce in the strongest terms the folly, stupidity, and wickedness of idolatry, and, in arguing against it, employ much such arguments as a Christian missionary would employ. In one instance the idolator is supposed to object, that though it be true that there is but one Supreme God, yet he must have ministers to assist him, and inferiors to execute his will, just as human rulers must have such assistance. The answer given to this is, that human rulers always *appoint* the persons who are to assist them, and without such appointment no one can act in the emperor's behalf. If, then, it were true that the Supreme Ruler needs others to assist him, no one could act on his behalf unless appointed by him. But so far from having appointed the idol gods worshipped by idolators, he has expressly forbidden men to worship them. The writer goes on to argue, that if God required no aid to create heaven and earth, he surely could not require any assistance in governing them. The idolatry of China is ascribed to the "lying fables and unfounded stories" of the priests of Buddha and Tau; stories circulated by them merely to fill their own pockets through the folly of others. They are aided in this by "the devilish serpent, the King of Hades." The ancient religion of China, they say, was not corrupted by such falsehoods. They give the impression that the ancients worshipped the true God; but in this they are hardly sustained by the historical records of the country. Idolatry prevailed in China from the earliest period of which the ancient records furnish any account, though it was not of so gross a kind as that subsequently introduced.

These arguments are rather sternly and summarily enforced by the utter demolition of the idols in the places captured by the insurgent armies. It is said, too, that they have in some

instances slain the idolatrous priests. We believe, however, that if this has ever been done, it has been on account of some resistance or treachery on their part. It has not been their general practice, though no doubt a priest who, after warning given, should persist in his idolatry, would be very summarily dealt with. This method of overthrowing idolatry does not accord with our notions of religious liberty; but when we remember the despotic character of the Chinese government, and the Biblical examples of a similar course, we need not be surprised that the insurgent leaders should have felt called upon to adopt this course. They do not compel any one to adopt the Christian faith. All they insist upon is abstinence from idolatrous acts of worship. Their demolition of the idols may have, moreover, a powerful effect in convincing the people of the folly of idolatry. It is an argument palpable to the senses, if these idol gods are so utterly powerless for their own protection, all must see at once the absurdity of trusting in them as if they were capable of protecting others.

The doctrine of universal depravity is recognized and enforced by the insurgents; and with it the necessity of salvation by Christ, and of sanctification by the Holy Spirit. The way of salvation is set forth in all its main features with a clearness sufficient to lead an awakened inquiring soul to rest upon the only sure foundation. We cannot but hope that the Spirit of all grace, who has caused so much precious truth to be thus proclaimed to great multitudes, will make it effectual to lead some souls to a saving knowledge of Him who is the way, the truth, and the life. It is not for us to "limit the Holy One," or prescribe to him how he shall carry on his own work.

One of the tracts holds the following language:—"Who has ever lived in the world without offending against the commands of Heaven? But until this time no one has known how to obtain deliverance from sin. Now, however, the great God has made a gracious communication to man, and from henceforth whoever repents of his sins, in the presence of the great God, and avoids worshipping false gods, practising perverse things, or transgressing the divine commands, may ascend to heaven

and enjoy happiness for thousands and myriads of years, in pleasure and delight, with dignity and honour, world without end. But whoever does not repent of his sins in the presence of the great God, but continues to worship false gods, practising perverse things as before, and going on to transgress the divine commands, will most certainly be punished by being sent down to hell, and suffering misery for thousands and myriads of years, in sorrow and pain, with trouble and anguish, world without end. Which of these is the best, and which is the worst, we leave it to you to judge."

Thus it appears that the doctrinal views of these men are, on most points, entirely in accordance with the teachings of the Bible. While maintaining these views, they also reject with the utmost contempt the vain superstitions universally received and acted upon in China, as well by the rulers and the literati as by the illiterate rabble. Astrology, necromancy, witchcraft, the art of divination in all its forms, have ever maintained a strong hold upon the Chinese mind. Each day has its ruling star, and the star exerts a happy or a baleful influence over the events of its day. Hitherto the imperial almanac has noted the character of each day throughout the year in reference to its influence on certain important acts of common life, such as marriage, burial, laying the foundation of a building, or setting out on a journey. All this the insurgents have thrown to the winds. In the preface to their almanac they say:—"All the corrupt doctrines and perverted views of preceding almanacs are the result of the devil's cunning devices to deceive and delude mankind. We, your majesty's servants, [it is the five princes who are speaking,] have therefore set them aside. For the years, months, days and hours are all determined by our Heavenly Father. Thus every year is lucky and favourable, every month is lucky and favourable, and every day, as well as every hour, is lucky and favourable. How can they be classified as good and bad, and what can be the use of selecting one period above another? Whoever truly venerates our Heavenly Father, the Supreme Lord, and the great God, is under the protection of Heaven, and can engage in his duties whenever he thinks proper.

Every season, therefore, may be considered as prosperous and favourable." Speaking of the same subject in another place, they say:

"The fifth kind of wrong is witchcraft and sorcery.

Magic arts deceive the multitude and are a breach of Heaven's commands.

Life and death, sickness and calamity, are all determined by Heaven.

Why then deceive the people by the manufacture of charms?

Incantations to procure luck, vows to fiends, and services to devils,

Fastings and processions, are all of no avail."

They have adopted an entirely new calendar, making the year to consist of 366 days, divided into twelve months of thirty and thirty-one days alternately.

The most remarkable feature of Chinese idolatry, and that which has ever had the strongest hold upon the minds of the people, is the worship of ancestors. We find no mention of this in the books of the insurgents. We believe, however, from what is said of idolatry in general in these books, and from information derived from other sources, that all such rites are prohibited by these reformers.

The observance of the Sabbath is enjoined in the books, and the day is kept as a day of rest. Public religious services are held on that day, but we have no account of the nature of those services. In their calendar the Sabbath is marked as falling on the days designated by the constellations Fang, Heu, Mau, and Sing. These days, according to the correct Chinese notations, always correspond with the Christian Sabbath; but by some unaccountable mistake, the insurgents have made all the days as marked by the names of the twenty-eight constellations to fall one day earlier than the day of the same name in the correct notation. We say the *correct* notation, because this cycle of twenty-eight days has been reckoned in a continuous series from time immemorial, and the insurgents must have dropped a day. The result of this mistake is, that they observe Saturday as the Sabbath. The error, however, is an astronomical one.

Of the character of their religious observances but little is known. Dr. Charles Taylor visited Chinkiang in June, 1853, and was present at their morning worship. He describes the service as simple, solemn, and earnest. It consisted of the

chanting of a hymn, accompanied by musical instruments, during which all remained seated, and a prayer offered by the person conducting the service, all kneeling. A kind of ritual has been prepared, containing a few prayers for particular occasions. These prayers are entitled—A Prayer for a Penitent Sinner:—A Prayer to God for Morning or Evening:—Thanksgiving to be offered at Meals:—A Prayer in the time of Sickness and Affliction. There are also prayers for birthdays—on occasion of constructing a hearth, building a house, piling up stones, or opening up ground—and for funeral occasions. In the last we find the following petition:—"There is here present the soul of thine unworthy servant, such a one, who on a certain day, month, and hour, departed this life. Having placed the body in a coffin, put on mourning, and conducted the funeral to the place of burial, I reverently prepare animals, wine, tea, and rice, offering them up to thee, the great God, our heavenly Father, earnestly beseeching thee, of thy favour, to admit the soul of thine unworthy servant, such a one, up into heaven, to enjoy abundant happiness with thee."

This prayer for the soul of the departed is probably the result of ignorance merely—not of any definite view as to the state of the dead. Of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead they are silent. The offering of wine, tea, and rice, appears to constitute a part of all their services, a portion being placed on the altar or table for each of the persons of the Trinity. This arises from defective instruction, in connection with the rites to which all Chinese are accustomed. Considering these circumstances, and the ritual which they found in the Old Testament, it is not strange that they should have adopted such sacrifices as a part of their worship.

Of the existence of such an organization as the Christian Church, with regularly authorized ministers, the insurgents seem to be entirely ignorant. It is said that the officers are expected to act as religious teachers. The highest officers, it seems, give regular instruction in the Scriptures to their immediate subordinates, and they in their turn to those immediately under their supervision, so that instruction is provided for the whole army.

Of the ordinance of the Lord's Supper they are entirely

ignorant; and they have very crude and incorrect ideas of baptism. All who are admitted to their brotherhood, it is believed, are required to be baptized by some one of their number; but baptism is, they think, to be frequently repeated by the person himself, as a means of washing away sin. It is alluded to in the following passage:—"When the prayer is over, let him [the penitent] take a basin of water, and wash himself clean, or if he perform his ablutions in a river, it will be still better."

The insurgents adopt the ten commandments as their moral code. These they interpret rigidly, as may be seen by their comment on the seventh commandment. They say—"The casting of amorous glances, the harbouring of lustful imaginations, the smoking of foreign tobacco, (opium,) or the singing of libidinous songs, must all be considered as breaches of this command." Opium-smoking, gambling, divination, wine-drinking, and even the use of tobacco are forbidden; and the prohibition is not allowed to stand as a mere form on the statute-book; it is rigidly enforced. For opium-smoking and adultery, death is the penalty. The officers of the English steamer *Hermes*, in May, 1853, found a man on trial for the latter offence; and in December, those of the French steamer *Cassini* saw the heads of men who had been executed for the former.

It has been said that the chiefs allow themselves a plurality of wives. This may be true, though there seems to be no sufficient evidence to establish the fact. If it be so, this alone would not be enough to convict them of hypocrisy, as it may be done in ignorance.

Several of these pamphlets are occupied with details concerning the organization and discipline of the army. It would appear that the most rigid discipline is maintained. One of the features of their discipline is the entire separation of the men and women. In the city of Nanking, the number of women is said to be 480,000. They are confined strictly to their own quarter of the city, and are divided into brigades of 13,000 each. These are again subdivided into classes of twenty-five each. It is stated on the authority of a deserter from Nanking, that each of these classes is provided with a teacher,

and all are required to learn to read the books prepared for them. On the same authority it is said that the men receive no pay, but are abundantly provided with all that is necessary for their comfort. All these arrangements are but temporary, to continue only during the state of war. When the new dynasty is fully established, other arrangements are to be made, and then the warriors may be united to their wives again. The number of men in Nanking, capable of bearing arms, is said to be between five and six hundred thousand. It is surely a wonderful power that can effectually control such a multitude of men and women, so as fully to carry out arrangements that place them under such restraint. What mysterious influence is it that leads such a host to submit to this rigid control? We know of no parallel in history.

It is evident from the above survey of the teachings of these insurgents that they have acquired a large amount of Bible truth, mingled with some serious error. When we remember in what way they have received their knowledge of these doctrines, our surprise is not that there is so much error, but so much truth. Yet they have much to learn, and it is to be feared they will not be very docile pupils. That God designs to use this revolution for effecting great changes in China cannot be doubted; and there is every reason to anticipate that those changes will be favourable to foreign intercourse, and to the propagation of the Christian religion. Whether the immediate effects will not in some respects prove injurious, we pretend not to foresee. The hand of God, however, is so manifest in the movement, the results already accomplished are so wonderful, and so much truth has been promulgated, that we cannot but hope for results, eventually, that shall rebuke our apathy and want of faith.

The success of the revolution as a political movement can hardly be considered any longer doubtful. What has already been done has been accomplished with so much ease, that we cannot suppose the Tartar forces can now offer any effectual resistance. Nanking was visited in December 1853, by the French war steamer *Cassini*, and the impression made upon the minds of the officers by all that they saw, was that of an irresistible host, animated by a common enthusiasm. But

whatever be the result politically, a great religious movement has assuredly commenced in China. The hearts of multitudes have been deeply stirred. The cross of Christ has been held up before the minds of myriads of men, in a way that could not fail to secure in some measure their attention. We believe that the truth of God, so far as it is contained in these publications, and especially as it is set forth in his own holy word, published and distributed by the insurgents, will not be permitted to return to him void. It is a token for good that so much care is taken to give the Bible to the people. It is not the least remarkable circumstance connected with this reformation, that there is no tinge of Romanism in it. Though Rome has for centuries had her priests, and her thousands of converts, scattered through the country, God has not permitted this great movement to be polluted by her touch. We have here a reformation springing up in the heart of China, where no Protestant missionary ever trod, taking for its basis the word of God.

The Church of Christ should cry mightily to God for a happy result from the events now taking place. We know not what will be the issue. When the old government is overthrown, it may not be easy to establish a new one. Our hope is in God. He seeth the end from the beginning, and will do all things well.

Before closing this article, we may be permitted to refer briefly to a subject which has excited some solicitude, and which is alluded to in the pamphlet before us. It is generally known that for some years the missionaries in China have been divided in opinion respecting the proper term to use in translating the Scripture terms for "God," or "gods." One of the terms proposed is *Shangti*, the other is *Shin*. To the former it is objected that, as used by the Chinese, it designates a particular being—one of their own false gods. If used by missionaries, therefore, as experience proves, it would generally, or at least very often, be understood as referring to that false god. There is also a philological objection to its use as a translation of *Elohim* and *θεος* in the Chinese version of the Bible, on the ground that it cannot, like those words, be ap-

plied to worshipped beings generally. To the other term it is objected that it means "spirit," and not "God." It is applied, indeed, to the worshipped beings of the Chinese, but those beings, it is contended, are "spirits," and not "gods." It is replied, that since these beings are in all respects similar to the beings designated in the Scriptures by the words *Elohim* and *θεος*, they must be regarded as gods, and the Chinese word by which they are designated is the one corresponding to those Scripture terms. That word, as all admit, is *Shin*.

The practice of such a body of men as the insurgents, cannot be overlooked in settling such a question. It seems that in speaking of the true God, they generally use the term *Shangti*. They use it, however, as his distinctive title, in the sense of Supreme Ruler, or rather, perhaps, as a proper name, since they speak of it as "his venerable name," and they never use it in any other way. But when they speak of false gods, or of all gods, true and false, as in the sentence, "Thou shalt have no other God besides me," they invariably use the word *Shin*. Dr. Medhurst translates the word "spirit" or "spirits," but generally writes the word "god" also in brackets, to show that the insurgents use it in that sense. If, then, these intelligent native writers be taken as a guide, the term *Shangti* cannot be used to translate *elohim* and *θεος* when they refer to false gods, while the word *Shin* may with propriety be used to translate those words, whether they refer to the true God, or to false gods. We shall, therefore, hope to see the controversy on this subject soon brought to a happy termination, and the ministers of Christ going forth through that vast empire, proclaiming, in words not contradictory of each other, the great truths which are able to make men wise unto salvation.

Abraham Gossman.

ART. VI.—*Infidelity; Its Aspects, Causes, and Agencies; being the prize essay of the British Organization of the Evangelical Alliance.* By the Rev. Thomas Pearson, Eyemouth, Scotland. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854. Pp. 620, 8vo.

PLUTARCH cautions his reader to be well on his guard, that in order to escape robbers, he do not plunge into an impassable chasm; that, while escaping from superstition, he do not fall into the power of unbelief, by leaping over that which lies between them, viz., true piety. There are many who see no other choice than between the robbers and the chasm: but the true believer finds a safe path, and avoids both the one and the other. The truth lies midway between superstition and infidelity. These are the two great opposing powers which it meets with in the world. Though apparently opposite, they have the same source. They are but the different poles or manifestations of one evil principle. They generally appear at the same time, and always betray a secret sympathy with each other. At different periods in history, the one seems to have grown up and overshadowed the other; but they have really co-existed, each being the prolific cause of the other. The human mind and the human race passes easily from superstition to unbelief. Religious opinion, and, indeed, philosophical opinion, oscillates between these two extremes, and has scarcely yet attained its equilibrium, or found the centre. "The worldly tone of the inner life suppresses religious feeling entirely, and then turns to unbelief; or, mixing itself up with that feeling, gives to it an interpretation of its own, and thus turns to superstition. The desperation of unbelief surrenders the troubled conscience a prey to superstition; and the irrationality of superstition makes religion suspected by the thoughtful mind."* And this description is not more true of the individual than of the race. The process is constantly going forward. The history of religious opinion is very much a history of these transitions. Men are seen to pass from believing too little to believing too much, and then from believ-

* Neander's Church History, p. 13.

ing too much to believing too little. The forces of unbelief and superstition are not unfrequently, therefore, combined against the truth. Starting from the same point, they recede in opposite directions around the circle, until they meet, and unite their forces against an intelligent faith, and against the written word. It is not peculiar to the present age that the truth should be assailed at the same time by both these powers. It would be strange if they were not found leagued together. And when we consider the giant power with which each is clothed, the hold each has upon our fallen race, and the rapid strides which they have made, or claim to have made, what multitudes have been taken by the robbers, or plunged into the chasm, it is not wonderful that the friends of truth should be somewhat apprehensive as to the result. Though confident that the truth must ultimately triumph, they may well fear the present danger. At least it is well that they should so fear as to arm themselves for the encounter, and avert, so far as may be, the danger which they apprehend.

It is important that we should turn our minds to the point at which the real danger lies. An adroit foe will ever send out his forces and feign an attack which he does not intend to make, while he brings his real power to bear at a very different quarter, and bends his energies to make a successful breach where there is no adequate defence. It may be so at the present day. The form in which superstition now threatens the truth, and with which alone the truth has any serious conflict, puts on a bold front. Owing to the aggressions which it has made in England, and to some extent in our own land, we are in danger of giving it more importance than it really has. We clothe it with a power which it does not possess. We yield too readily its boastful claims: and while we labour to resist its attacks, we are leaving unguarded, perhaps, the point of real danger. At least we are in danger of having our attention too much confined to that which makes a threatening appearance, but has little real power. There are three considerations which go to show that the truth is in much greater danger from a subtle infidelity, than from a bold and boastful superstition.

In the first place, the numerical increase of these powers is

very different. The most reliable statistics prove that Romanism does not increase to any extent, either absolutely, or relatively to other religious bodies. The recent census in England brings out the fact, that there were but about two hundred thousand Romanists found in their churches, during the Sunday on which the census was taken. And though this does not probably give a fair estimate of its power, for the adherents of Rome are not ordinarily found in their places of worship, in the same proportion to their entire number as the members of other religious bodies, it does yet prove that their power is not so great as they had claimed, or as the friends of truth had feared. The census of this country shows that Romanism, notwithstanding the immense immigration, has scarcely kept on a level with the increase in Evangelical Churches. It bears a less proportion now to the entire population than it did some years since. So that in England and in the United States, the two countries in which it professes to have made its most important conquests, its increase has been very small, if it has gained anything. On the other hand, it has been losing many from among its old and most steadfast adherents. There is good reason to believe that in Italy, as well as in Ireland, there is a great change taking place in the habits of thought and the character of the people; that multitudes who have not already shaken off its fetters, are fast coming to that point; and that when the light shall have penetrated further, and those who are now groping their way towards it, shall have come out into the open day, the revolution will be sudden and complete. On any broad view of the case, superstition, so far from increasing its power, is actually going to decay. The state of things with infidelity is very different from this. In some one of its forms, it is making accessions to its numbers, both from within the Church and without. In some lands, the apostasy has been fearful, and for a time well nigh universal. We cannot, indeed, gather statistics to show this, for infidelity conceals itself from view. It has no places of worship, for it scarcely recognizes any being to whom worship is due. It publishes no statements of its progress or numbers, except as these are uttered by over-bold advocates, who reveal, perhaps unintentionally, what they claim and hope for. It manifests

its power, however, in the efforts it puts forth. We infer its strength and increase from the means which it employs to disseminate its views, and the untiring energy with which it employs them. It comes in learned and elaborate works; it enters the field of exegetical study; it appeals to the imagination, as clothed in the forms of poetry; it is taught in novels in which the story is used as the vehicle of its sentiments; in essays, in lectures, and by oral addresses; it has its emissaries in the shop and factory; it breeds amid the dens of vice which infest our cities. Young men follow its oracles, and hang upon their lips as if they were indeed what many of them claim to be, prophets and seers, who stand as the oracles of truth. It boasts, no doubt, of much more than it has really accomplished; but it can scarcely be doubted that it is on the increase, daily gathering its forces for that final conflict between faith and unbelief, "the progress of which constitutes the deepest theme of history."

A second consideration, which diminishes the danger from the superstition of the present day, in comparison with that which we may fear from unbelief, lies in the nature of these two systems, the one standing before us in a tangible, organized form, the other being invisible and subtle. We know the forces of Romanism, the resources upon which it relies, and its method of attack, and we are so far prepared to meet it. Its pomp and show, its display of numbers and strength, attract our notice. It never leaves us in ignorance of its victories. It publishes, and placards, and obtrudes upon our notice in every way, each change in its favour, as if the friends of truth were called upon to tremble, because some one here and there has been lured into its fold by the splendour of its ritual, or by its deceitful promise of rest, as children are attracted by a gaudy toy, and weak minds, or minds impatient of investigation, impose upon themselves, and take the promise for the reality. And though it is proud in its assumptions, and boasts itself as if it had laid its hand upon the very citadel of the truth, it is not to be feared as if it were an unknown and untried foe. It is not so with unbelief. It is invisible in a great measure, and the invisible is always the most fearful. It works beneath the surface. Thousands of minds may be in-

sensibly corrupted as to their principles, without its being known. The seeds may be planted long before they germinate and produce their fruit. Men are commonly unbelievers in heart long before they announce it, either in the form of words or actions; possibly long before they are conscious of it to themselves, at least so conscious of it as to admit it in a distinct assertion. Men are far gone when they can say, without a blush of shame, and a secret trembling at the fact, "We are infidels." This is pre-eminently true of those who have been educated believers, and who know in some sense the value of that which they have lost. They are shocked at the result which they have reached, and of course are loth to admit it. For a time they tremble when they find themselves loosed from their ancient moorings, drifting upon the sea of unbelief, blown about with every wind, and ready to be engulfed by the yawning waves. It takes time for them to recover their self-possession—to acquire a courage which will enable them to look the result in the face, and admit what they have found to be true of themselves. We become aware of the ruin when it is almost beyond reparation. Infidelity, therefore, in its very nature, and the mode in which it progresses in the world, is not so likely to arouse our fears as superstition, although the danger may be equally near, and the work which it does is far more disastrous.

There is still a third thing which leads us to believe that the great and immediate danger arises from the progress of unbelief. All the mental habits and tendencies of the age expose us more to its assaults. There is little probability that the superstitions of the Middle Age can be reimposed upon the minds of men. There are few who will submit to be bound in the fetters which the Reformers cast off; and fewer still who will voluntarily return and put their necks beneath the yoke. It is not impossible, indeed, that the world should recede from the light, and walk in darkness. There is no absolute certainty that such may not be the result. We are not sure that the habits of thinking, the modes in which truth is sought, the patient and careful investigation which lies at the foundation of all true science, and which science tends to produce, the freedom with which men pursue their inquiries without regard

to authority, the independence which the mind claims for itself in its speculations, give us actual security from such a result, but they unquestionably render it very improbable. Men are not disposed to yield the prerogative with which God has endowed them, of thinking for themselves. It is not easy to erase from the soul the conviction, that in the matter of its religion it has the right and privilege of a direct and individual approach to God. The sense of responsibility for its faith as well as practice, which grows out of this conviction, is well nigh indestructible when it has once been awakened. And yet these convictions must be removed, men must be brought to abandon that which they hold most dear, and all the mental habits of the race must be changed, before the world can be brought back to the bondage from which it has been released;—a revolution, which, as all history shows, never takes place suddenly, but through long processes, and by imperceptible degrees, like the geological changes which have passed upon the surface of the earth, or like those changes which are still going forward in the relative positions of the land and sea. If the world ever returns to its bondage, it will be by a path which leads through the wastes of unbelief. The change will come as a reaction from infidelity, just as the older forms of infidelity were a reaction from the superstitions of the Middle Age. Men will choose the robbers, who, though they strip them of all that they hold dear, may yet spare their lives, in preference to the leap into the chasm, which is certain death; just as some of old, escaping from the robbers, took without thought the fatal leap. And if there were no middle path upon which a man could walk securely, there are few who would censure such a choice; for it were far better, doubtless, to bow to the authority which that corrupt Church claims, and to worship God, (though he should be worshipped in partial ignorance,) according to her command, than to deny our religious nature altogether, and be without God in the world; or, what amounts to the same thing, fall down and worship ourselves. There is no important difference between the man who denies that there is a God, and him who calls himself divine; for religion, in any intelligible sense, is alike impossible in both cases. Both are at the bottom of the chasm, although the fall

may be rather more stunning in one case than the other. The danger from Romanism lies chiefly in this, that it may be resorted to as a refuge from the desperations of unbelief, as some form of superstition has ever followed in the wake of infidelity.* We are not saying that Rome has not a fearful power; or that the Church should not resist her progress as a most fearful calamity to the cause of truth and righteousness; or that her efforts should be less vigorous than they are; but that the chief danger lies in a subtle unbelief, which in its various forms, falls in with the tendencies of the day, and is sapping the religious principles and convictions of men, and which, if not checked, will sweep away the faith of many, and leave them to whatever false system may offer satisfaction to the quenchless aspirations and emotions of our religious nature. We think that the mind of the Church should be turned towards this foe; that while she strives to guard the truth from the perversions of Rome, she should guard it, at least with equal watchfulness and zeal, against the desolating forces of unbelief; and that both from its nature as laying waste every thing that is good in its track, and from the whole tendency of our mental and social condition, this latter is the more immediate, impending, and fearful danger, and of course calls upon us to meet and resist it, in whatever form it may appear.

The essay of Mr. Pearson is important to this end, inasmuch as it tends to bring before the minds of those who are set for the defence of the truth, the real nature, and to some degree the magnitude, of the danger to be apprehended. Its object seems to be rather to describe the character, and the variety, and number of the enemy's forces, than to furnish the armour with which they can be met. And this is a valuable aid. It requires considerable reading to keep even with the advancing tide and ever-changing form of unbelief. Infidelity has a wonderful plastic energy. It adapts itself readily to the demands and character of the age. While it remains the same in substance, it changes its form with every varying circumstance of

* We see this result already in Germany. Some have passed over and given in their adhesion to Rome. It is altogether probable that others will follow, unless there should be a more powerful revival of true religion, of which there are signs of hope. It is not wonderful that between the two, good men should sympathize more with Rome even than with Strauss, Feuerback, and Bauer.

society. It attaches itself to everything which may give it plausibility, and gain for it easier access to the minds of men. It is sure to come up in a new shape, and baptized with a new name, with every crisis or revolution in society, and with every new form of philosophical speculation. Error or unbelief is never self-sustaining. It betrays its weakness by seizing upon some partial truth for its support. It always sets out with such a truth as its starting-point. It always lays this foundation upon which to rest the superstructure it is building. And as the Bible is a many-sided book, as its truths come into contact with men, and society, and systems of philosophy, at various points, at each of these points, sometimes contemporaneously, but more often in succession, infidelity manages to hang its objections, and by an ingenious misstatement or perversion of the truth, gains for itself an apparent ground upon which to rest, and a form which is apt to deceive the unsuspecting. As these social changes are going forward with unprecedented rapidity, and men are pushing their investigations in all directions with unwearied energy, and sometimes with far too bold a spirit, as if there were no limits beyond which it became them to tread with reverence; as the human mind seems to be teeming with new plans, and thoughts social, political, and philosophical, are worked out into clearer and more intelligible forms; it is not wonderful to find infidelity availing itself of this state of things, and putting on a new form, that it may gain new adherents, and assailing those fortresses of truth which it had found hitherto impregnable, by new methods, and exulting, as it were, with fresh hopes of success. Indeed, the friends of truth, in this respect, are like those who defend a broad and open land against a wily foe, who are called to protect this point, and then the other, but each, it may be, from its peculiar situation, by a very different process. It might require courage and skill, but that courage and skill under a very different application. The foe might be the same, but the outward form in which he appears, and the modes of attack, might vary. It is thus with the unbelief of the present age. It is unwearied, restless, and changing. Modern infidelity, therefore, may denote very different things to different persons. It needs to be accurately defined and described. That which

was modern a few years since has become obsolete. Abandoned and laughed at by its own friends, some bolder or freer thinker has struck out a new path, and the whole host are now following hard after him. A new star reigns in the ascendant. Whoever, therefore, will patiently follow error in its devious course, wade through the works in which it appears, in which a little that is new is mixed up with much that is stale with age, and rightly discriminate what is modern from what is ancient, what objections have been answered a thousand times to the world's satisfaction, from those which yet require to be answered, performs a good service to the cause of truth, and deserves well of her friends. And this is the work which the author of this essay has done with a good degree of success. It is chiefly descriptive rather than argumentative.

In some respects, we wish that the author had given us a more profound and thorough refutation of the errors which he describes, or that he had reduced the size of his essay, so that it could have been placed within the reach of the multitudes who are in danger, to whom the poison comes in so much cheaper a form than the antidote. There are obviously two classes of works required in this controversy with unbelief, especially in the present day, when the error is brought down into a popular form and penetrates every class of society, from the highest to the lowest, from the most cultivated to the most ignorant, alike infests the walks of literature and the sinks of pollution and crime. It is no longer the retired thinker alone who is carried away by his own speculations, lost in the fog in which he has enveloped himself, and shut out the light of truth, but these retired speculations are brought down to the comprehension of all, and sent forth to do their destructive work. We need, in the first place, profound and philosophical refutations of the system of unbelief; works in which the error shall be met in its very source. We must not only trace the stream to its fountain, but cast into the fountain that salt of patient and Christian thinking, which shall cause it to send forth sweet instead of bitter waters. Connected, as infidelity always is, with systems of philosophy, it must be shown that these philosophical systems from which it springs, are false, and then a true system must be substituted in its room; or

that they are but partially true, and then the true must be separated from the false, so that the features upon which infidelity grafts itself shall be seen to be not true; or that though the system itself is true in all its essential features, the infidelity which is attempted to be grafted upon it, is an excrescence, that it holds with the philosophy by no necessary, or logical, or vital connection. Its pretended supports must be taken from under it, so that it shall be left to stand upon its own basis, or indeed not to stand at all. We are convinced that the core of the controversy lies here; that laying aside the moral causes of unbelief, the great cause lies in philosophies constructed in a wrong method, or based upon false principles, or embracing false results, because of an imperfect analysis of the powers and faculties of the mind, and a partial view of the facts upon which all true philosophy rests; that the power which these systems exert cannot be broken until men are brought to receive a true philosophy; and that the prevailing forms of infidelity will not, therefore, be entirely removed until this is done. The older deism of Collins, Bolingbroke, and Tindal, fell with the philosophy upon which it rested before the profounder investigations of Reid. The materialistic infidelity of Condillac and Cabanis expired with their philosophy, although it may well be questioned whether it has not given place to a still more destructive unbelief, rising out of a philosophy which, though far more pretentious, comes little nearer the truth. And the same process must go forward still. We may satisfy ourselves, and perhaps the larger part of men, of the utter groundlessness of modern infidelity by other methods than this. We may prove it bad by its fruits, which would certainly be no difficult task; we may array against it the primitive and indestructible convictions of our moral nature; we may show its inconsistency with itself; but to remove the ground upon which its advocates rest, to take away the force of the argument which they press so often, that their system is the result of close and logical thinking upon the undeniable teachings of our reason, and of course cannot be opposed by our moral nature, if the author of both be a beneficent being; to take away this standing place, we must have a more comprehensive and truer philosophy, which shall

commend itself to the unbiassed judgments of men, as grounded upon a careful and searching analysis, upon the widest induction of facts, and at the same time strictly logical in its processes. The true limits of the powers of the human mind and of the field of its knowledge must be fixed, which in itself would overthrow the very position on which their infidelity rests; for it rests upon the assertion that the human reason can know and comprehend the Absolute, and is in itself, therefore, the source of all moral and spiritual truth. One such work, or a work which should even in a small degree approximate to it, and contribute something towards such a result, would be of incalculable value to the cause of truth. It is scarcely necessary to add that such a philosophy would unavoidably be humble and Christian in its tone. For the very first fact which strikes us when we look within, and ever remains prominent among the facts of consciousness, is that we are limited and dependent; and that humility, therefore, ought to be and is a fundamental condition to successful investigation. It might claim with propriety what the Edinburgh philosopher claims, and perhaps not without truth, for his own scheme: "The foundation of our philosophy is humility. For it is professedly a scientific demonstration, of the impossibility of that wisdom in high matters which the Apostle prohibits us even to attempt; and it proposes, from the limitation of the human powers, from our impotence to comprehend what, however, we must admit, to show articulately why the secret things of God cannot but be to many past finding out. Humility thus becomes the cardinal virtue, not only of revelation, but of reason; and philosophy is found to be the most useful auxiliary of theology."*

We need, on the other hand, a class of works which shall contain the results of such thinking, in a popular form, and then sent forth from the press in such a shape that they should come within the reach of every man, however limited his resources, who stood in danger of being lured into unbelief, or who was anxious to satisfy his doubts, and to find the truth. For the class of men who stand most in danger are just those

* Sir William Hamilton's *Discussions*, p. 588.

who have neither the leisure nor the power of attention and thought, to read with advantage profound discussions. They are the artizans, mechanics, and young men in business; and, going further, they are the ignorant, those who are without property, the dwellers in the narrow streets and packed houses of our cities, the day labourers at the forge and in our factories. (For infidelity in its more modern forms differs in this respect from its previous manifestations, that it seeks to carry itself into every rank of society, and applies its formulas with no small influence, to every question in life.) These are the men who need to be informed. And this must be done, not by costly works, but by smaller essays, or tracts, put within the cheapest rates, and expressed in terms level to the comprehension of the lowest ranks, in the common language of uncultivated men. In this respect, the friends of truth might well learn a lesson from her foes. For we could scarcely overstate the efforts which infidelity is putting forth in this field, nor the artfulness with which its appeals are addressed to the ignorant, and to those who suffer misfortune, or groan under the inequalities of life. There is no rank in society, among whom passion and prejudice have more unlimited sway, in which infidelity is certain to produce such disastrous results. It is this which clothes it with such fearful power. No man who thinks, can anticipate without trembling, the time when these masses shall become thoroughly impregnated with the principles of infidelity; principles which are not only destructive of all religion, but lead to the violation of all the sanctities of life—and then have their passions aroused by the artful appeals of their leaders. It is just here, therefore, that the great, immediate danger lies, and this is the point which we are called to guard, at any expense and effort, and by all that we hold most dear.

The book before us belongs to neither of these classes, but occupies a position between the two. The author starts out with the obvious truth, that infidelity, in its essential feature, is a negation, rather than an affirmation; that it consists in a denial of the common faith of the Christian world. Under this general denial, he enumerates the several forms “of Atheism, in which the negation is complete; Pantheism, or the

denial of the Divine Personality; Naturalism, or the denial of the Divine Providential Government; Pseudo Spiritualism, or the denial of the Divine Redemption, (including as it does, the doctrines of the Trinity, Atonement, and Spirit's influences); Indifferentism, or the denial of Man's Responsibility; and Formalism, or the denial of the power of Godliness." Under each of these heads, the author gives a historical view of that particular form in which infidelity has manifested itself, from the introduction of the Gospel, to the present day; and then follows the history either by a statement of arguments in favour of the truth, or by some remarks which show the practical workings of the system to be bad; or that its objections lie against Providence as well as the Bible; and thus indirectly furnish a proof that the system described is without foundation. With most of the information contained in this part of the volume, our readers are already familiar, from previous articles on this general subject.*

It is no doubt true that the older forms of infidelity, though proved untenable, and abandoned by their advocates, have numerous adherents among us still. The pestilence which carries desolation through the land may have passed away, and yet sporadic cases may appear, here and there, and of the most deadly type. But the most recent, and perhaps the most prominent form of unbelief, is that which goes under the name of Spiritualism; by which is meant the theory which asserts that whatever revelation of "moral or spiritual truth God makes to man, must be from within, and not from without." It substitutes as our authority the "moral sentiments," or "religious intuitions," or "spiritual insight," or the truths of our "religious consciousness," for an outward revelation of truth addressed to our minds in distinct propositions. It denies the possibility of a book-revelation within this field, or, what amounts to the same thing, the possibility of a revelation at all, in the strict sense of that word. It does not question the genuineness of the Bible, but claims that the spiritual truths, of which its authors were conscious, were conveyed by them in forms, and through conceptions, which were the most unfortu-

* *Biblical Repertory*, January 1839, and January 1840.

nate; that the spirit is lost in the letter; and that we may, therefore, deny every thing which is distinguishing of Christianity, its doctrines, and the evidence upon which it rests, and still remain Christians—still hold fast to the essence, which a few of the present day have had the skill to separate from the “degraded types,” and “unfortunate conceptions,” under which it has been buried for centuries. As described by its advocates, this “Christianity, (*i. e.*, this spiritualized essence,) is dependent upon no outside authority. We verify its eternal truth in our soul. It bows to no idols, neither the Church, nor the Bible, nor yet Jesus, but God only. Its redeemer is within, its salvation is within, its heaven, and its oracle of God.” These spiritual truths underlie all religions, as they lie in every soul, and each man has the power, not only of receiving them when revealed, but of discerning them for himself. There is therefore “but one religion, as there is but one ocean.” Fetichism, Paganism, and Christianity, are but different and clearer developments of the “Absolute religion.” “Religion is the same—not similar, but just the same—in every man, differing only in degree.” “Of course, then, there is no difference but of words, between revealed religion and *natural* religion; for all actual religion is revealed in us, or it could not be felt.” Or as described in slightly different terms by another of its advocates: “What God reveals to us, he reveals *within*, through the medium of our moral and spiritual senses.” “Christianity has practically confessed,” (when or where?) “what is theoretically clear, that an authoritative *external* revelation of moral and spiritual truth, is essentially impossible to man.” And as this would not be a sufficiently broad basis to sustain the structure which is to be reared, it is claimed that these truths of “spiritual insight” are in open contradiction with the doctrines of the Bible. “If the Spirit within us, and the Bible without us, are at variance, we must either follow the inward, and disregard the outward law, else we must renounce the inward and obey the outward.”* Who can doubt which side of the alternative these men who are gifted with such wonderful insight would choose? It would be strange if they should not follow the inward light, which shines

* See the chapter on Spiritualism, and the Eclipse of Faith.

upon them so clearly; although the world has agreed with remarkable unanimity in calling that light darkness. We cannot but admire the modesty with which these men announce their discoveries. Certainly some little vanity might be pardoned in men endowed with such spiritual vision; who have been raised up as great prophets and seers to *reveal* to the world the delusions under which it lies. We say *reveal*, because these men claim to do for their fellows what they deny to be possible for God to do for them. They make a book-revelation of moral and spiritual truth.*

There are two invariable symptoms of this form of unbelief. It has an abhorrence of all evidence or proof, and makes strenuous opposition to creeds and formulas of faith. These are an abomination to it. It cannot abide a proposition so stated as to admit of proof or refutation. It cries out against a creed as if it were an instrument of torture to the soul. It deals with sentiments, feelings, the glorious truths which come out so clearly when we look within, but truths which do not admit of expression in the forms of words, with undefinable intuitions, with the teachings of consciousness—teachings, indeed, which lie beneath the consciousness of most. Its advocates are seers—sayers more properly. They never reason, but utter. And if you are not convinced, if the utterance does not make a response in your own soul, all that can be said is, that you are still, with the mass of the world, in darkness, living under the “unfortunate conceptions” which conceal the pure idea. It is in vain to reason with a man to convince him that he has a “spiritual insight,” which he declares, after an honest search, he does not possess. One might as well reason with the blind, to convince him that he sees. Connected with this opposition to all proof, or argument, and creeds, it makes great pretensions to a comprehensive charity. It is indifferent what a man’s “spiritual insight” reveals to him, provided he holds that this is the only source of moral and spiritual truth. Its charity has an enormous capacity. It swallows everything, and that without a grimace or effort. Fetichism, Mohammedanism, Judaism, Christianity, “are all

* Eclipse of Faith, p. 73.

the same religion, differing only in degree." The good and the bad, provided they live according to the teachings of their "spiritual insight," are alike worthy and alike safe. Or, to use their own terms, "Many a swarthy Indian, who bowed down to wood and stone; many a grim-faced Calmuck, who worshipped the God of storms; many a Grecian peasant, who did homage to Phœbus Apollo when the sun rose or went down; yes, many a savage, his hands smeared all over with human sacrifice, shall come from the East and the West, and sit down in the kingdom of God." The man who can utter such sentiments, and dignify them with the name of charity, without a blush of shame, has certainly gone far beyond our insight. We cannot strain our vision so as to see how that which is false can by any process be viewed as true, or that which is diabolical can be justified as virtue.

It is not difficult to trace this system to its source. It follows directly from the pantheistic philosophy, although it does not always appear in connection with it. The process in which it originated is this. A broad distinction is drawn between the powers and functions of the understanding and reason. The office of the understanding is simply to give form to the knowledge or facts which come to us through other sources. It is the constructive faculty of the mind. The reason, on the other hand, is the organ of truth. It is not constructive, but intuitive. The understanding deals only with truths and facts already within the mind; reason perceives truth; understanding furnishes the forms, but never the material of our knowledge; reason has a direct intuition of the material; it is the organ by which the mind not only possesses or forms those primitive universal and necessary convictions which all men have, but by which it has also a direct and immediate intuition of spiritual or supersensual truth; indeed, a direct beholding and comprehending of the Absolute. And this reason, it is said, is not personal, but impersonal, and dwells alike in every man. Reason is thus deified, or the human and divine reason is the same. If all this is so, then two things follow, upon which this whole scheme rests; first, that there can be no revelation of truth in the form of doctrine, or truths formally and logically expressed, but that all truth must be revealed in the

form of religious intuitions; and second, that the reason, or religious consciousness, being the same in every man, every man has the power of discerning, without external aid, all these truths for himself. Hence their often asserted position, that religion is one and absolute.

The connection between this system of unbelief and the pantheistic philosophy, may perhaps be stated more clearly in another way. This philosophy, as is well known, starting far back in the depths of our nature, in which it seeks for some certain standing-place; starting in some simple assertion which most would readily admit—which, indeed, is partially true—proceeds, step by step, to build up the system by the most rigid processes of reasoning, until it comes out with the conclusion which destroys the distinction between God and the creation; making the world but a process or evolution of Deity, and the human mind, as the intelligent part of the creation, that in which God comes to a consciousness of himself. The soul, therefore, must have all truth within itself. An external revelation becomes impossible. All things are a necessary and unending process. Men are a part of Deity. And hence we hear certain members, though all do not go so far, speaking of their leaders as God-inspired men, and claiming the same inspiration for heathen sages as they concede to the apostles and prophets, or even to Christ himself.

It will be seen that this scheme involves two points, and but two. First, that all revelation of spiritual truth must be from within, or through the intuitional consciousness, and that each soul is sufficient for itself; and secondly, that these results of spiritual insight or the intuitive powers, are at variance with the doctrines of the Bible. It is necessary that it should maintain both these positions, in order to give it the least show of strength.

We do not propose to enter at any length into the argument here. It would require more time and space than we have at our command. It may be urged, however, against this scheme, that it proceeds upon an entire misconception of the nature of religion. It makes religion a feeling, an intuition, a sentiment; instead of a principle, a belief of the truth, and an obedience to it. It views it not only as a life, but as a life to

the exclusion of doctrine and duty; as if, indeed, there could be any intelligible spiritual life apart from a belief and love of the truth, and a practical obedience to it in the life. We can frame no conception of a spiritual life, which does not involve faith, love, and duty. If there is this higher life of the soul, it must have a vital connection with the truth, and that truth so expressed that it be understood in order to be felt. But the moment that spiritual truth, in its logical or doctrinal form, or what is equivalent, a form in which it can be apprehended and received by the mind, is seen to be a necessary element in the spiritual life, that moment this scheme falls to the ground. For then a revelation becomes possible without as well as within, *i. e.*, becomes possible, because necessary to the existence of the spiritual life. Hence it is that we hear this unceasing cry about creeds, and confessions, and evidences.

It may be urged again, that the distinction between the logical and intuitional consciousness upon which some of its advocates rest, is pressed too far. For while there is ground for this distinction between the reflective and intuitive faculties, there is danger, lest the distinction be applied to an extent which facts will not justify. Man is a "complicated unity." All the powers of his nature, though they may be separated in analysis, work together, and for each other. We should be slow to admit that the understanding has no other office than to give form to the phenomena which come through our senses, or to the "higher truths or laws" which come through the intuitions of reason. "It is one and the same indivisible mind, which is the subject of religious thought and emotion, and of any other thought and emotion. Religious truth, like any other truth, is embraced by the understanding—as indeed it would be a queer kind of truth that is not—is stated in propositions, yields inferences, is adorned by eloquence, is illustrated by the imagination, and is thus, as well as from its intrinsic claims, rendered powerful over the emotions, the affections, and the will."*

A third thing which bears against this scheme is, that it is inconsistent with the truth of history or the recorded expe-

* Eclipse of Faith, p. 309.

rience of men. Its advocates differ very widely among themselves. They are not agreed what are the truths which lie so clear to the spiritual vision. One asserts that his insight leads him to believe in the immortality of the soul, another stands in doubt, his vision does not clearly decide, and still another asserts stoutly that the soul is not immortal. It would be hard to gather out a confession of faith, or any number of truths to which they would subscribe. And if it could be done, it would be seen that they stand on nearly the same ground with the older Deism, and are fairly open to all the arguments by which that system has been often and thoroughly refuted. And this want of argument among themselves prepares us for the admission, that the state of men in the world is not such as their theory requires. This absolute religion, which is claimed to be one and the same, does not prove to be so, even its friends being judges. It would be so, it is said, if all the "proper conditions were fulfilled." But practically the conditions are not observed. "The conception which men universally form of God is always imperfect, sometimes self-contradictory and impossible." Or, according to another, there are various principles which mislead and seduce the spiritual faculty, and so prevent that unanimity which might otherwise have been attained. A beautiful commentary this upon the sufficiency and validity of that internal revelation which supersedes the necessity of any revelation from without! The insight must be clear, indeed, which leaves the vast majority of men in error, and error which is consistent with the grossest conceptions of God. The truth is, when we seek for this absolute religion, it cannot be found. Beyond the influences of the Bible, men walk in the thickest darkness on all the questions which concern their origin, their present condition, or their future destiny and hopes. The utmost which they can gather from this boasted spiritual illumination is uncertainty. They get but faint and distant glimpses of the truth. And even those who live within the influence of this external revelation, and yet deny its authority and necessity, are not greatly in advance of the heathen. They enjoy the reflected light of that truth whose direct and life-giving beams they might share if they would. They have clearer intuitions, because of the

Christian influences by which they are surrounded, but they too are oppressed with the most painful uncertainty. All history confirms this. And besides this failure to reveal what man needs to know, and what the human race has been perpetually groping after, "seeking after God if haply they might find him;" what are we to conclude as to the authority of this inward revelation, when even those who announce it differ so widely among themselves? How is a man to know whether his inner eye is clear—whether he actually sees what he thinks that he sees? On what ground is he to come to a certainty? And without certainty on questions like these, the soul cannot rest. Is every man to follow his own light without question, or is he to compare it with the results which others have reached, or with some fixed standard? and if so, what? What right has one man to set up his "spiritual faculty," or the truths which he thinks he has discerned, as a standard for other men, or for humanity? To whom shall we go for the one and absolute religion? And if it fail thus to give either light or certainty, as history and experience, the very sighs and hopes of the ancient sages, the groans and tears of humanity in pagan ignorance, seeking rest and finding none, the uncertain answers which come back from the soul when questioned even in a Christian land—all unite to teach us, what becomes of its boastful claims? We are aware that an argument of this nature might be constructed against the Bible; but it would be invalid, because the Bible teaches that man is not in his normal condition; that he needs the light which it claims to give; and that men walk in darkness, because they will not come to the light.

A fourth thing which disproves this theory, is, that there is no such variance as is claimed to exist between the teachings of our inner nature when fully and fairly stated, and the teachings of the Bible. There is the fullest harmony between them, so far as the inner revelation (if we may use this term, although it appears a clear misnomer,) can be compared with the outward, and beyond that point the inward leads us to expect just what the Scriptures reveal. Natural religion not only harmonizes with revealed, but leads us to anticipate, in some degree, what that revealed religion shall be, *i. e.*, it leads

us to hope that the questions to which it gives rise, and to which it furnishes no satisfactory answer, shall there find their answer, that the great problems which meet every reflecting soul, shall receive a clear solution. The clearest spiritual intuition which meets every one when he turns his eyes within, is, that man is not in his normal condition, that his nature has undergone a dreadful fall. The doctrine of sin and depravity is the teaching of natural as well as of revealed religion. It is not so clearly seen, but still sufficiently evident to bring it within the class of truths which belong to the "revelation within," that God is just, and that sin, therefore, must be punished if he govern the world. We do not appeal simply to the consciousness of men to establish these intuitions, but to every religion which has arisen among men, which embraces them, and indeed offers a remedy. The light within gives us reason to hope, if it be not the remnant of an original external revelation, that though God is just, he may be approached by sinful men, through some mediation in the way of sacrifice or atonement. Every false religion embraces this also. We may add that every man comes to the conviction—a strange conviction on the supposition that this theory is true—that he is helpless and ignorant, needs light from some external source, needs indeed just that which the Bible reveals in the doctrine of the Spirit's influences. All these intuitions which serve to prepare the way for an external revelation, or to awaken the sense of want in the soul, are just as clear and universal as are the truths which belong to "spiritual insight" as their source. But surely no one will pretend that there is any contradiction between these truths and the doctrines of the Bible as to the fall and redemption. There is much more in the Bible than could have been conjectured from the "inward revelation;" but so far as it goes, there is a perfect harmony between them. The most fundamental position in their theory proves to be without support. It falls before the slightest examination. We say the most fundamental position, for if we should grant what they claim, that there is an interior illumination through which every man could gain a distinct and certain knowledge of the elementary "moral and spiritual truths," which we may grant for the sake of the argument, although all

experience proves the claim to be unfounded; there would yet remain the possibility and necessity of an external revelation to satisfy the deeper questions which the soul ever asks, as to how God may be reconciled to sinful men, and man be restored to his primitive and normal state. And that the Bible furnishes professedly the answers to these questions—answers which we have seen accord well with the fairest conjectures of natural religion—is in itself a convincing proof that it is *the revelation from without*, which is necessary if men are ever to be saved from the present fearful ruin.

And besides all this, if their theory be true, and they will be consistent with themselves, it will lead them inevitably to deny that there is a personal God, who governs the world. For if every man receives from within all “moral and spiritual truth,” and every other truth which relates to our being, or to the government of God, is to be tested by these intuitions; to be received or rejected according as each man thinks that they agree with his intuitions or not; then it will follow, since the same objections lie against the revelation which God makes of himself in his works of creation and providence, as against the Bible; since there is sin in the world, and inexplicable suffering, under his providence, that they must embrace either Pantheism, in which moral evil, with all its results, is regarded as a necessary step to a higher good—a link in the endless chain; or Atheism, which denies the being of God, and leaves us to explain sin and misery as the parts of an inexorable fate under which we live, and shuts out of course from the soul all hope either of relief or cure.* It appears to us, therefore, that what the prophet said of the degenerate and idolatrous race to whom he was sent, may be fairly said of these modern infidels: “Your fathers have forsaken me, saith the Lord, and have walked after other gods, and have served them, and have worshipped them, and have forsaken me, and have not kept my

* See Eclipse of Faith, 148, 149. The author of this work puts the advocates of this theory in this dilemma, from which escape seems to us impossible: “Either the supposed truths of their spiritual theory are known to all mankind or not; if they are, surely their books, and every such book, is the most impertinent in the world; if not, these authors did well to write, supposing them to have truth on their side; but then that indicates the possibility and utility of a book-revelation;” or, as he elsewhere proves, leads to the absurd conclusion, “that that is possible with man, which is impossible with God.” p. 292, 88, 89.

law, and ye have done worse than your fathers, *for behold ye walk every one after the imagination of his evil heart, that they may not hearken unto me.*"

We had proposed to call the attention of our readers to a still more recent form of infidelity, which assumes the title of "Secularism," and holds for its fundamental principle that the truths of the present world are the only truths of which we are or can be certain. But a system which virtually denies man's religious nature, buries beyond the prospect of resurrection all his most sacred hopes and aspirations, and degrades him very much to the level of the brute, can never prevail to any extent, nor exert any great power even over those who profess to receive it. It has no claim therefore to special notice. The reader may find it described and refuted in an Appendix to this Essay.

We come now to the second point of the Essay, in which the author proceeds to describe the causes which have been most efficient in the production of the results before described. They are found to be in general, "the moral state of men," which inclines them to resist the evidences upon which the truth rests, and to resist the truth itself, which in its nature and tendencies runs counter to their depraved inclinations; and in particular, "speculative philosophy, social disaffection, the corruptions of Christianity, religious intolerance, and the divisions of the Church." Each of these causes is dwelt upon at considerable length, and with great ability; although perhaps, relatively to each other, too much stress is laid upon the divisions of the Church, and too little upon the tendencies and results of the speculative thinking of the age. We are inclined to think that too much of the unbelief of the world is laid at the door of the Church. It is quite too common a charge against her, on the part of those who oppose her progress; and quite too readily granted on the part of her friends. Every intelligent man must be conscious that he is imposing upon himself, when he pretends to justify his own persistency in sin by the imperfections of Christians, or his denial of the Bible, because the Church has been sometimes stained with impurity, and rent by divisions. He must be conscious that the ground upon which he pretends to rest is not the real ground; and that

in pleading it, he is only attempting to cover up or excuse what he has not the courage to avow. It is rather the occasion, therefore, than a real and efficient cause of unbelief. It is an afterthought raked up to justify what the unbeliever feels to be without reason or excuse. We pass from this part of the work with a single remark further; that while our author does not profess that his enumeration is exhaustive or complete, and there may be therefore other causes which are at work to produce the same end, he has yet selected the prominent causes, which are operating with tremendous efficiency, and in some instances, never with greater efficiency, than at the present day. We regard this part of the essay as likely to prove more valuable than the first.

Having thus defined its causes, we are brought to notice the agencies of which infidelity makes use. It propagates itself through the press, the clubs, the schools, and the pulpit. It is obviously of the greatest importance that the Church should know not only the nature of the foe, and the causes which have given it birth, but with what weapons it carries on its warfare. Few are probably aware of the extent to which each of these agencies is employed by the enemies of the truth. It is clearly shown, we think, that the power of the press is used with equal, if not greater effect, against the truth, than for it. We feel unwilling to admit that it preponderates on the side of unbelief; but the array of facts which our author presents in regard to France and England, is startling, if not such as to carry conviction to most minds. We see not why the case should be greatly different with us. There are three great forms in which the press is employed for this purpose; the periodical press, including the daily and weekly journals, and the larger monthlies and quarterlies; the light literature which is current and so widely read; and the more laboured attempts to sustain their principles, in philosophical discussions or essays. The most alarming feature of the first class, is the studied indifference which it maintains upon all subjects which touch upon spiritual religion, or even upon those doctrines which are the common faith and heritage of Christians. There are few journals in which common questions are discussed in a decided Christian tone. The great

social and political questions are discussed and decided mainly upon the low grounds of expediency. It has somehow come to be felt, by what authority we know not, that the great practical principles of the Bible are to be kept separate from political problems, as if a nation's religion could be excluded from all the fields of its activity, or as if such an attempt could be successful, without leading a people into infidelity. We regard the remarks of the author as just and important. It is time that these questions were taken out from the limits of mere worldly prudence, and settled by an appeal to the conscience of the people, and the higher and more indestructible parts of our nature. In addition to this silent influence against a practical Christianity, there are alarming issues which are inculcating infidelity. The author shows that the weekly papers which have the largest circulation, "are or were of an irreligious and demoralizing character." "A respectable London publisher states, that while cheap religious periodicals have made limited progress, either in number or interest, the corrupt printing press has been unceasingly at work." "The present circulation in London of immoral unstamped publications, of a half-penny to three half-pence each, must be upwards of 400,000 weekly." "Besides this, there are the importation of French novels, and prints of such a character, that they could once be obtained only by stealth, but are now sold openly where other periodicals are kept for sale." Our author divides them into three classes. First, the avowedly infidel, which have for their object, as described by themselves, "to induce the people to shake off religious belief, to cut the cable by which theology has a hold on practical affairs, and to let it float away to the undefined future to which it belongs." They circulate at an extremely cheap rate, and are read by the young men gathered in shops and factories.

A second class are those which are polluting; works which pander to the vilest passions and lusts of men. Mr. Mayhew, in his "London Labour and London Poor," says that one sheet-seller "assured him that his master alone used to get rid of 10,000 copies of such work on Saturday nights and Sunday mornings, the principal customers being young men."

A third class, which is properly described as labouring in

the same cause, whether intentionally or not, is the latitudinarian or neutral press, which is filled with light reading, republications of French works; a constant reiteration of the idea, either open or concealed, that men are not responsible for their belief. We speak with some confidence when we say, that this class is very large, in our own country. And no one who has observed the intentness with which such papers are read, and the very wide circulation which they attain, can doubt that they are powerfully at work undermining the principles of men, and preparing them to embrace any system of error which may present itself as plausible to their minds, or promise to free them from the restraints of the Bible. The larger part of these papers go into families which take but the one, and are commonly read from beginning to end, and by all the family. They are filled with some sickening love-story, or some thrilling tale, in which all the sympathies of the reader are artfully enlisted in favour of some desperate criminal; or in which, what is still worse, characters who are living in open and shameless vice, and constantly uttering the most corrupting sentiments, are yet so clothed as to please the imagination or fancy of the reader, and secure his approbation. The usual religious sentiments of such papers are either mawkish sentimentalism, or such as break the way to an open rejection of the gospel.

If we come to the larger monthlies and quarterlies, the state of things is very much the same. The *Westminster Review*, it is well known, is in the hands of an infidel publisher and editor. Its leading religious articles are designed to favour the more modern unbelief. The larger number of the literary quarterlies of our own land, manage to maintain an entire indifference upon all questions of Evangelical Religion. We demur to this attempt to exclude religion from fields of human activity, first, as we have said, from all social and political problems, and then from literature. What Arnold said of the press in his day was never truer than at present: "We do not need articles on religious subjects half so much as articles on common subjects written with a decidedly religious tone."

If we turn from this field to another, we shall not see much

that bids us hope. There are constantly issued in our cities, publications which are powerfully destructive in their tendencies. We cannot better define the class, than to describe one which came to hand not long since. It offered itself as a gospel to the poor, and then proceeded by an appeal to Scripture—introducing our Saviour himself as the great reformer—to establish these two principles: that the poor have an equal right to the possessions of the rich, exhorting them to bide their time, but to be in readiness to take what belonged to them when the time should come, or when opportunity should offer; and secondly, that marriage was an unjust and tyrannical institution, and ought to be destroyed. All this was done, not in the bare form in which we have stated it, but in the most plausible method, and with a style calculated to persuade men of the sincerity and purity of its author. At the same time, there was no concealing of the principles taught. Every thing was brought down to the comprehension of the most illiterate, and the whole accompanied with a glossary, in which every unusual word was explained in terms common to all. We read such a book, and their name is legion, with a kind of wonder that society still exists, or that there is so much virtue remaining in the world. The wonder is, that men are not more corrupt than they are. We feel ourselves driven back to faith in the restraining grace of God, even for temporal security. And these works are put out in such a form that they come within the reach and means of any who choose to read them. There is good reason to believe that their circulation is not confined to cities, but widely extended throughout the land, scattered like seeds of death. It has been affirmed by the *Edinburgh Review*, as quoted by our author, that the total annual issue of immoral publications exceeds by twenty-nine millions the total circulation of most of the religious book and tract societies of England and Scotland, with some seventy religious magazines beside. It has been affirmed more recently, that the purely infidel press of London issued publications to the amount of more than twelve millions, during the year 1851. It is probably not better in our own land. Germany, it is said by one of her own citizens, is filled with a flood of pamphlets, novels and romances, making the

pantheistic philosophy popular, and of course infidelity has spread further and further. "The secret of wickedness has long sneaked about, but no one would credit, up to the year 1848, when truly we were convinced:" and we are daily receiving importations from that land.

Besides all this, there are a large number of works, literary, scientific, and theological, which are either openly opposed to the Bible, or contain principles utterly subversive of it. We have our philosophies of religion which recognize no revelation, properly speaking. We have exegetical works, infected more or less with the analogical principles of the German commentators. Translations from these authors meet with a ready sale. Literature contributes its aid to an extent unknown before. Books of essays, compilations of lectures, a certain kind of metaphysical and sentimental poetry which sees no distinction between God and nature; to some extent history also, filled with false views of providence, and the destiny of the race; all these are sent forth with the design of overthrowing the ancient faith in the Bible. Taking the whole field in which the press operates, we can hardly doubt that its preponderating influence, for the present, is against the truth, or indifferent to its interests—that that instrument which God has chosen, above all others, for the advancement of truth and goodness, has been strangely turned to work their overthrow.

We have presented these facts, collected chiefly from the Essay before us, that our readers might know from what source the danger comes. Infidelity is not so much to be feared from the strength of her positions or forces, as from the disguised and secret attacks which she makes. There never was a time in which philosophical formulas were applied to such an extent as at the present day. There never was a time when infidelity knew so much how to find its way among the masses of the people, or in which she put forth such vigorous efforts to carry out her knowledge into an actual result. It is these efforts to popularize itself, its artful appeals to the pride and vanity of men, which clothes it with such fearful power, and leads us to fear sometimes for the present, while yet confident in the ultimate triumph of truth and right, that we are to see a wider spread moral depravation than we

have yet seen; or that the desolations which ever follow in the rear of unbelief, and which we have seen afar off, may yet come upon us.

Charles Hodge.

ART. VII.—*A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Validity of the Orders of the Scotch and Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches.* By W. Goode, M. A., F. S. A., Rector of Allhallows the Great and Less, London. New York: A. D. F. Randolph, 683 Broadway, 1853.

THE question, whether the Church of England recognizes the validity of the orders of non-episcopal churches, is one which concerns it much more than it does them. They are not the worse for non-recognition. They are not thereby curtailed of any spiritual power or advantage. They enter no claim to be regarded by Romanists or Anglicans, as constituent portions of the Church visible and catholic. They can as well afford to have their church standing denied, as the United States could bear to have their national existence called in question.

The case is far different with the Church of England itself. To refuse to recognize those as Christians who are Christians; to refuse communion with those in whom Christ dwells by his Spirit; to unchurch the living members of Christ's body; to withhold sympathy, fellowship, and co-operation from those in whom Christ delights, and who are devoted to his service; to take sides in the great conflict, between true and false religion, between the gospel and ritualism, against the truth and against God's people, is a very great sin. It is the sin of schism which all churchmen profess to regard with special abhorrence. It supposes wrong views of the nature of the church, of the plan of salvation, and of the nature of religion. We do not wonder, therefore, that the evangelical spiritual members of that Church are anxious not only to free themselves from the imputation of this sin and

heresy, but to prove that the Church to which they belong is not justly chargeable with either.

This, to say the least, is not a work of supererogation. There is much to render plausible the charge in question. Not only is the schismatical principle of making episcopal ordination essential to the ministry, and a valid ministry essential to the being of the Church, to the efficacy of the sacraments, and to union with Christ, the avowed doctrine of a large and controlling portion of the Anglican Church in England and in this country, but that Church, as a Church, stands isolated in the Christian world. It is excommunicated by Rome, and it in its turn refuses official recognition of other Protestants. An Episcopal minister communing in a Presbyterian Church, would, in our days, be almost as rare a sight as a Romish priest communing with the Church of England. The difference between the relation of the Episcopal clergy to those of other Protestant Churches, and of the clergy of those Churches to each other, is palpable. Mutual recognition, in the latter case, is open, cordial, and undoubted; in the other, it is always dubious and hesitating, and often explicitly denied. That Church, therefore, as a Church, stands aloof. It has no practical communion with other Churches. It rebaptizes, in many cases, Presbyterian children, and reordains Presbyterian clergymen. It sends no corresponding members from its conventions, either state or general, to the Synods or assemblies of any other Church. It does not invite the ministers of other denominations to minister in its pulpits, or to take part in its religious services. It draws a distinct and broad line of demarcation between itself and all other Protestant bodies. We are speaking of the acknowledged and unquestioned *animus* and *status* of the Church as a body. We know there are hundreds of her ministers, and thousands of her people, who have none of this spirit, and to whom the exclusiveness of their ecclesiastical canons is a burden and an offence. We know that many cases have occurred in which this exclusiveness has been triumphed over, and Episcopal churches *lent* to Presbyterian ministers. We know, too, that this isolation of the Church of England is inconsistent with the avowed principles of her own standards, and contrary to the spirit and practice of her Re-

formers and immediate successors for a hundred years. Nevertheless it is a fact. There must therefore be something in her constitution which tends to exclusiveness, and which leads her thus to stand aloof from the great body of evangelical Christians. This can hardly be merely Episcopacy; because the Moravians, and some Lutheran Churches, are episcopal, and yet are completely identified with other Protestant communions. Neither can it be either the use of a Liturgy, or its peculiar character; because other Protestant Churches have liturgies, and some of them less evangelical than that of the Church of England. The isolation of that Church is no doubt to be referred, in a measure, to the outward course of her history; to her having been framed and fashioned by the king and parliament, established by the law of the land, and made the exclusive recipient of the wealth and honours of the State. But besides these outward circumstances, there must be something in the system itself, some element essentially anti-protestant and exclusive, to which the effect in question is principally to be referred. This, we doubt not, is, in general, the subordination of truth to form; the making what is outward more important than what is inward. The question how a company of Christians is organized; what is their form of government; what their mode of worship; what their ecclesiastical descent, is of far more consequence in determining the question whether they are to be recognized as a Church, and to be communed with, and regarded as Christian brethren, members of the body of Christ, than either their faith or practice. If a body of professing Christians is organized in a certain way, it is a Church, no matter whether it is as heretical and idolatrous as Rome, or as ignorant and superstitious as the Greeks or Abyssinians. If organized in a different way, it is no Church, it has no ministry, no sacraments, and no part in the covenant of mercy. This is the legitimate consequence of the idea of the Church on which the whole Anglican system is founded. The Church is regarded as an external society, with a definite organization, perpetuated by a regular succession of ordinations. Of course, in searching for the Church, the search is not for truth and holiness, but for organization and succession. Hence, Rome is a Church, because she has pre-

lates and succession; the Free Church of Scotland is no Church, because it has no bishops. The one is indeed heretical, schismatical, and idolatrous, the mystical Babylon; the other, one of the most orthodox, exemplary, and devoted body of Christians in the world. Still, the former is our Latin sister, whose orders and sacraments are valid and efficacious; the other is an apostate communion, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and from the covenant of promise, forming no part of the Church catholic and apostolical. There is not only more of outward recognition, but of inward cordial sympathy and fellowship with prelatival Churches, no matter how corrupt, than with non-episcopal Churches, no matter how pure. The form is made of more importance than the substance. Such is the necessary consequence of making the Church an external society, and prelatival ordination essential to the ministry. This is the element which has been infused into the Episcopal Church of England and America, and which has produced its legitimate fruit in the isolation of that body from other Protestant communions. Though not original in its constitution, it is so congenial with it, that it has ever been adopted by a large portion of its members, and its influence can hardly be resisted even by those who see its unscriptural character, and are shocked by its legitimate effects.

There are certain radical points bearing on this whole subject, incorporated in all Protestant confessions, the denial of which is a denial of Protestantism, and the ignoring of which, on the part of any Church, necessarily leads that Church into an unnatural and anti-protestant position. One of these, as just intimated, relates to the idea of the Church. All Protestant Churches rejected the Popish doctrine, that the Church is, in its essential nature, an external society, and especially that it is such a society organized in any one definite form. Every confession framed at the time of the Reformation defined the Church as the body of Christ, to be the company of believers, the *coetus sanctorum*, the company of faithful men; or, as the doctrine is expressed in the Westminster Confession, "The Catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered in one, under Christ, the head thereof, and is the

spouse, the body, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all." By this is meant that the body to which belong the attributes, prerogatives, and promises pertaining to the Church, consists of true believers. And this is only saying that the characteristics, prerogatives, and promises, which, according to the Scriptures, belong to Christians, pertain not to the nominal, but to the real disciples of Christ; and whatever of absurdity and evil is consequent on confounding the distinction between nominal and real Christians, is inseparable from making the external Church, a body of professed believers, the possessor of the attributes and prerogatives of the true Church. The great corruption, apostasy, assumption, and tyranny of Rome consisted in appropriating to herself, as an external society, the attributes and powers of the body of Christ; and the leading Protest of those who rejected her authority was directed against that all-comprehending assumption, and consisted in the affirmation that the true Church was composed of true believers, and that every man united to Christ by a living faith was a member of his body and an heir of his salvation, no matter what his external ecclesiastical relations might be, and despite of all that pope, prelate, or presbyter, might say or do.

This is one fundamental principle of Protestantism. A second, scarcely less important, is, that the visible Church catholic consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children, and that particular churches consist of any number of such professing Christians, together with their children, united together for the maintenance and protection of the truth, and mutual watch and care. A particular church may be one worshipping assembly, or any number of such congregations collectively considered as united under some one tribunal.* The obvious meaning of this definition of the visible Church is, that as true believers constitute the true Church, so professed believers constitute the apparent or visible Church; and consequently, the

* *Ecclesia visibilis est vel universalis, omnium Christianorum societas, nullo quidem fœdere externo juncta, ex iisdem tamen originibus nata, notisque communibus ab alienigenis diversa; vel particularis, singularis Christianorum societas, externo fœdere juncta.*

question, whether any external organized body, or particular church, is to be recognized and treated as a constituent member of the visible Church catholic, depends on the question, not whether they are organized in this or that particular way, nor whether they are derived by regular descent from the apostles, but simply and solely whether they profess the true religion. The second great question, therefore, between Protestants and Romanists, in reference to this whole subject, relates to the *criteria* or marks by which we are to determine whether any particular church is really a constituent portion of the visible catholic Church. The Protestant confessions, without exception, declare the word and sacraments, or simply the word, *i. e.*, the profession of the true religion, to be that criterion.* As among nations there may be good and bad governments, that is, political institutions more or less in accordance with the principles of right and with the revealed will of God, yet every independent state, no matter what its political organization may be, whether a pure despotism or a pure democracy, is entitled to be received into the family of nations; so every organized body professing the true religion and associated for the maintenance of the truth, and for the worship of God, is entitled to be recognized as a part of the true visible Church. Protestants have ever acted on this principle, and they must do so, or forfeit their character and their spiritual life. The Churches of Switzerland, of France, of the Palatinate, of Saxony, of Holland, of Sweden, of England, of Scotland, had each their own peculiar mode of organization or form of government; yet each recognized all the rest. If a body pro-

* The Protestant confessions generally make the word and sacraments the criterion of a Church, and sometimes, as in the Westminster Confession, it is simply the word. On this point, Turretin says:—"Quamvis autem in assignandis veræ ecclesiæ notis quædam in verbis occurrat diversitas inter orthodoxos, in re ipsa tamen est consensus. Nam sive unica dicatur, doctrinæ scilicet veritas et conformitas cum Dei verbo, sive plures, pura scilicet verbi prædicatio, cum legitima sacramentorum administratione, quibus alii addunt disciplinæ exercitium, et sanctitatem vitæ seu obedientiam verbo præstitam, res eodem redit. . . . Porro observandum circa notas istas diversos esse necessitatis gradus, et alias aliis magis necessarias esse. In primo gradu necessitatis est pura verbi prædicatio et confessio, utpote sine qua ecclesia esse non potest. Sed non parvum habet necessitatis gradum sacramentorum administratio, quæ ita ex priore pendet, ut abesse tamen ad tempus possit, ut visum in ecclesia Israelitica in deserto quæ caruit circumcissione; eadem est disciplinæ ratio, quæ ad tuendum ecclesiæ statum pertinet, sed qua sublata vel corrupta non statim tollitur ecclesia." Vol. iii. p. 98.

fessed the true religion, it was received into the sisterhood of Churches, whether it was Erastian, Prelatical, Presbyterian, or Congregational. The only Church which has stammered and faltered in this matter is the Church of England, which has always acted as though it was at least an act of condescension or concession, to recognize non-episcopal denominations as true Churches. The subjective reason for this faltering has been, the dread of detracting from the importance of the episcopate. If admitted less than essential, the fear was, it might be utterly disregarded. The objective reason, as before stated, is to be found in the doctrine so congenial to her system, that external organization enters into the essence of the Church.

The Protestant doctrine which makes the profession of the true religion the only essential criterion of the Church, is neither arbitrary nor optional. It is necessary and obligatory. We must hold it, and must act upon it, or set ourselves in direct opposition to the word of God. It arises necessarily out of the undeniable scriptural principle, that nothing can be essential to the Church but what is essential to salvation. This principle is held alike by Romanists and Protestants. It is because the former regard baptism and submission to the pope as necessary to salvation, that they make them necessary to the Church; and it is because Anglicans hold there can be no salvation without communion with bishops, that they hold there can be no Church without a bishop. So long, therefore, as Protestants hold that faith in the Lord Jesus Christ is the only indispensable condition of salvation, they must hold that faith is the only essential condition of the being of the Church. To make anything else essential is to alter the conditions of salvation; and to alter the conditions of salvation is the greatest act of presumption, folly, and wickedness of which sinful worms can well be guilty.

It follows necessarily from what has been said, that by "the profession of the true religion" as the criterion of the Church, is meant the profession of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. Unless the Bible teaches that the knowledge and belief of all the doctrines contained in the word of God, are essential to salvation, it cannot be assumed to teach that the profession of all those doctrines is essential to the existence of

the Church. No man believes the former of these propositions, and therefore no man can consistently believe the latter. We are bound to recognize as a Christian any man who gives satisfactory evidence of piety, and who professes his faith in the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, even though he be ignorant or erroneous as to non-essential points. In like manner, the question whether any body of Christians is to be recognized as a Church, does not depend upon its being free from error, but upon its professing the doctrines essential to salvation.*

It need hardly be said that in making the true religion the only essential condition of the Church, and in limiting the demand to fundamental doctrines, Protestants do not intend that other things are unrevealed or unimportant. They readily admit that much is revealed and enjoined in Scripture, which, though not essential to salvation, is necessary to the perfection of Christian character, and to the well being and purity of the Church. But as perfection is not necessary in the individual to substantiate his claim to be regarded as a Christian, so neither is a perfectly scriptural creed or form of government necessary to the being of the Church, or to the existence of an obligation on our part to recognize it as such.

If it be asked, what is involved in this recognition? the answer is easy. To recognize a man as a Christian, is to admit his right to be so regarded and treated; it is to feel and act towards him as a Christian, and to acknowledge that he has all the rights and privileges of a Christian. In like manner, to recognize a body of men as a Church, is, 1. To admit their right to be so regarded and treated. 2. It is to feel and act towards them as a constituent part of the visible Church catholic; and 3. It is to acknowledge that they have all the rights and privileges which belong to a Church of Jesus Christ. That is, that they have a right to receive members into the

* Romanists objected to this criterion of the Church, that the common people are not competent judges of doctrines. To this Protestants replied—*Agitur hic de examine non cujusvis doctrinæ, et quæstionum omnium, quæ circa eam moveri possunt, sed tantum doctrinæ necessariæ ad salutem, in qua essentia fidei consistit, quæ perspicuè exstat in Scriptura, et potest a quolibet fidei percipi.*—*Turretin*, vol. iii. p. 106.

communion of the Church, or to exclude them from it; to administer the sacraments, to ordain and depose ministers, and, in short, to do everything which Christ has commissioned his Church to do.

If it be asked further, whether all other churches are bound to recognize and give effect to the acts of every body which they recognize as a sister Church, that is a very different question. It is the confusion of these two things, although so distinct, which alarms some conservative minds, and leads them to renounce the simplest principles of Protestantism. They fear that if they recognize a certain body as a Church, they must receive all their members, give effect to all their acts of discipline, recognize their ministers as their own, &c. This is a great mistake. We may recognize Austria as a nation, and yet not regard her sentence of banishment on one of her citizens for holding republican principles as binding on us. We may regard the Seceders as a Church, and yet not be bound to refuse communion with those whom they may excommunicate or depose for singing our hymns, or uniting in our worship. It is one thing to recognize the possession of certain rights by a particular body, and another to endorse the wisdom or the propriety of the exercise of those rightful powers in any given case. As we are not arguing, but simply stating what are the first principles of Protestantism on this whole subject, we cannot enter further into details, or attempt to specify the cases when one Church is bound to recognize the acts of another as though they were its own. This would require a treatise; our present object is far more limited. We wish merely to state those principles which have in fact led all evangelical churches to recognize each other as constituent members of the Church universal, and the neglect or denial of which has led to the isolation of the Church of England from other Protestant communions.

It is easy to see the intimate connection between the principles above stated, and the whole system of evangelical religion and doctrine. If any one form of external organization or mode of ordination be essential to the Church, it must be essential to religion; and if necessary to religion, it must be the exclusive channel of grace and salvation. This is the

essential feature of Ritualism. These two things are historically as well as logically related. To whatever extent any body make prelacy and episcopal orders essential to the being or well being of the Church, to the same extent have they also made them essential to piety, and regarded them as the channels of grace. It is not, therefore, anything merely adventitious to Protestantism, but something which arises out of its very nature, when it teaches that the profession of the true religion, or sound doctrine, is the only necessary condition of the being of the Church; and, therefore, that we are bound to regard as Christian Churches all those bodies which profess the true religion, no matter what their external organization may be.

A third distinctive principle of Protestantism relates to the ministry. On this subject all the Protestant Confessions teach,

1. That there is no such distinction between the clergy and laity as the Romish Church affirms. The former do not constitute a distinct class, separated by internal and indelible peculiarities of eminence from their fellow Christians, and exalted over them, not merely in office, but by inward grace.

2. Those Confessions teach the universal priesthood of believers; that through Christ all have liberty of access by the Spirit unto the Father; and consequently that Christian ministers are not priests intervening between the people and God, as though through them and their ministrations alone we can become partakers of the benefits of redemption. The people do not come to God through the clergy as their mediators, nor are they dependent on them for grace and salvation; and therefore it is not the vital question with them, whether their clergy have the true succession and the grace of orders. "Hinc patet," says the venerable Turretin, "ecclesiam non esse propter ministerium, sed ministerium propter ecclesiam, et ecclesiam non pendere a ministerio; sed ministerium ab ecclesia." Vol. iii., p. 253.

3. Protestants unite in teaching that all Church power vests radically not in the clergy as a class, but in the Church as a whole. In other words, that the great commission by which the Church was constituted, by which its powers were defined and conveyed, and its duties as well as its prerogatives deter-

mined, was addressed and given not to the clergy as a class, but to the whole Church. The power of the keys, therefore, vests ultimately or primarily in the people; of which power they can never rightfully divest themselves. In the articles of Smalcald, Luther, expressing the common doctrine of Protestants, says: "Necesse est fateri, quod claves non ad personam unius hominis, sed ad Ecclesiam pertineant. Nam Christus de clavibus dicens, Matt. xviii. 19, addit: Ubiunque duo vel tres consenserint etc. Tribuit igitur principaliter claves Ecclesiæ, et immediate." In the same document, he says: "Ubiunque est Ecclesia, ibi est jus administrandi evangelii. Quare necesse est, ecclesiam retinere jus vocandi, eligendi et ordinandi ministros."

Turretin, in speaking of the right to call men to the ministry, says: "Nostra sententia est, jus vocationis ad ecclesiam *originaliter et radicaliter* pertinere, apud quam illam deposuit Christus." This he proves first, "*a traditione clavium*; quia ecclesiis data est potestas clavium, quæ in se complectitur jus vocationis. Patet ex Matt. xvi. 19, ubi claves regni cælorum promittuntur Petro, et in ejus personâ toti ecclesiæ, et Matt. xviii. 18, Christus dat ecclesiæ potestatem ligandi et solvendi: Vol. iii. 251. Licet corpus ecclesiæ exercitium juris vocandi pastores commiserit Presbyterio ad vitandam confusionem; non ideo se absolute et simpliciter eo jure spoliavit, ut dicatur eo carere nec possit amplius in ullo casu eo uti. Quia ita commisit juris illius exercitium Rectoribus, qui nomine suo illud administrant, ut illud tamen originaliter tanquam sibi proprium et peculiare reservavit. Nec exemplum societatis civilis huc pertinet, ubi populus ita resignat jus suum Principi, quem eligit, ut eo absolute et simpliciter exuatur. Quia longe hac in parte differt societas politica et sacra. In illa populus potest resignare absolute jus suum principi, illi se subjiciendo, ut Domino. Sed ecclesia jus suum non transfert pastoribus quoad proprietatem tanquam dominis, sed tantum quoad usum et exercitium tanquam ministris, qui illud administrant, non proprio nomine, sed nomine ecclesiæ. Ratio discriminis est, quod in societate civili, ubi agitur tantum de bonis temporalibus, nihil obstat quominus populus possit resignare absolute jus suum, imo expedit aliquando ad vitandam confusionem et anarchiam. Sed in ecclesia,

ubi agitur de salute, fideles non possunt sine crimine absolute se exuere jure illo, quod habent in media, quæ illi dantur ad promovendam salutem suam, quale est ministerium. Licet enim fides et pietas ipsorum non absolute pendeat a pastoribus, tamen exercitium ministerii, quod purum est et integrum, magno est ad pietatem adjumento, et contra fidei conservatio difficillima est in corrupto ministerio." Vol. iii. p. 260.

This doctrine, that Church power vests not in the clergy as a class, but ultimately in the people, does not imply that the ministry is not an office, as the Quakers teach; nor that it is not an office of divine appointment. Neither does it imply that any man may of his own motion assume the office, and undertake the exercise of its functions, any more than the doctrine that all power in the State vests ultimately in the people, implies that any man may assume the office of a magistrate of his own will. Neither does the doctrine in question at all favour the theory of the Independents. That theory rests mainly on two principles, both of which we regard as manifestly unscriptural. The one is that which the name implies, viz., that each congregation or organized worshipping assembly is independent of all other churches; and the other is, that the ministerial office may be conveyed and withdrawn by the vote and at the option of the people. The function of the people is not to confer the office, but to join in the exercise of a judgment whether a given person is called of God to be a minister, and to decide whether he shall exercise his office over them, as their spiritual guide.

But while the doctrine in question teaches neither Quakerism nor Independency, it is none the less one of the radical principles of Protestantism. The Reformers protested not less against the Romish doctrine of the ministry, than they did against the Romish doctrine of the Church; the two being inseparably connected. They protested against the doctrine that Christ gave the Holy Spirit to the apostles as a permanent class of officers in the Church, to be by them transmitted by the imposition of their hands to their successors, and through them conveyed in ordination to presbyters, imparting to them grace and supernatural power. According to this theory, the grace and power which constitute a man a minister,

and which authorize and enable him to execute ministerial functions efficaciously to the salvation of men, are derived solely from the hands of the ordaining bishop. Without such ordination, therefore, no man can be a minister. He can have neither the authority nor the power to discharge its functions. A failure in succession is of necessity a failure in the ministry, and a failure in the ministry is a failure in the Church. In opposition to all this, the Reformers taught that while the Holy Ghost is the fountain of all Church power, the Spirit is not given to the bishops as a class, but to the Church as a whole. He dwells in all believers, and thereby unites them in one as the body of Christ. To them he divides, to each severally as he wills; giving to one the gift of wisdom, to another the gift of knowledge, to another that of teaching, to another that of ruling. Every office in the Church presupposes a gift, and is but the organ through which that gift is legitimately exercised for edification. It is, therefore, this inward call of the Holy Ghost which constitutes, in a manner, a minister; that is, which gives him the authority and ability to exercise its functions for the conversion of sinners and the edification of believers. The fact that a man has this inward call, must be duly authenticated. This authentication may be either extraordinary or ordinary. The extraordinary authentication may be given either in the form of miracles, or in such a measure of the gifts of the ministry and such a degree of success as places the fact of a divine call beyond all reasonable doubt. No Protestant questions the call of Calvin and Farel to the work of the ministry, and no Protestant cares to ask for any authentication of that call beyond the approbation God so abundantly manifested. But in all ordinary cases the authentication of the inward divine call is by the judgment of the Church. There is a right and a wrong, a regular and an irregular way of expressing this judgment; but the main thing is the judgment itself. The orderly scriptural method of expressing the judgment of the Church, is through its official organ, that is, the Presbytery. Ordination is the public, solemn attestation of the judgment of the Church that the candidate is called of God to the ministry of reconciliation;

which attestation authorizes his entrance on the public discharge of its duties.

It is on these principles the Reformers answered the objections by which they were constantly assailed. When the Romanists objected that the Reformers had no valid call to the ministry, they answered, *ad hominem*, that many of them had been regularly ordained in the Romish Church: and as to others that they had the call of God duly authenticated both by the extraordinary manifestations of his approbation and by the judgment of the Church.

When it was further objected, that any man might claim to have the call of God, and thus the door would be open to all manner of confusion and fanaticism, as among the Anabaptists, they made two answers; first, that a great distinction must be made between an orderly and settled state of the Church, and times of general corruption and confusion. As in a State, in ordinary times, there is a regular and prescribed method for the appointment of magistrates, which it would be a sin and evil to disregard, but when the magistrates turn tyrants or traitors, the people resume their rights and appoint their magistrates in their own way; so in the ordinary condition of the Church all are bound to abide by the regular and appointed methods of action; but if the rulers of the Church become heretical and oppressive, the people have the right to renounce their authority, and to follow those who they see are called of God to the ministry.

When it was still further urged that this was to do away with the ministry as a divine institution, and to make it a mere creation of the Church, and supposed the people to have the power to make and depose ministers at their pleasure, it was answered, that the Protestant doctrine and practice were indeed inconsistent with the Romish theory of the ministry, which supposed that orders are a sacrament, that the Holy Ghost, conveying both authority and supernatural power, is communicated by the imposition of the hands of the bishop, and can be communicated in no other way. This rendered the Church entirely dependent on the ministry, by making grace and salvation dependent on an uninterrupted succession

of valid ordinations. But this view of the nature of the ministry was declared to be unscriptural and destructive. On the other hand, it was denied that the Protestant doctrine conflicted with any thing taught in the word of God on the subject, or with the practice and faith of the Church in its purest ages. It was admitted that the ministry was a divine institution; that ministers receive their authority from Christ, and act in his name and as his representatives; that the people do not confer the office, but simply judge whether a candidate is called by God to be a minister; that in the expression of this judgment, those already in the ministry must, in ordinary cases, concur; and that to them, as in all other matters connected with the word and sacraments, belongs as the organs or executive officers of the Church, the right to carry the judgment of the Church into effect, *i. e.*, to them belongs the right to ordain. At the same time, however, they maintained two important principles, perfectly consistent with this view of the ministry as a divine institution the appropriate organ of the Church for the examination and ordination of candidates for the sacred office. The one was that already referred to as so clearly expressed by Luther when he said, "*Ubicunque est ecclesia, ibi est jus administrandi evangelii*;" and therefore, if we acknowledge any body of men as a Church, we must admit their right to take their own course in the election and ordination of ministers. We may believe, as the great body of Christians do believe, that there is a right and a wrong, a regular and an irregular, a scriptural and an unscriptural method of proceeding in this matter. But as no Protestant believes that any thing connected with such externals is essential to salvation or to the being of the Church, he cannot, on the ground of any such irregularity, refuse to acknowledge an organized body of the professors of the true religion as a true Church or their ministers as true ministers. Hence, although in the great Protestant body one class believed that bishops were the only appropriate organs of the Church in ordination; another considered the Presbytery was, according to the Scriptures, the appointed organ; and others, and they perhaps the majority, held that the *jus vocandi ad ministerium* vested jointly in the clergy, the magistrate, and the people; yet as all agreed in

the principle above stated, viz., that wherever the Church is, there is the right of administering the gospel, they universally acknowledged the validity of each other's orders.

The second principle, which secured unity and mutual recognition in the midst of diversity both of opinion and practice, is nearly allied to the one just mentioned. The Reformers distinguished between what is essential and what is circumstantial in a call to the ministry. The essentials are, the call of God, the consent of the candidate, and the consent of the Church. The circumstantials are, the mode in which the consent of the Church is expressed, and the ceremonies by which that assent is publicly manifested.* However important these circumstantials may be, they are still matters about which Churches may differ, and yet remain Churches.

While the principle was thus clearly inculcated that every Church could decide for itself as to the mode of electing and ordaining ministers, it was no less strenuously held that every Church had a right to judge for itself of the qualifications of its own ministers. Hence, the fact that a man was recognized as a minister in one denominational Church, was not regarded as proving that he had the right to act as a minister in the Churches of another denomination. We may admit a Baptist or Independent minister to be a minister, and yet, if he wishes to act as such in our Church, we have a perfect right, first, to be satisfied as to his personal fitness; and, secondly, that his call to the ministry should be ascertained and authenticated in the way which we believe to be enjoined in Scripture.

It is easy to see how the denial, or oversight, by the Church

* *Essentia vocationis, says Turretin, consistit in triplici consensu, Dei, Ecclesiæ, et vocati. . . . Modus vocationis consistit in actibus quibusdam vel præcedaneis, vel concomitantibus, sine quibus vocatio confusa foret et inordinata, qualia sunt examen fidei et morum, testimonium probæ vitæ, benedictio, et manuum impositio. Quoad prius, cum essentielle vocationis possit esse in cætu, ubi desunt pastores, certum est populum fidelem posse vocationem facere in casu summæ necessitatis. . . . Sic non desinit vocatio esse plena et sufficiens quoad essentialia sine pastoribus. Quoad ritus et ceremonias vocationis, quæ non sunt de essentia vocationis, obtinere debent in ecclesia constituta, sed non semper observari possunt in ecclesia constituenda et reformanda. Vol. iii. 261. Again, Dum in ecclesia viget ministerium, illa debet quidem eo uti ad vocationem pastorum, nec pastores ordinare potest nisi per ministerium jam constitutum. Sed deficiente ministerio, vel misere corrupto, potest ipsa sibi ministros eligere, ad sui ædificationem, etiam sine ministerii interventu; tum quia hoc jus habet a Deo, tum quia omni tempore et loco tenetur ministerium conservare.*

of England of the three great Protestant principles, to which we have referred, has led to her present isolated and anti-Protestant position. Regarding the Church as essentially an external organization, with a definite form of government, she is slow to recognize as Churches any societies not organized according to that model. The profession of the true religion is not sufficient to sustain the claim of any communion to be regarded as a Christian Church. As no man can be a Christian if not subject to a bishop, so no society can be a Church unless episcopally organized. The ministry is an office continued in the Church by a regular succession of prelatial ordinations, and therefore cannot exist when such ordination is wanting. It is the object of Mr. Goode's book to prove that such is not the original and genuine doctrine of the Church of England; that these anti-Protestant principles are foreign from her original constitution, and that her present anti-Protestant position is due to the perverting influence of the romanizing party within her pale.

The occasion for the publication of the treatise before us, was the printing a private letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury, obtained under false pretences, by a convert to Romanism. In that letter the Archbishop said, in reference to "the validity of the orders of the foreign Protestant non-episcopal churches," "I hardly imagine there are two bishops on the bench, or one clergyman in fifty throughout our Church, who would deny the validity of the order of those pastors, solely on account of their wanting the imposition of episcopal hands." This avowal caused a great outcry. The Tractarians were shocked to hear the primate of all England deny their fundamental doctrine of apostolical succession and grace of orders. A cloud of publications issued from the press, assailing the archbishop in terms such as those only could use who regarded him as a fallen archangel. The higher the reverence due to him if faithful, the greater the execration justified by his apostasy. Mr. Goode, so extensively and so favourably known by his able and learned work on the "Rule of Faith," here undertakes to vindicate the archbishop, and to prove that it is not "a doctrine of the Church of England, that episcopal ordination is a *sine qua non* to constitute a valid Christian minis-

try." His first argument is drawn from the fact, that under Henry VIII. the bishops and clergy put forth a document containing the very doctrine on which the validity of Presbyterian ordinations has been chiefly rested, namely, the parity of bishops and presbyters, with respect to the ministerial powers essentially and by right belonging to them. In the *Institution of a Christian Man*, put forth by the bishops and clergy, in 1537, we read as follows:

"As touching the sacrament of holy orders, we think it convenient that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach the people committed unto their spiritual charge, first, how that Christ and his apostles did institute and ordain, in the New Testament, that besides the civil powers and governance of kings and princes, (which is called *potestas gladii*, the power of the sword,) there should also be continually in the Church militant certain other ministers or officers, which should have special power, authority and commission, under Christ, to preach and teach the word of God unto his people; to dispense and administer the sacraments of God unto them, &c., &c.

"That this office, this power and authority, was committed and given by Christ and his apostles unto certain persons only, that is to say, unto priests or bishops, whom they did elect, call, and admit thereunto, by their prayer and imposition of their hands.'

"And, speaking of 'the sacrament of orders' to be administered by the bishop, it observes, when noticing the various orders in the Church of Rome: '*The truth is, that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees or distinctions in orders, but only of deacons or ministers, and of priests or bishops.*' And throughout, when speaking of the jurisdiction and other privileges belonging to the ministry, it speaks of them as belonging to 'priests or bishops.'

"Again, in the revision of this work set forth by the king in 1543, entitled, *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*, in the chapter on 'the Sacrament of Orders,' priests and bishops are spoken of as of the same order."

Again, "In the autumn of 1540, certain questions were proposed by the king to the chief bishops and divines of the

day, of which the tenth was this: 'Whether bishops or priests were first? and if the priests were first, then the priest made the bishop.' With the wording of this question we have nothing to do, and should certainly be sorry to be made answerable for it; but our object is to see what views were elicited in the answers. Now to this question the Archbishop of Canterbury (Cranmer) replied: 'The bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things, but both one office, in the beginning of Christ's religion.' The Archbishop of York (Lee) says: 'The name of a bishop is *not properly a name of order, but a name of office*, signifying an overseer. And although the inferior shepherds have also care to oversee their flock, yet, forso much as the bishop's charge is also to oversee the shepherds, the name of overseer is given to the bishops, and not to the other; and as they be *in degree* higher, so in their consecration we find difference even from the primitive Church.' The Bishop of London (Bonner) says: 'I think the bishops were first, and yet I think it is *not of importance, whether the priest then made the bishop, or else the bishop the priest*; considering (after the sentence of St. Jerome) that in the beginning of the Church there was none (or, if it were, very small) difference between a bishop and a priest, especially touching the signification.' The Bishop of St. David's, (Barlow,) and the Bishop elect of Westminster, (Thirlby,) held that bishops and priests '*at the beginning were all one.*' Dr. Robertson, in his answer, says: '*Nec opinor absurdum esse, ut sacerdos episcopum consecret, si episcopus haberi non potest.*' Dr. Cox (afterwards Bishop of Ely) says: 'Although by Scripture (as St. Hierome saith) priests and bishops be one, and therefore the one not before the other, yet bishops, as they be now, were after priests, and therefore made of priests.' Dr. Redmayn, the learned Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, says: 'They be of like beginning, and at the beginning were both one, as St. Hierome and other old authors show by the Scripture, whereof one made another indifferently.' Dr. Edgeworth says: 'That the priests in the primitive Church made bishops, I think no inconvenience, (as Jerome saith, in an *Epist. ad Evagrium.*) Even like as soldiers should choose one among themselves to be their captain; so did priests choose

one of themselves to be their bishop, for consideration of his learning, gravity, and good living, &c., and also for to avoid schisms among themselves by them, that some might not draw people one way, and others another way, if they lacked one Head among them."

In turning to the divines of Queen Elizabeth's reign, when the formularies of the Church of England were finally constituted and established, our author quotes in the first instance the learned bishop of Exeter, Dr. Alley, who in his Prelections on 1 Peter read publicly in St. Paul's, in 1560, says:

"What difference is between a bishop and a priest, St. Hierome, writing ad Titum, doth declare, whose words be these: 'Idem est ergo presbyter, qui episcopus,' &c.; a priest, therefore, is the same that a bishop is, &c.'

"And having given Jerome's words in full, he adds:

'These words are alleged, that it may appear priests among the elders to have been *even the same that bishops were*. But it grew by little and little that the whole charge and cure should be appointed to one bishop within his precinct, that the seeds of dissension might utterly be rooted out.' (Alley's *Poor Man's Library*, 2d ed. 1571, tom. i. fol. 95, 96.)

"It could hardly be doubted, then, by one who held this, that if the circumstances of the Church required it, Presbyterian ordination would be valid.

"About the same period, namely, in 1563, we have a much stronger testimony from Dr. Pilkington, then Bishop of Durham:

'Yet remains one doubt unanswered in these few words, when he says, that 'the government of the Church was committed to bishops,' as though they had received a larger and higher commission from God of doctrine and discipline than other lower priests or ministers have, and thereby might challenge a greater prerogative. But this is to be understood, that *the privileges and superiorities, which bishops have above other ministers, are rather granted by men for maintaining of better order and quietness in commonwealths, than commanded by God in his word*. Ministers have better knowledge and utterance some than other, but their ministry is of equal dignity. God's commission and commandment is like and indifferent to

all, priest, bishop, archbishop, prelate, by what name soever he be called. . . . St. Paul calls the elders of Ephesus together, and says, 'the Holy Ghost made them bishops to rule the Church of God.' (Acts xx.) He writes also to the bishops of Philippos, meaning the ministers. . . . St. Jerome, in his commentary on the first chapter *Ad Tit.*, says that 'a bishop and a priest is all one.' . . . A bishop is a name of office, labour, and pains.' (*Confut. of an Addition. Works*, ed. Park Soc. pp. 493, 494.)

"Both these were among the bishops who settled our Articles, on the accession of Queen Elizabeth.

"Our next witness shall be Bishop Jewell, of whose standing in our Church it is unnecessary to add a word. On the parity of order in priests and bishops, he says:

'Is it so horrible a heresy as he [Harding] maketh it, to say, that by the Scriptures of God a bishop and a priest are all one? or knoweth he how far, and unto whom, he reacheth the name of an heretic? Verily Chrysostom saith: 'Between a bishop and a priest in a manner there is no difference.' (In 1 Tim. hom. 11.) S. Hierome saith . . . 'The apostle plainly teacheth us, that priests and bishops be all one.' (ad Evagr.) S. Augustine saith: 'What is a bishop but the first priest; that is to say, the highest priest?' (In *Quest. N. et V. Test.* q. 101.) So saith S. Ambrose: 'There is but one consecration (ordinatio) of priest and bishop; for both of them are priests, but the bishop is the first.' (In 1 Tim. c. 3.) All these, and other more holy Fathers, together with St. Paul the apostle, for thus saying, by M. Harding's advice, must be holden for heretics.' (*Def. of Apol.* Pt. ii. c. 9. div. i. *Works*, p. 202. See also Pt. ii. c. iii. div. i. p. 85.)

"But there is a passage in his writings still more strongly bearing on the point in question. Harding had charged our Church with deriving its orders from apostate bishops, &c. Jewell replies:

'Therefore we neither have bishops without church, nor church without bishops. Neither doth the Church of England this day depend of them whom you often call apostates, as if our Church were no Church without them. . . . *If there*

were not one, neither of them nor of us left alive, yet would not therefore the whole Church of England flee to Lovaine. Tertullian saith:—‘And we being laymen, are we not priests? It is written, Christ hath made us both a kingdom and priests unto God his Father. The authority of the Church, and the honour by the assembly, or council of order sanctified of God, hath made a difference between the lay and the clergy. Where as there is no assembly of ecclesiastical order, the priest being there alone (without the company of other priests) doth both minister the oblation and also baptize. Yea, and be there but three together, and though they be laymen, yet is there a church. For every man liveth of his own faith.’” (*Def. of Apol.* Pt. ii. c. v. div. i. p. 129.)

“It is needless to point out how much this passage implies.

“We proceed to Archbishop Whitgift.

“And first, as to the parity of order in bishops and priests, he speaks thus:

‘Every bishop is a priest, but every priest hath not *the name and title* of a bishop, in that meaning that Jerome in this place [*Ad Evagr.*] taketh the name of a bishop. . . . Neither shall you find this word *episcopus* commonly used but for *that priest that is in degree over and above the rest*, notwithstanding *episcopus* be oftentimes called *presbyter*, because *presbyter* is *the more general name.*’ (*Def. of Answ. to Adm.* 1574, fol. p. 383.)

‘Although Hierome confess, that by Scripture *presbyter* and *episcopus* is all one (AS IN DEED THEY BE *quoad ministerium*), yet doth he acknowledge a superiority of the bishop before the minister. . . . Therefore no doubt this is Jerome’s mind, that a bishop *in degree and dignity* is above the minister, though he be one and the self-same with him in the office of ministering the word and sacraments.’ (*Ib.* pp. 384, 385.)

“Secondly, as to the form of government to be followed in the Church. His adversary, Cartwright, like the great body of the Puritans, contended for the exclusive admissibility of the platform of church government he advocated; and, like Archdeacon Denison, maintained that ‘matters of discipline

and kind of government are matters necessary to salvation and of faith.' And this is Whitgift's reply:—

'I confess that in a Church collected together in one place, and at liberty, government is necessary in the second kind of necessity; but that any one kind of government is so necessary that without it the Church cannot be saved, *or that it may not be altered into some other kind thought to be more expedient*, I utterly deny, and the reasons that move me so to do be these. The first is, because *I find no one certain and perfect kind of government prescribed or commanded in the Scriptures to the Church of Christ*, which no doubt should have been done, if it had been a matter necessary unto the salvation of the Church. Secondly, because *the essential notes of the Church be these only; the true preaching of the word of God, and the right administration of the sacraments*: for (as Master Calvin saith, in his book against the Anabaptists): 'This honour is meet to be given to the word of God, and to his sacraments, that wheresoever we see the word of God truly preached, and God according to the same truly worshipped, and the sacraments without superstition administered, there we may without all controversy conclude the Church of God to be:' and a little after: 'So much we must esteem the word of God and his sacraments, that wheresoever we find them to be, there we may certainly know the Church of God to be, although in the common life of men many faults and errors be found.' The same is the opinion of other godly and learned writers, and the judgment of *the Reformed Churches*, as appeareth by their Confessions. So that notwithstanding government, or some kind of government, may be a part of the Church, touching the outward form and perfection of it, yet is it not such a part of the essence and being, but that it may be the Church of Christ without this or that kind of government, and therefore the kind of government of the Church is not necessary unto salvation.' (*Ib.* p. 81.)

'*I deny that the Scriptures do . . . set down any one certain form and kind of government of the Church to be perpetual for all times, persons, and places without alteration.*' (*Ib.* p. 84.)

The next testimony is that of Hooker, who says: "There

may be sometimes very just and sufficient reasons to allow ordination made without a bishop. *The whole Church visible being the true original subject of all power*, it hath not ordinarily allowed any other than bishops alone to ordain; howbeit as the ordinary cause is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways. Men may be extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways admitted unto spiritual functions in the Church. One is, when God himself doth of himself raise up any. . . . Another when the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep."—*Ecclesiastical Polity*, vii. 14. See also iii. 11.

"In a former passage of the same book," says our author, Hooker "distinctly admits the power of the Church at large to take away the episcopal form of government from the Church, and says:

'Let them [the bishops] continually bear in mind that it is rather the force of custom, whereby the Church; having so long found it good to continue the regiment of her virtuous bishops, doth still uphold, maintain, and honour them, in that respect, than that any true and heavenly law can be showed by the evidence whereof it may of a truth appear, that the Lord himself hath appointed presbyters for ever to be under the regiment of bishops;' adding, that 'their authority' is 'a sword which the Church hath power to take from them.'" *Ib.* vii. 5. See also i. 14, and iii. 10.

When we remember that Hooker is the greatest authority on ecclesiastical polity in the English Church, these extracts have special interest. They contain the clear assertion of the principle, which is, after all, the turning point between Protestants and Romanists, that all Church power vests ultimately in the whole Church, and not in the clergy, much less in the bishops. If the reverse were true, then the Church depends on the episcopate; derives its spiritual life through that channel as the only bond of connection with Christ. A corrupt bishop or presbyter could never be deposed or changed unless by others, who might be themselves corrupt. God, according to this theory, has not only left his sheep in the power of

those who, as the apostle says, may be grievous wolves, but he has, if we may reverently so speak, debarred himself from giving the gifts of the Spirit in any other way than through the line of apostolical succession. There was a time when a similar theory was held in reference to the state, and when men believed that the kingly office was instituted by divine command; that subjects could not depose their sovereign, nor change the succession, but were shut up to passive submission. But men have since discovered that the doctrine that civil power vests ultimately in the people, is perfectly consistent with the doctrine, that "the powers that be are ordained of God, and that whoso resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God." This was a lesson which princes and people were slow to learn, and it is well for statesmen, who sometimes forget their obligations and speak with small respect of the clergy, to remember that this great emancipating truth was first effectually taught to the world by the Protestant ministry. It was not until they had avowed and acted on the principle, that although the ministry was a divine institution, and obedience to ministers, within their appropriate sphere, is a matter of divine command, yet as all Church power vests ultimately in the people, they have the right to reject any minister, even though an apostle, who preached another gospel, that the nations awoke to the consciousness of a like power with regard to their civil rulers.

Another most important principle here avowed by Hooker is, that nothing binds the Church but an express law of Christ; that any office the Church has created she may abolish. This he applies to the episcopate, though he labours to prove it was instituted by the apostles. But as it was instituted by them, according to his doctrine, not as something commanded and necessary, but simply as expedient, he consistently admitted the Church might abolish it. Of course these principles are utterly inconsistent with the doctrine, that there can be no Church without a bishop.

Our author proceeds to quote several of the bishops, and other writers of that period, who in their controversy with the non-conformists maintain the ground, that no one form of Church government is laid down in Scripture as essential or

universally obligatory. Thus Dr. Bridges, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, in his "Defence of the Government Established in the Church of England," 1587, says—if the form of government in the Church "be not a matter of necessity, but such as may be varied," then "there is no reason why we should break the bond of peace, and make such trouble in the Church of God, to reject the government that is, in the nature thereof, as much indifferent, as the solemnizing this or that day the memorial of the Lord's resurrection." p. 319.

In opposition to the same class, Dr. Cooper, Bishop of Lincoln, then of Winchester, says, in his Admonition to the People of England, 1589: "Only this I desire, that they will lay down out of the word of God some just proofs, and a direct commandment, that there should be in all ages and states of the Church of Christ one only form of government." p. 61-63.

Dr. Casin, Dean of Arches, in 1584, in a work, "published by authority," asks: "Are all the Churches of Denmark, Swedeland, Poland, Germany, Rhetia, Vallis Telina, the nine cantons of Switzerland reformed, with their confederates of Geneva, France, of the Low Countries, and of Scotland, in all points, either of substance or of circumstance, disciplined alike? Nay, they neither are, can be, nor yet need so to be; seeing it cannot be proved, that any set and exact form thereof is recommended unto us by the word of God."—*Answer to An Abstract of Certain Acts of Parliament*, 1584, p. 58.

Of course men who held that no one form of government is essential to the Church, could not maintain, and did not pretend, that episcopal ordination was necessary to a valid ministry.

Our author next appeals to the Articles and other Formularies of the Church of England, which were drawn up by the school of theologians, whose writings are quoted above.

The 23d Article: "It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preacher, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's

vineyard." That this article does not teach the necessity of episcopal ordination, our author argues from the obvious import of the works, from the known opinions and practice of the authors of the 39 Articles, and from contemporary and subsequent expositions from sources of authority.

Again, in the 55th Canon of 1604, all the clergy of the Church of England are required to pray for the Church of Scotland, which was then, as now, Presbyterian.

The third argument of our author is from the practice of the Church. From the Reformation until the Restoration of Charles II., Presbyterian ministers were admitted to the cure of souls in the Church of England without re-ordination. At the Restoration a law was passed, requiring episcopal ordination in the case of all who were admitted to preferment in the English Church, and a clause to the same effect was introduced into the preface to the ordination service. This rule, however, as our author urges, proves nothing more than that, in the judgment of those who made it, the ministers of an Episcopal Church should be episcopally ordained. With the same propriety any Presbyterian might insist on Presbyterian ordination for all its own ministers, without thereby unchurching other denominations. Mr. Goode, therefore, insists there was no change of doctrine as to this matter at the time of the Restoration.

As to the previous admission of non-episcopal ministers to office in the Church of England, the evidence is abundant. In 1582 the Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Canterbury granted a license to John Morrison to the effect—"Since you were admitted and ordained to sacred orders and the holy ministry, by the imposition of hands, according to the laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland—we, therefore, approving and ratifying the form of your ordination and preferment—grant to you, by express command of the reverend father in Christ, Lord Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, to celebrate divine offices, to minister the sacraments," &c.—*Strype's Life of Grindal*, Bk. 2. c. 13.

The High Church Bishop Cosin, writing from Paris in 1650, says:—

"Therefore, if at any time a minister so ordained in these French Churches came to incorporate himself in ours, and to

receive a public charge or cure of souls among us in the Church of England, (as I have known some of them to have so done of late, and can instance in *many other* before my time,) *our bishops did not re-ordain him before they admitted him to his charge, as they must have done, if his former ordination here in France had been void.* NOR DID OUR LAWS REQUIRE MORE OF HIM THAN TO DECLARE HIS PUBLIC CONSENT TO THE RELIGION RECEIVED AMONGST US, AND TO SUBSCRIBE THE ARTICLES ESTABLISHED.”—(Letter to Mr. Cordel, in Basire’s “Account of Bishop Cosin,” annexed to his “Funeral Sermon;” and also in Bishop Fleetwood’s *Judgment of the Church of England in the case of Lay Baptism*, 2d ed. Lond. 1712, p. 52.)

And the same testimony is borne by Bishop Fleetwood, who says that this was “certainly her practice [*i. e.*, of our Church] during the reigns of King James and King Charles I., and to the year 1661. We had many ministers from Scotland, from France, and the Low Countries, who were ordained by presbyters only, and not bishops, and they were instituted into benefices with cure. . . . and yet were never re-ordained, but only subscribed the Articles.” (*Judgment of Church of England in case of Lay Baptism*, 1712, 8vo. pt. ii. *Works*, p. 552.)

Mr. Goode follows up these proofs with a series of quotations from the leading English theologians of a later date, all going to show that even those who took the ground of the divine right of episcopacy were far from adopting the principles of the Tractarian school, or from making episcopacy essential to the being of the Church. We think he has succeeded in proving his point, though doubtless many of his authorities might be, as they have in fact been, called into question. We know that Tractarians are famous for their *Catena Patrum*, quoting, as we think most disingenuously, detached sentences from the writings of men in support of principles which they expressly repudiated. We do not believe that our author is chargeable with any such offence. We, however, give the quotations selected from his pages on his authority, as our only object was to show how the evangelical members of the Church of England vindicate her from the anti-Protestant and schismatical principles of the modern Anglo-Catholic school.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Law and the Testimony: By the author of the "Wide, Wide World."
New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854. Large 8vo.

When we first learned from the preface of this large and beautiful volume the history of its preparation, we said to ourselves, here, at last, we have it, and from the gifted pen of one known through "the Wide, Wide World," a systematic synopsis of the inspired teachings of the Scriptures upon all the great subjects which man needs to know—a theology for the people, in the *ipsissima verba* of the Holy Ghost. So far as the work goes, it is done with great carefulness and labour; and is, as such a work could hardly fail to be, extremely valuable, as a contribution to sound doctrine, and to the scriptural exposition of the *loci communes* of theology. But we respectfully submit that the work is deficient on its practical side. The reader seeks in vain for any thorough exposition, or even recognition of the New Testament law of love, grounded on the relations of human brotherhood. The "first and great commandment," according to the divine classification of our Lord's own instructions, has received but a very meager treatment at best, and that almost entirely indirect, as compared with the full and satisfactory collations bearing on the leading topics of doctrinal theology: and the second "commandment, which is like unto it," so far as we can see, is wholly overlooked in the classification, on which the accomplished and earnest authors laboured. There are not even empty pigeon-holes, to show the lack of what has been unjustly cast as a reproach in the teeth of our theology—that its engrossment with doctrine has led to the practical oversight of duty and life. Every intelligent and warm-hearted Christian must feel this to be a great omission in a popular work like this, especially when a concerted and formidable assault has been made on the Church, because its teaching does not apply itself to the wants created by the social evils under which the human race is still groaning, in Christian as well as Pagan lands. We are at the furthest possible remove, as our readers know abundantly, from any sympathy with the popular depreciation of the importance of doctrinal truth. We hold the work in its present form to be valuable; but if we could get the ear of the respected authors, we should leave no argument untried to induce them to go through the Scriptures again, and draw out, and set in order the prac-

tical side of religion; showing how it applies itself to the relief of man, both in his individual and his social capacity; and how it anticipates and supersedes the countless, clamorous reform movements, which a vaunting but insufficient philanthropy would substitute for its benignant and heavenly lessons, and its divine and all-conquering Spirit. It would be difficult to name a work of the kind of greater interest and value than one constructed on the plan of that before us, and done with equal thoroughness and skill, which had for its aim to develope and arrange in the very words of God, the practical duties of true religion under its several dispensations, and especially as set forth under its final and perfect form by our Lord and his apostles. The authors have now given us an exposition of Christianity regarded as a system of doctrine; will they not go on and give us a companion for it, in an exposition of Christianity regarded as a *life*; its duties, individual, social, and political—springing, first, from the universal relation of human brotherhood, and, secondly, from that closer spiritual relationship, which is mediated among believers by the incarnate brotherhood of the Son of God.

The Sources of English Words: so classified and arranged as to facilitate the Expression of Ideas, and assist in Literary Composition. By Peter Mark Roget, author of the "Bridgewater Treatise on Animal and Vegetable Physiology," &c. Revived and edited, with a list of foreign words, defined in English, and other additions. By Barnas Sears, D.D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854. Pp. 468, 12mo.

The author tells us he has been fifty years engaged upon the plan and execution of this book. We can easily believe it. Indeed the wonder is, that any man ever had the courage to undertake, or the endurance to execute it. To make a dictionary, herculean as that task is, is a trifle to this:—"A Collection of the Words of a Language, and of *all the idiomatic combinations* peculiar to it, arranged, not in alphabetical order, but according to the ideas which they express." "The purpose of an ordinary dictionary," in the language of the author, "is, simply to explain the meanings of words; and the problem of which it professes to furnish the solution may be stated thus: the word being given, to find its signification, or the idea it is intended to convey. The object aimed at in the present undertaking, is exactly the converse of this; namely, the idea being given, to find the word or words by which that idea may be most fitly and aptly expressed." This, surely, would seem to be a very mechanical conception of the process of composition; and to make sad havoc of the properties of style, and the lights and shades of thought. And yet one cannot doubt that there are many men, and more boys, who would

be materially aided by the book, just as there are many persons who would walk a great deal better with a wooden leg than with none at all. The device is intended, in other words, we presume, as an adjuvant to the undeveloped strength and resources of the learner, not as a substitute for them—at least in any of the higher and completer processes of composition; or, at best, it can only serve as a *tool* in the hands of genius, to augment the delicacy of the touch, and the perfection of the finish, not as a machine to take the place of human labour, and work out its results by the laws of mechanics. We feel bound, always and everywhere, to protest against the common tendency to regard thought and expression as essentially distinct things, and capable of separate culture; just as the body is different from the soul, or one's dress capable of improvement, apart from his person. Having entered our protest, we are ready to pay, in full, the debt due to the laborious projector and executor, and the learned editor and improver, of the volume before us.

Historical Development of Speculative Philosophy from Kant to Hegel.

From the German of Dr. H. M. Chalybaus, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Kiel. By the Rev. Alfred Edersheim, Free Church, Old Aberdeen. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1854. Pp. 443.

The work, of which this is a translation, was originally a series of Lectures, delivered at Dresden, Germany, as long ago as 1835, and subsequently re-written and extended; and having for its object to expound the genesis of the prevailing systems of Speculative Philosophy, during the teeming period intervening between the time of Kant and that of Hegel. The cultivated audience to whom they were addressed, did not differ essentially, unless we except the national characteristics of the Germans with reference to philosophical studies, from that of thousands among ourselves. It may, therefore, be presumed, that a work which has passed through at least four editions in the original, will meet a corresponding want in its English dress.

The leading characteristics of the author are the thorough knowledge, at once comprehensive and minute, of the systems discussed, and the varying reactions between them; the cool candour and impartiality with which they are handled; and the perspicuity of the exposition, at least to those who have been trained at all to the use of the terminology peculiar to the modern philosophical schools of the Continent. Those who are in search of knowledge on this perplexed subject, without having time to investigate the original sources for themselves,

will receive great assistance from this careful, thorough, and perspicuous analysis.

A Christian Father's Present to his Children. By J. A. James, author of "The Christian Professor," &c., &c. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1853. Pp. 416. 18mo.

Another volume of that sustained style of elevated Christian discussion on high and commanding topics, for which the author is now so well known, and so highly respected. The subjects embraced in the volume are those which weigh upon the heart of every thoughtful parent, and such as every Christian father would desire to lay, in all their solemn weight, upon the conscience of his child. If the style of the author displays an excess of elaboration and stateliness, it is compensated in a high degree by the dignified and serious earnestness of his address.

The Missionary of Kilmany: being a Memoir of Alexander Patterson, with Notices of Robert Edie. By the Rev. John Baillie, author of "Memoir of Rev. W. H. Hewitson." New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854. Pp. 252. 24mo.

The reader familiar with the "Memoir of Dr. Chalmers," will recognize in this delightful but unpretending volume, a record of one whose religious impressions were the first fruits of the ministry of Dr. Chalmers in his settlement at Kilmany. The godly life of this humble, but remarkable man, became a blessing to the parish, to a degree that drew from Dr. Chalmers long afterwards the remark, "It emphatically may be said of him, 'he did what he could;' his labours have been more blessed than those of any man I know." Besides the stirring interest intrinsic in the life of such a man, it possesses a collateral interest in the light it throws upon the character and labours of Chalmers. If the book should awaken the latent sense of responsibility in the private members of our churches, by showing how much the humblest private Christian may accomplish, and then teach those whom it awakens to that responsibility how to win souls to Christ, like Alexander Patterson and Robert Edie, it will be a precious legacy indeed.

