



earnest, and in some places keenly sarcastic, indicating the bitter regrets of a noble spirit, deeply wounded by the corruption of the age. There are not wanting, however, kind and benevolent descriptions from nature, from the external life of men, and from the heart; and as if by way of compensation for those objects of horror, among which he sometimes detains us, these are depicted with the gentlest and most graceful colours:—these passages sound like music in our ears.” The Stuttgart *Litteratur blatt* designates Pollok, as “the Dante of Protestantism.”]

A Report of the Debates in the Presbytery of Philadelphia, at a special meeting held in the city of Philadelphia on the 30th of November, and continued on the 1st and 2d December, 1830. Philad. A. Claxton.

Psalms and Hymns, adapted to Public Worship, and approved by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. States of America. Philadelphia, 1830.

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

APRIL, 1831.

ART. I.—REVIEW OF DR. MATTHEWS' LETTERS.

The Divine Purpose displayed in the works of Providence and Grace; in a series of Twenty Letters, addressed to an Inquiring Mind. By Rev. John Matthews, D. D., [late of] Shepherdstown, Virginia. Lexington, Ky. Printed and published by Thomas T. Skillman, 1828. pp. 221.

WE are so much accustomed to receive our literature from Great Britain, that we are prone to overlook valuable compositions produced in our own country; especially, if they proceed from a section of the United States not famous for book making; or from the pen of an author but little known. Notwithstanding the national pride, in relation to American literature, so disgustingly displayed in some of our popular journals, it is a fact, that our booksellers are in the habit of reprinting British works, on particular subjects, much inferior to writings of home-production, which lie in utter neglect. Perhaps the Eastern States ought to be considered as an exception from this remark; where, from the first settlement of the country, authorship has not been uncommon; and where almost every preacher, at some time in his life, has the pleasure of seeing something of his own composition, in print. Still it may be observed, that

the literature of New England circulates freely only within her own limits. Of the thousands of printed sermons which run the round through her homogeneous population, very few copies find their way into the other states, except where her sons form the mass of the population. This restriction, however, is becoming less and less every year; and as the population of other parts of the country acquire a taste for reading, the literary wares of our Eastern brethren get into wider circulation, and find a readier sale. But leaving out of the account large towns and cities, there is but a small share of literature in the greater part of our country. There are scattered every where through the land well informed and well educated men; but very few of them ever think of writing any thing more than a paragraph for the newspapers; or, at most, a fourth of July speech. Even in the oldest of the United States, celebrated for men of talents and extraordinary political and legal attainments, all the writings of a theological kind which have ever issued from the press, might, I presume, be easily compressed within the narrow limits of a common portmanteau. When, therefore, any thing in the shape of a religious book proceeds from that quarter, it should receive particular attention. It has on this account, as well on others, seemed to us proper to bring more conspicuously before the public the little volume, the title of which stands at the head of this article. These Letters, we have understood, were originally published in the *Evangelical and Literary Magazine of Virginia*. They were afterwards collected and published in a small volume at the Franklin press, Richmond; and in the following year, were reprinted at Lexington, Kentucky, with the author's name, which did not appear in the Richmond edition. This then may be reckoned the third edition of these Letters; but still they are almost entirely unknown to the reading population of the Middle and Northern States. Since this work was published, the worthy author has been appointed Professor of Theology in a Seminary in Indiana, and has entered on the duties of his office.

The object of the writer seems to have been, to exhibit, in a clear and familiar way, some of the strongest arguments for the scriptural doctrine of the universality and particularity of the Divine decrees; and to remove the prejudices, and answer the objections of many serious well meaning people, who are shocked at the mere mention of this subject, even if it be couched in the very language of inspiration. There are persons of some mental cultivation, and of a serious and devout character, who

cannot bear to read, or hear read, the eighth and ninth chapters of the Epistle to the Romans; or the first chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians.

The real opinions of serious people cannot, with any certainty, be judged of by the doctrinal standards of the denominations to which they have attached themselves. This is especially the case in the South and West, where many people have been brought up without religious education of any kind whatever. Now, where such persons become serious inquirers, or hopeful converts, they join any religious society among whom they happen to have received their serious impressions: or, if there be different denominations mingled together, they commonly attach themselves to one or the other, not from any distinct knowledge of the system of doctrines which they hold, but from a preference to their order of worship and mode of preaching; or, from an opinion, that the members of one society are more intelligent, consistent, or pious than those of another. Persons thus introduced into a particular church, are often much perplexed and offended at some of the doctrines which they sometimes hear preached, and which they find in the creed of the society to which they have attached themselves: particularly, they are apt to stumble at the doctrine of *predestination* and *election*, as held by Calvinists. It is not uncommon to find serious people, whose feelings are so affected with the mere contemplation of these doctrines, that they are thrown into deep distress, and even agony, whenever they occur to their minds; and while they dare not totally reject them, as many do, they are altogether reluctant to receive them, and are afraid of the light by which they are shown to be a part of Divine revelation. We have known many estimable persons to continue in this state of conflict, between their judgment and their feelings, many years; who could never, with the least composure or patience, hear any thing said on these points. Not that they were convinced that these doctrines are not revealed in the word of God, but because, through some prejudice or unhappy association, they always excited in them feelings of horror and distress. To meet cases of this sort, the Letters under review, seem to have been written: and, in our opinion, they are the production of no ordinary mind. In the discussion, not only is all harsh and all technical language avoided, but there is a sparing use even of scriptural phrases, until the author has proceeded to some extent, in developing the true nature of the doctrine.

The plan adopted is, first, to depreciate "*the pernicious effects of party spirit in the church*"—next, to show "*the importance of truth*"—then "*the influence of prejudice*"—*the true doctrine of divine decrees, and of divine providence—the doctrine of a particular providence, extending to all events—that free agency is not suspended, or violated by the divine purpose—proof of the extent of the divine plan from the promises and prophecies—the purposes of God and moral agency consistent—but incomprehensible—the nature of moral government—salvation by grace—all favours bestowed according to God's purpose, good pleasure or foreordination. Therefore, it depends on the will of God, who shall be saved.—The means of salvation suited to each individual, included in the divine purpose—providence subservient to the purposes of grace—great events and small cannot be separated, in the plan of the Almighty—the former are made up of the latter.—Man, as far as he has foresight and means, is a predestinarian in all his own important schemes—the architect, the farmer, &c. determine on ends, and elect means to accomplish them.*

The eighteenth and nineteenth Letters are on the subject of "*the final perseverance of Christians;*" and in the last, the author undertakes to show, *that these views are adapted to excite devotion;* and, consequently, cannot be unfriendly to piety and morality.

It will be seen by the above syllabus, that in this little volume, very interesting and important subjects are brought into discussion: and it is one recommendation of this work, that a doctrine, most commonly handled in a forbidding and polemical style, is here treated with great calmness, and brought down to common apprehension, by means of familiar and appropriate illustrations. There is not a harsh or censorious word in the whole book. It may, therefore, be recommended as a specimen of mildness in the discussion of a subject, which commonly produces warmth and hard speeches. It would afford us real pleasure, to see a treatise on the other side, equally characterized by the spirit of candour and kindness: and whatever cause may be promoted by fierce controversy and denunciatory declamation, we are sure, that the cause of truth gains nothing by such weapons. The pool must be calm in order to be transparent; and truth is rendered invisible, or undistinguishable, in the perturbed waters of wrathful controversy. The Christian warrior should ever remember,

that the weapons of his warfare, though 'mighty to the pulling down of strong holds,' are not *carnal* but *spiritual*. Though he must *contend* for the faith, he may not *strive*. All 'vain janglings' and 'logomachies' are strictly forbidden; and all discussions that tend rather 'to engender strifes, than godly edifying.' We should, therefore, be desirous of giving currency to this unpretending book, on account of the Christian spirit which pervades it throughout. No one, however he may differ from the author, need be afraid of having his feelings wounded by the perusal of these pages. But this is not the only recommendation of this little volume. It contains much sound, and we may say, *profound* reasoning: or, to express ourselves more correctly, the result of profound reasoning; for there is no long and elaborate chain of ratiocination—here every thing is simple, and remarkably adapted to the capacity of common readers; but no man could render such a subject familiar, and easily intelligible, who had not deeply and maturely pondered it, and viewed it in all its important aspects, and especially, in its practical bearings.

The fact cannot be denied, that the doctrine of absolute decrees; or the divine purposes; or predestination; or election; or by whatever terms it may be expressed, is viewed by most men—and not the unlearned only—as an absurd and unreasonable doctrine. From the days of Lucian, it has been set up to ridicule, and scurrilous abuse; and they who hold it, are considered and represented, by men of the highest order of intellect and greatest learning, as denying human accountability; or as grossly inconsistent, in holding that all things are decreed in the eternal purpose, and yet that men are free in their actions. Seldom, however, are we favoured with any calm, impartial reasoning on this subject. It is treated, as if the doctrine was self-evidently false and absurd; and as if there was no need of argument; since every man's reason must teach him, that he cannot be justly accountable for actions, which by no possibility he could avoid, as they were from all eternity, absolutely decreed.

This strong prejudice against the doctrine of predestination, is not confined to the men of the world; it has entered the church; and by a large majority of those who have assumed the office of interpreters of the mind of God, it is rejected with abhorrence; and by many of them scouted as not only absurd, but subversive of all morality. And, which is somewhat surprising, ministers of churches, which formerly held this doc-

trine firmly, and expressed it strongly in their formulas of faith, do strenuously oppose it; and contrary to all common usage of words, and correct rules of interpretation, pretend, that it is not contained in their articles of religion. If a thousand impartial, intelligent men could be brought to peruse the seventeenth article of the Church of England, and of the American Episcopal Church, whatever might be their own belief, they would, as we suppose, unanimously declare, that the doctrine of predestination, as held by Calvinists, is clearly and strongly expressed in that article: and the whole history of the reformation in the Church of England, goes to prove, that this interpretation is correct; for in the early days of that reformed church, all her distinguished ministers were predestinarians; just as much as were the ministers of Geneva. No stronger evidence of this is needed, than the fact, that the Institutes of John Calvin—so grossly calumniated by many leading men of that church now—was the text book, enjoined by authority in both the universities. But our object in the remarks which we are about to make, is, to inquire, whether there is any foundation, in truth and reason, for the general aversion to this doctrine.

It cannot be doubted that the language of Scripture, in many places, is favourable to the doctrine. All things seem to be there ascribed to the counsel and will of God; and the minutest events as well as the greatest, to be under the government of his providence. Things, to our apprehension, most casual and more trivial, are specified, as under the direction of God: for what is more casual than the drawing of a lot, but the whole disposal thereof is of the Lord; and what seems more trivial than the falling of the hairs of your head, and yet this event, apparently unimportant as it is, never takes place, without our Heavenly Father.

But while the Bible, throughout, ascribes the occurrence of all events, of every kind, to the will of God; yet, it as uniformly represents man as a free, accountable agent; yea, it represents him as acting most wickedly, in those very transactions which are most expressly declared to be determined by the counsel of God. It would seem from this, that the inspired writers perceived no inconsistency between a purpose of God, that a certain event should occur, and that it should be brought about by the free and accountable agency of man. And it is believed, also, that men of sound minds, who have never heard of any objections to this doctrine, are not apt to be perplexed

with any apparent inconsistency between these two things. And, we are persuaded, that were it not for the ambiguity of certain words, and the artful sophistry with which truth and error are confounded by those who oppose the doctrine, very few persons would experience any difficulty on this subject. If a man of plain sense, should be informed by prophecy, that he would certainly kill a fellow creature the next day or year, and that in perpetrating this act he would be actuated by malice, it would never be likely to enter his mind, that he should not be guilty of any crime, because the action was certain before it was committed. But if you change the terms, and say, that he would be under a *necessity* to perform this act; that it being absolutely certain, he could not possibly avoid it, immediately the subject becomes perplexed, and involved in difficulty; for every man of common sense, feels that he cannot justly be accountable for what he could not possibly avoid; and that for what he does from absolute necessity he cannot, in the nature of things, be culpable. Here, the whole difficulty is produced by the use of ambiguous and improper terms. While nothing was presented to the mind, but the certainty of the event, coupled with voluntary action, no relief from responsibility was felt: but the moment we speak of the act as produced by necessity, and as being unavoidable, the judgment respecting its nature is changed. These terms include the idea of a compulsory power acting upon us, not only without, but in opposition to our own will. A necessary event is one which cannot be voluntary or free; for if it were spontaneous, it could not be necessary; these two things being diametrically opposite. So an unavoidable action is one which takes place against our wishes and will. But a voluntary action may be as certain as any other; and by one who knows futurity, may be as certainly predicted. Even a man may often be certain beforehand, how a voluntary agent will act in given circumstances, provided he knows the moral character of the agent. As if a being actuated by no other feeling towards another but malice, should be placed in such circumstances, that he has the choice of performing a benevolent action towards that individual or omitting it, he will most certainly neglect to do it, or, if he may with impunity, injure such an one, or do him good, he will most certainly choose the former; yet is such a malignant agent perfectly free, and perfectly accountable. These things are agreeable to the common feelings of all men, and depend on no metaphysical niceties. And there can be no doubt, but that a

large share of the difficulty which perplexes honest minds, in the contemplation of the Divine purpose, which fixes the certainty of events, arises from the confounding of things totally distinct, by the use of ambiguous terms.

But still it may be thought by some, that as to the point of man's responsibility, there is no difference between certainty and necessity; that if it be certainly fixed, that a man shall act in a particular way, it is impossible that he should do otherwise, and therefore he cannot be free. To which we would reply, that the whole difficulty supposed to exist, arises, as before, from confounding ideas which should be kept distinct. There is no manner of inconsistency between the certainty of a future action and liberty in the performance of that action. A voluntary action may be as certainly future as any other; and spontaneity is the only liberty which can be predicated of the will itself. If an action is voluntary, it is free; and the idea of a necessary volition is absurd and contradictory. When, however, we speak in accordance with common sense and experience, of liberty, as being essential to moral agency, we always mean liberty *of action*; that is, the liberty of doing *what we will*. Now, if certainty were inconsistent with freedom, it would seem, that uncertainty was that which constituted the liberty of an action; but it is evident, that an action produced by compulsion may be as uncertain as a voluntary act; and, as was before stated, an action may be perfectly voluntary and free, and yet certain. If we know what we will do the next hour, surely this knowledge of the certainty of our own act does not alter the nature. If, when considered as uncertain and unknown, it is free and voluntary, if the same action and produced by the same cause is viewed as certain or as known, it cannot affect the nature of the action, as to its moral quality. And if it were the fact, that the certainty of the existence of a future act destroyed its freedom, then the probability of its occurrence would have the same effect, so far as the event was probable. And according to this doctrine, every human art, or nearly every one, would be affected as to its liberty; for what action ever occurs, of the existence of which before hand, there may not be a probability in the view of some one? But why should uncertainty render an action free and moral, which would not otherwise be so? Surely this is no self-evident truth. So far from it, that in thinking of the morality of an act, or responsibility of an agent, we never take this circumstance into view, whether before it happened it was

certain or uncertain. And if certainty affected the character of an act before it occurred, why should not absolute certainty after the event, have the same effect? When an act is performed, its certainty is so great, that no power can render it uncertain; and no good reason can be assigned, why this should not destroy its freedom, as much as previous certainty. But the truth is, that the moral character of an action is not in the least affected by its previous certainty or uncertainty, but is determined by its own nature;—its conformity or nonconformity, to a moral rule.

Let us now return to the consideration of the decrees of God, or the Divine purpose. And the whole subject may be reduced to these two points. First, did God, when about to give existence to the universe, comprehend in his infinite mind a perfect plan of his own work? And secondly, is the existing state of things accordant with the original plan? If both these questions are answered in the affirmative, then the dispute about the decrees of God is ended; for, by his decrees nothing else is intended, than that perfect plan which originally existed in the mind of the Great Architect: and if creation and providence answer to this plan, then is it true, that God has “fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass.” If any objection is felt to the word “decrees,” it may be changed for another less exceptionable; especially, as it is not the term usually employed in the Scriptures to express this idea; and also, because it is in relation to this subject, used in a sense considerably different from its common acceptation. The phrase “Divine purpose,” employed by an author, is both scriptural and appropriate, and liable to no objection which occurs to us. It is a principle with us, not to contend about words, where there is an agreement in ideas. Let us then see what exception can be taken to the first position laid down above, viz. that God when about to produce the universe of creatures, had in his mind a perfect plan of the whole work. This, of course, would include every creature and every action and event, with the nature which should be possessed by each, and the causes and qualities of every action. If the Supreme Creator formed any plan of operation, this plan would certainly include every thing which should ever come to pass, unless there are some things which are of such a nature, that they could not be embraced in any pre-conceived plan. This brings us up to the very gist of the objection. It is alleged, that the free doctrines of moral agents could not possibly form any part of such a plan, because, if

fixed by a purpose or plan, they could not come to pass as free actions, 'and depending for their existence on the free will' of voluntary agents, could not, in the nature of things, be fore-known. This is the foundation of two distinct theories; both of which must be fairly brought into view, and subject to the examination of reason. And we begin with that one which is most remote from what we believe to be the true theory. According to this, God neither proposed any thing respecting the free actions of moral agents, nor was it possible for him to know what they would be. As this theory has, at first view, the appearance of denying the omniscience of God, its advocates have taken great pains to obviate this objection. They allege, that as it is no disparagement of God's omnipotence, to say, that there are impossible things which his power cannot accomplish; so in regard to omniscience, there may be things which cannot be known, not from any imperfection in this attribute, but because, from their uncertain nature, they are not capable of being known. There is the appearance of plausibility in this representation, but it is only an appearance, for in regard to the performance of impossibilities, the thing is absurd and inconceivable, as for example, to cause a thing to be and not be at the same time. There is here really no object on which power can be executed. But the case is far different in regard to the knowledge of future contingencies. The defect of a knowledge of these argues a real imperfection in this attribute. We cannot conceive of a being possessing an increase of perfection by a power to do that which is impossible; for, as was said before, the thing is wholly inconceivable. But we can conceive of knowledge which extends to free actions of moral agents. Man himself possesses some degree of this knowledge; and we cannot attribute omniscience to the Deity without including in our idea, the perfection of this knowledge. To say that there are things which from their nature cannot be known, is only to say, in other words, that there is no omniscient being in the universe; for if there were, there would be nothing unknown to him. Moreover, it should be well considered before this theory is adopted, that this ignorance must relate to all actions of this class; for if one can be certainly known as future, without destroying its freedom, so may all. And it matters not by what means the knowledge of future contingencies may be acquired, it must equally, in all cases, affect the freedom and morality of the actions known. So that, if the Governor of the universe, from observing the conduct of crea-

tures in time past, should be able with certainty, to foreknow what they will do in future, such knowledge would be incompatible with the freedom of actions thus known. And, as we observed, in another part of this review, if certain knowledge is thus inconsistent with moral agency, no reason can be assigned, why probable knowledge, in proportion to its approximation to certainty, should not have the same effect.

But what idea does it afford of the government of the universe, to suppose, that the Supreme Ruler is totally ignorant of all the future volitions of his creatures, and of all the consequences of these volitions? Dark, indeed, are the prospects of the wise Director of all things, on this theory; and miserable must be the suspense and anxiety of him who sits at the helm, if every future voluntary act, of so many millions of free agents, is utterly unknown to him. No provision can be made beforehand to meet any emergency. The universe must be governed by sudden shifts and expedients, adopted as the exigence may demand. And on this principle, general laws, for the government of the world, would be altogether unwise, because they could not be so arranged as to meet the cases which might, in the course of events, occur; these being entirely unknown. Such a theory, if pursued, must lead inevitably to atheism. Nothing more is necessary to prove the falsity of this theory, than to trace it to consequences so absurd and dreadful.

The theory which takes from the Deity all certain knowledge of future free actions of moral agents, is not only repugnant to right reason, but contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture. According to it, the fall of our first parents was an event unknown to God before it actually took place; and no provision, therefore, could have been made to meet the exigency. No plan of recovery could have been devised. All which, is expressly contradictory to numerous plain declarations of the Bible. That evidence, however, which demonstrably proves the falsity of this theory, is, the long chain of prophecy, which foretells innumerable events which are dependent on the free will of man. Many of these predictions have been exactly fulfilled, by men who knew not God; and generally, by agents who had no idea that they were executing any divine purpose, or accomplishing any divine prediction; and the responsibility of these agents, and the morality of their actions were not in the least affected by the circumstance that they were fore-ordained; and foretold by the prophets. The illustration of this position from the Scriptures, is full, and

could easily be adduced; but this has often been done by others, and is inconsistent with the narrow limits allotted to this review. We would simply refer the reader to the history of Adam, of Pharaoh, of Joseph, of Saul, of Nebuchadnezzar, of Cyrus, of Judas who betrayed Christ, and of the Jews who crucified him. If the Scriptures contain one word of truth, it is most certain that the free actions of moral agents are foreknown.

To evade the horrible consequences of denying foreknowledge to the Deity, as being subversive of his absolute and infinite perfection, some speculative men have invented a theory, if possible, more absurd; and that is, that God has the perfection of omniscience, but it is not necessary that he should exercise it, in regard to all events. They suppose, that he could know all the volitions of free agents which ever will exist, but that he does not choose to know them, before they come to pass, lest he should infringe the liberty of the creature. The former theory attributed the ignorance of the Deity of future contingencies to the necessity of nature; this ascribes it to his will. But according to both, actual knowledge of such events is not possessed; and the only difference in regard to the divine attributes which exists between them, is, that according to the first, God is supposed to be necessarily imperfect, while by the second, he is voluntarily imperfect. But as it relates to the difficulty, or rather impossibility, of governing the world with wisdom, they are precisely the same. God remains ignorant of every free action, of every moral agent, until it actually takes place. To whom the world is indebted for this extraordinary hypothesis, we cannot tell, but the chevalier Ramsay was the first writer, known to us, who published it. And it ought to have died with him; but to the grief of many of his brethren, and the surprise of all reflecting theologians, it has found an advocate in the learned Dr. Adam Clarke. But, there is so little danger of its being adopted by any considerate, sensible man, that we may safely leave it to sink by its own absurdity. We are not a little astonished, to find such a man as Dr. Beattie, in his *Elements of Moral Science*, seriously proposing the first mentioned theory, as a relief from the inevitable consequences of the doctrine of certain foreknowledge. It seems, however, to show how heavily these consequences press upon the Arminian scheme.

We now come to the consideration of the second general theory, mentioned above. According to this, God, it is ad-

mitted, does certainly and perfectly foreknow whatever shall come to pass, without any exceptions; but in regard to the free actions of moral agents, he has formed no purpose, nor made any decree, but leaves them fully to the freedom of their own will. And to support this theory, much pains is taken to prove that mere knowledge cannot affect the freedom or morality of the actions which are its objects: and it is, moreover, attempted to be shown, that a purpose, that an action shall exist, in future, must render it necessary. Now, in regard to the first position, we not only admit, but strongly maintain, that the foreknowledge of the certain existence of an action, does not render it a necessary action: if the agent be free, the action is free, whether we suppose it to be foreknown or not. And we agree also, that it is not the knowledge of a future action which renders it certain: it must, in the order of things, be certain before it can be foreknown. But if an event be certainly foreknown, it must have a certain future existence, and of that certain future existence, there must be some reason or cause. Now that cause is either the purpose of God that it should be so, or it is something else. If the former, then it is decreed; but if it be some other cause, whatever that may be, as it fixes the certainty of the event, it must be as inconsistent with freedom, as if the same effect was produced by the divine purpose. If another cause may render an event so certain that it may be infallibly foreknown, without any interference with moral agency, then the purpose of God may render an event certain, without any violation of the freedom of the creature. But if it be alleged, that there is no other cause of the event necessary to be supposed, than the free agency of the creature; we reply that, in one sense, this is true. It is true, as it relates to the proximate efficient cause. But if God knows how such a creature will act, there must be some foundation on which this knowledge rests; that is, there must be some reason why the free creature should act as it is foreseen that he will act. For as every free agent has the liberty of acting, or not; or of performing a different action from the one which he eventually performs, if there existed no reason why the one took place and not the other, all knowledge of the action before it occurs is necessarily excluded. It would be to suppose knowledge, without the least foundation for that knowledge in the object. In answer, it is sometimes alleged, that God's knowledge is not like ours; nor can we judge of his manner of knowing things, by what takes place among creatures. While we readily ad-

mit the general truth, we deny that it can have any application to the case before us. God cannot know that something exists where there is nothing. God cannot know that an event is certainly future, where there is, by the hypothesis, nothing seen by him which can be the cause of this certainty; or, in other words, God cannot see that an effect, yet future, will certainly be produced, if he does not know any cause of its existence. This mode of knowing things is indeed incomprehensible, but it does not involve a palpable impossibility.

But waving this discussion, let us assume only what is granted, that if a future event be infallibly foreknown, it must be infallibly certain; as certain as any decree can make it. In this point the two theories are perfectly the same. The event is as certain as it can be; for it will be perceived by all, and must be admitted, that it is as impossible, that an event foreseen by omniscience, can fail, as that a decreed event can fail. If mere certainty of existence, therefore, is inconsistent with free agency, the theory of foreknowledge is as subversive of freedom as a fixed purpose. But it is alleged, that the purpose influences the action, and therefore, there is a wide difference. We answer, that if the divine purpose—as we maintain—has no other influence on the action than to render it certain, there is no difference at all; for on some account, and for some reason, it matters not what—the thing is as certain as it can be, on the theory of mere foreknowledge. But it will be asked, how can an event be rendered absolutely certain, by a divine purpose, without rendering that event necessary? If an end is purposed and rendered certain, the means must also be put into operation, and made as certain as the end; therefore, he who purposes that a thing shall be, must be its proper and efficient cause; for how can he otherwise give effect to his own purposes, than by putting into operation such causes as will produce the predetermined end? And therefore that being who decrees an event, and provides for its accomplishment, must, in all reason, be considered the proper cause of it, which when the object of the decree is a sinful action, must lead to the blasphemous consequence, that God is the author of sin. A mere purpose without efficient action cannot possibly secure the certainty of any event, therefore a decree which shall secure the certain futuration of any thing, must be followed by an actual agency, which will be sufficient to accomplish the end. And if God decrees that an intelligent, voluntary being shall certainly perform an action, it is necessary to suppose, that directly or indirectly,

he should exert a power to influence the actions of this voluntary agent, in which case, the being thus influenced by the controlling power of another, cannot be free and accountable.

Here we have the whole strength of the objection to absolute decrees. This is the gordian knot, which it has been found so difficult to unloose, that most men are disposed to cut it. And it must be confessed, that there seems to be something incomprehensible to us, in this thing; and perhaps, the common method of acknowledging, that human minds cannot reconcile the fixed purposes of God with the free agency of man is best: yet it would be easy to show, that the difficulty is fully as great, and even greater on the Arminian, than the Calvinistic theory. The former, indeed, talks of conditional decrees or purposes of God, which are mere hypothetical things; a purpose to do this or that, if some other event should occur; but if this should not occur, to act differently. This, indeed, is to make the great omniscient God like ourselves. It is to represent him as dependent for his eternal purposes on creatures not in existence. But really, this theory can afford no manner of relief: for, as God, from the beginning, knew what the actions of free creatures would be, his own purposes were as much fixed as they could be, on any other hypothesis. If a ruler determines to punish his subjects if they commit certain crimes, and is at the same time assured that they will commit them, his purpose to punish is as certainly fixed as it can be.

But before we dismiss this subject as incomprehensible, let us examine whether there is not a theory on which the divine foreknowledge and purpose, may be reconciled, and on which Calvinists and Arminians may become united in their views.

Whatever plan the Almighty determined on from the beginning, or whatever purpose he formed in regard to the universe of creatures, all was done under the guidance of infinite wisdom. That God decreed, in wisdom, every thing which he did purpose, is admitted by all. To form a plan for the creation, arrangement, and government of the world, supposes that out of all possible plans, that was selected which seemed best to infinite wisdom. In the order of nature, therefore, the whole congeries of creatures and events, which compose the universe, must have been present to the Divine Mind before his purpose was formed; or to speak more correctly, all creatures, with all their relations and actions were in the view of God's infinite understanding, when he decreed their future existence; and the whole was viewed as one connected plan or system, and was

contemplated at one comprehensive glance, and all future existence was decreed by one single act. Now, whatever the nature and qualities of acts was viewed to be in the divine purpose, the same must they be in the event. If God determined that free agents should exist, and that their actions should be free, when this part of his plan is executed, free agents with their free actions will exist; and the decree, so far from being inconsistent with their freedom, is the very thing which renders it certain that such free agents and voluntary acts will ever have a being. Could not God from all eternity decree, that creatures endued with liberty should exist, and if this was his purpose, will not the event answer to it? And if such creatures exist and act, will not their actions be free? If, then, the plan of the universe adopted by infinite wisdom, included the existence of free moral agents and their free actions, such creatures and such actions must come into being, in consequence of the decree; human liberty, therefore, instead of being destroyed by the decree, is established upon an immutable basis. If God is omnipotent and wills the existence of a free agent, the next moment, such a being would instantly start into being, if he wills, that such a creature should exist six thousand years after the creation, the effect will as certainly follow, and will as exactly answer to the purpose of the divine mind. It would be very strange, indeed, if the Almighty could not effectually will the existence of a free, voluntary act: to suppose the contrary, would be to deny his omnipotence. Now, if he can decree the future existence of such an act, it will surely come to pass, agreeably to the design; that is, it will exist as a free act. Now whether we can tell how God can secure the freedom of such an act or not, we ought not to hesitate to believe that a being of infinite perfection can accomplish it. To say, then, that the decree by which the certainty of a free act is secured, violates free agency, seems very much like a contradiction in terms.

The objection, that the doctrine of absolute decrees necessarily makes God the author of sin, derives its whole force from overlooking the important fact, that there may be created agents, who are endued with the power of originating action by the very constitution of their nature; and who, although dependent on God for their existence and faculties, yet being supported in being, are capable of acting, and of acting freely. If such creatures did not exist, there neither would be, nor could be, any such thing as moral agency; and consequently, no such thing as praise or blame. But if God accomplishes his pur-

poses by crediting such agents, who are free and voluntary in their actions, and capable of doing right or wrong, it is not sound logic to infer, that the moral qualities of their actions must be ascribed to him. They are answerable for their own acts. If such active, accountable beings can be created—and why should we doubt it—their actions ought not to be ascribed to the Creator.

But still the difficulty occurs, that if God positively decrees that such creatures shall perform certain acts; to execute this purpose, it is necessary to suppose that he exerts an influence mediately or immediately, on their minds: and if a superior being causes one dependent on him, to perform certain actions, the latter, it is thought, cannot be accountable for such acts.

There are two methods of answering this objection. We first admit the fact, that God does exert his power in the production of all the acts of creatures, by such a concurrence with them, that the physical part of the act is the effect of his agency, but so far as it is of a sinful nature it is their own. Thus it is acknowledged, that God is the efficient cause of our free acts, considered merely as acts of intellect or will; but at the same time the act of the creature determines the moral quality of the thing done. This is the distinction invented by the schoolmen, and adopted by most Calvinistic theologians of former days; and which they attempt to illustrate by various comparisons. It is, however, a distinction not easily understood; and has never been so explained as to remove the darkness and perplexity in which the subject is involved. For, if God is the efficient cause of the action, as it is an act of the mind, and if he determines its physical nature, it does not appear that any thing is left for the creature, but to yield: the physical part of an act is the substance of that act, and its morality is the relation which it bears to something else. Now, although we may conceive of an act, as purely a mental energy, without taking into view any of its relations; yet when such an act is produced in the mind of man, who stands in certain relations to God and his fellow creatures; and is under a moral law, which measures and estimates the moral character of every act, it does not appear, how we can admit that it is as to its substance the effect of divine power, and yet as to its morality the act of the creature.

Others come up directly to the difficulty, and maintain that God is the author of sin, or the efficient cause of sin, but that there is nothing of the nature of sin in him. They allege, that

there is no necessity that what God makes should be like himself; or, that he should possess the qualities and attributes of his creatures. God creates matter, but he is not therefore material. He creates poisonous reptiles, but who would think of inferring, that, on this account, he possesses properties answering to this? So God may be the author of sinful acts in creatures, and not be, in any degree, a partaker of sin. It is, moreover, alleged, that we are so constituted, that we judge of the morality of actions without any reference to their cause. If a man is conscious of a voluntary exercise, forbidden by the law of God, conscience immediately pronounces sentence of condemnation, without the least regard to the cause. We feel guilty on account of a wrong choice, however that volition may have been produced in our minds. Free agency, according to this theory, consists in voluntary action alone; and for all such exercises we are accountable. There is, therefore, no inconsistency whatever, between the divine purpose and free agency. This theory has many advocates in our country, and is considered an improvement of the old Calvinistic theology. But it is repugnant to common sense; and the arguments employed in its defence are sophistical.

For, in the first place, reasoning from the effect to the cause is one of the most clear and logical methods of demonstrating truth which we possess, and if it were abolished, almost all useful reasoning would be at end. By the works of creation we prove conclusively, that God is wise and powerful, and benevolent, because we can see manifest indications of these attributes in the creatures. We do not, indeed, conclude from such reasoning, that there is a perfect resemblance in the thing made to the Creator, which is impossible; but we legitimately infer from effects which could not be such as they are, unless their cause was powerful, wise, and benevolent. There must be in the cause that which will account for the effect: and when a free intelligent agent is the cause, his character may be known as far as his design in the effect is manifest. If these principles are not admitted, and it should be denied, that the nature of a cause can be determined from its effects, then it would follow, that an evil being may have created this world; and that a superior excellence to any that existed in the cause, might be in an effect. Now, if the evidence of goodness in the constitution of creatures proves that God is good; if he is the author of sin the conclusion would be as legitimate, that evil exists in him, which is blasphemous. But it is said, that

though sin in itself be evil, yet God in producing it has a good end in view; and then we establish the principle, that it is consistent with infinite purity to do evil, that good may come; and if this is consistent with divine perfection, it is also with human virtue; but such a principle is severely reprehended in the word of God.

By some writers, the difficulty is got over by what may properly be called a metaphysical quibble. They reason thus. There can be no sin before the first sin; he, therefore, who is the author of sin, cannot be sinful, for that would be to suppose that sin existed before it did exist; that is, sin before the first sin. Now, if such sophistry deserves an answer, it may be briefly given thus. When we speak of God as the author of sin, the meaning is, sin in the creature; and when of the first sin, we mean the first sin of man; but if it be true that God, by an immediate agency produces this sin in man, the consequence would be, that moral evil in man or any other creature, is not the only or the first evil of that kind, since it must have had a previous existence in the cause of these sinful acts of the creature. A parallel case is this: God is the author of holiness, but if holiness be produced by God, then it did not exist before it was produced, and thus we come to the impious conclusion, that because God is the author of holiness, there is no holiness in him, otherwise, holiness existed before it was produced, that is, before it did exist.

Again, if God produces by his Almighty power, all the evil thoughts and purposes which arise in the mind of the sinner, they are not properly the acts of the sinner, but of him who produces them. It is, indeed, said, that God acts upon us to cause us to act, and that the act is properly our own, if it be our feeling or volition, and it matters not how it was produced. The judgment of conscience is, that the man is guilty of whatever he wills improperly, however that will may have been produced in him. As was mentioned before, they insist that we have nothing to do with the cause of an act, in judging of its moral nature. If, on our part, it is voluntary, that is enough; the sin is as much our own as it can be; and the appeal is made to our own consciousness of what passes within our minds, when we pass sentence of condemnation upon ourselves. Now, there is some truth in this statement, which gives plausibility to the whole. It is true, that when we are conscious of an evil purpose, we immediately experience a sense of guilt, without any inquiry after the origin of this volition; but why is this, but

because we take it for granted, in all our judgments respecting our sins, that they are our own acts. And if men could be convinced that God was the author of all their sinful acts, they would cease to feel that they were accountable for them. Men, commonly, do not believe in their own existence more fairly, than in the fact, that their thoughts are the actions of their own souls, and that they originate in the activity of their own minds. We do not deny the power of God to produce what he pleases in any mind, but if he produces evil, the creature is excusable, for who can resist omnipotence? Who can think any thing else, upon this hypothesis, than what is created within him? But an attempt has been made to show that God may produce sin in the creature, and the acts remain sinful, because it is admitted, by all who believe in the operations of grace, that he works in all his people, both "to will and to do." If then the holy exercises of the pious are produced by the agency of God, and yet these are holy exercises, and are felt by the saints to be their own; then there is no reason why he may not work in sinners all their sinful exercises, and yet they be their own sins. To which we would reply, that sin is sin by whomsoever produced. As was said before, we do not deny the power of God to produce evil in the sinner's mind; but we deny that it is consistent with his holiness. The question now, however, is, whether the sinner can be justly punished for evil thoughts wrought in his heart by Almighty power. And we are willing to admit the parallel brought for illustration, and when extended to its proper length, will overthrow the cause which it was brought to support. When God works in his people to make them willing to love and obey him, is the praise of their exercises of grace due to them? Do they not universally ascribe all the praise to God, saying, not unto us, &c. They feel that if such acts are rewarded, it is a mere matter of favour. Look, then, at the other side of the parallel. When God works in the hearts of the wicked to do evil, the blame is not to be ascribed to them, but to him who is the true author of their exercises; and they deserve no punishment for such acts, unless God should choose, gratuitously or arbitrarily, to inflict punishment on them.

And if God can create an active being, I mean one essentially active, capable of originating action, why have recourse to other efficient causes to account for the existence of the free actions of such creatures? Some writers assume it as a maxim, that no creature can act without the physical efficient energy of God co-operating, to give him the ability to put forth the

act; or as it is more simply expressed by the abettors of the last mentioned theory, no creature can act but as it is acted on. But we deny that this is a self-evident truth; and we are sure it never can be demonstrated. It is freely admitted that every creature is continually sustained in existence, and in the possession of its faculties by the power of God; but if that creature be in its very essence active, it is evident from the premises, that nothing more is necessary to cause it to act, than to continue its existence. According to our theory, therefore, the efficient cause of free actions is to be looked for no where else but in the free agents themselves; except in special cases where God may choose, for wise and good ends, supernaturally to operate on their minds. And if there be no necessity of introducing other causes of free and voluntary actions, why should we encumber the subject more deeply with the doctrine of divine efficiency or concurrence in the performance of sinful acts. No distinctions, however nice, will ever be sufficient to guard that system from the shocking consequence of making God the author of sin.

But it is feared, that the theory which we defend will make the creature independent of the Creator; there is no reason for apprehension, as we not only admit that the power of God is, every moment, necessary for the sustenance of the creature, but we maintain that every action of the creature will be accordant with his eternal purpose. To obtain a distinct view of this subject, it is requisite to recall to mind a few undeniable principles. The first is, that in the production of creatures, God acts wisely, or as a being of intelligence; like finite beings, God has no need to deliberate, compare, and reason, but he perceives instinctively all possible things with all their possible relations. In wisdom he made all things that are made. Every minute part of every animal and of every vegetable was wisely ordained to occupy its appropriate place, and suited to answer its appropriate end. The whole system, in the various relations of one part to another, was arranged and adjusted in infinite wisdom. This supposes that the whole existed in idea before the infinite mind when his purpose was formed to give it existence. In this plan free agents formed a part; these, with all their actions, also were contemplated previously (in the order of nature) to the decree which determined their future existence to be certain.

Again, in selecting his plan, the great Creator acted with perfect freedom. He was under no necessity to create any

thing. He is independent of all creatures, and stands in need of nothing. Not only was he at perfect liberty to create or not, but he was free to adopt any system which pleased him. If there had been any thing in the existing plan which did not please him, or would not answer his purpose perfectly, he was at liberty to reject the whole, and would have done so. When he purposed to create the progenitor of the human family, he had it in his power to have given existence to another of the same species: he might, for example, have made the last man first; or have formed a person distinct from any who ever shall actually exist. Now this being the case, the inquiry arises, could not God have placed at the head of the human family, on whom the destiny of the rest should depend, one who would not have sinned? If he could not; if every creature that could have been created of the human species would certainly have sinned as well as Adam, then it follows eventually that sin could not be avoided if man existed; and the conclusion is, that a determination to create man, involved in it the purpose to permit the existence of sin. But if the alternative be taken, and it be said, that God could have created, in the place of Adam, one who would not have sinned, still the same conclusion forces itself upon us; for if, when he might have formed a creature who would not have transgressed, he chose to form one whom he knew would, it is as evident as any thing can be, that by this selection he did determine to permit the existence of sin.

Let us now, for a moment, examine the theory which supposes, that the plan of the Almighty, as it originally existed in the eternal mind, is not the one which is actually in existence; but that while it was his purpose that evil should have no place in the universe, contrary to his will and plan, it has come in through the transgression of free agents; and that in consequence of this a new plan has been adopted, accommodated to the exigence of the case. If we understand the Arminian theory, this is the point by which it stands distinguished from the theory which we believe. The mere statement of this opinion seems to us to carry with it a confutation. For, when the original plan was formed and adopted, according to the premises, it was certainly known that it would utterly fail; and was it ever heard of among creatures, that any intelligent being seriously formed a purpose which he knew at the time could not and would not be accomplished? To suppose, then, that God with a perfect prescience of all future events, resolved upon a plan

of the universe entirely different from what he knew would come to pass, is a scheme so unreasonable, that we know not how any one, after distinctly considering it, can adopt it: and we seem to ourselves now to perceive the reason why some speculative Arminians have been driven to the theory mentioned above, that God did not choose to know what would really take place.

But passing by the inconsistency of this theory on account of these reasons, let us see to what consequences it will lead us. The hypothesis is, that the present state of the world does not accord with the original plan of the Almighty; but that by the introduction of sin against his will, the whole state of the moral world is changed, and of course the government of the world by providence must be entirely different from what it would have been if man had not sinned. One undeniable consequence is, that the end which God had in view in the creation is lost, unless we suppose that his glory can be promoted as well by a state of things which prostrates his own plan, as by its execution. But if the ruler of the universe was frustrated in his purpose by the first sin, so he must be by every subsequent transgression; and, therefore, the existence of creatures, instead of answering his original purpose, whether that was to make them happy or to promote his own glory, has entirely failed of its complete accomplishment. And if this has occurred by the actual course of events in time past, what security is there, that the same will not be the fact in time to come? yea, what security is there that things will not continue to grow worse and worse, until all nature shall rush to some dreadful catastrophe, in which every thing good in the creation shall be utterly lost in everlasting darkness and confusion?

It will not be satisfactory to answer, that God has wisdom and power sufficient to prevent such a catastrophe; for his wisdom and power, according to the hypothesis, are not adequate to the prevention of sin and its consequences; and if these may arise and spread and increase, how can the consequence supposed be prevented? If the plan of the Almighty Ruler of the universe may be thwarted in one instance, it may in all. No security for the final well-being of the universe can be found any where. Now is it reasonable to think that, on these principles, a God of infinite wisdom would ever have made creatures capable of frustrating all his plans, and disappointing all his most benevolent purposes?

But it may be alleged, that God foreseeing the evil which would arise from the abuse of free will, determined to provide

against it, and accordingly, has done so, by sending his Son into the world to repair the ruins which sin has made; and thus, although God will not be glorified according to his original design, he will, nevertheless, be honoured by the new remedial scheme. The ground of the objection, however, still remains. If God's first plan was entirely frustrated by the sin of his creatures, what security is there, that the same will not happen in relation to this new plan? As the will of man is still free, and as the success of the mediatorial scheme depends on the choice of man, why may it not happen, that the end aimed at in the second will also be frustrated? Indeed, according to this theory, the fact has already occurred; for the design of God in sending his Son was to save all men, but it is acknowledged, that only a small part of the human race has been brought to salvation hitherto. And there is no better hope for the future, for men are not better now than formerly, and judging from the past, we may conjecture, that the greater number will continue to neglect this great salvation. Hence it appears, that the great God has been disconcerted and disappointed in all his designs: not only was his original plan of a universe without sin, frustrated, but his remedial plan, which was to save all men from sin, has also failed. These are consequences which inevitably flow from the hypothesis, that the cause of events in the world is not in accordance with the original plan of the Creator. But it is impossible, after an impartial view of the divine attributes, to believe in these conclusions. They are repugnant to reason. They are dishonourable to the divine perfections.

It may be, however, that the sober Arminian will be disposed to take different ground, and to maintain, that God did, with the prescience of all his sins, determine to create man; and that the existing state of things he did resolve to permit; but that he decreed nothing respecting these actions, but left them free; so that when the creature sins, he is not under any necessity of doing wrong from any divine purpose. Now, here it is evident, again, that there is an idea attached to the doctrine of decrees which does not belong to it, and which we have heretofore laboured to separate from it. It is, that if their sinful actions are decreed, they cannot be free, and must come to pass by an unavoidable necessity. To remove all difficulty, however, on this account, we will agree to meet the Arminian on the ground last selected. And we do aver, that in this theory he comes substantially into the very doctrine which we

maintain. For if God formed man with the full certainty of all his sins, then the purpose to create such a being with a foresight of such acts, is virtually decreeing the future existence of such acts. If, when the purpose was formed to create Adam, his fall was distinctly foreseen, then the determination to give Adam existence, involved the purpose that such an act as his transgression should also exist. Not that God intended or needed to do any thing to cause man to sin; this we reject, as much as the Arminian: but he resolved to *permit* this event. And here is the true ground of distinction between effective and permissive decrees; in the execution of the first, God acts himself; but in the execution of the last, other agents act, and act freely, and without constraint.

It does appear, therefore, that there is a ground on which the sober Arminian and moderate Calvinist can meet; and on which, even their views of the divine decrees can be made to harmonize.

ART. II.—WORKS OF JOHN HOWE.

The Works of the Reverend and learned John Howe, M. A. sometime fellow of Magdalen College, Oxon. London.

A STRIKING evidence of the prevalence of evangelical piety in England, is found in the great currency which is given, at the present time, to the works of the old Non-conformists. The massy volumes which were prized in the seventeenth century had become repulsive to modern readers, and the great productions of these excellent men needed a garb more consonant with the pampered taste of the age. The enterprise, therefore, is highly laudable which has presented us with the labours of Owen and Baxter and Bates and Flavel and Charnock and Howe, in an elegant and convenient form, and divested of that uncouth and peculiar orthography which characterizes the ancient folios.

The writings of the last mentioned theologian have been less perused by the majority of Christian readers than many other contemporary works; not so much from any want of interest in the subjects which he treats, still less from any defect in his matter or style, as from the more subtle and philosophical nature of his reasoning. The principal performances of Howe must ever continue to be most prized by men accustomed to

patient reflection, and by such he will be considered inferior to none of his age. We do not find in him that laboured and prolonged discussion of the doctrines of grace, and those searching investigations of Christian experience, which abound in Owen; nor the pungent, convictive, and almost irresistible appeals to the conscience which appear in Baxter; nor the silver current of figured language and brilliant thought of Bates; nor the melting, persuasive, descriptive eloquence of Flavel—at once plain and florid; but there is in Howe a majestic strength, a grave and stately bearing of mind, which looks down on the quaint antitheses and foreign images of his contemporaries; a philosophical view of all subjects, which reminds us of the ancient converts from Platonism; a power of demonstration, adroitness of invention, ingenuity of ratiocination, and native, easy grace of eloquence which are found in a similar, but inferior form in the discourses of More and Barrow.

John Howe was born May 17, 1630, at Loughborough, in the county of Leicester. His father was an exemplary clergyman of the Church of England, who was driven from his native country in consequence of the disposition which he manifested to befriend the Puritans. His academical education was received at Christ College, Cambridge, where he enjoyed the friendship and instructions of the celebrated Cudworth and Henry More. This intimacy is supposed to account for the strong tincture of refined Platonism which appears in his later writings. After having taken his bachelor's degree at Cambridge, he removed to Oxford and was admitted to the same at that seat of learning, Jan. 18, 1649. When, in 1652, he took his second degree in the arts, he is said to have gone through a course of philosophy, become acquainted with ancient ethics, scholastic theology, and the systems of the Reformers, and above all to have applied to the Holy Scriptures themselves, and thence deduced a system which no one ever ventured to say was founded on any human authority.

Mr. Howe was ordained, soon after, by Mr. Charles Herle, at Winwicke in Lancashire. "He would often say," says Dr. Calamy "that this Mr. Herle was a primitive Bishop; and the assistants in his several chapels were his clergy; and they joining in laying on hands upon him, he thought few in modern times had so truly primitive an ordination as he." He became the pastor of a church in Great Torrington, Devonshire, as the successor of the pious and noted independent Lewis Stukely. The ordinary labours of a minister in those days

were such as would alarm both pastor and people at present, however we may be disposed to glory in our increase of zeal. The statement of one of his biographers, in speaking of the manner in which he was accustomed to observe their very frequent fasts, will illustrate this remark. "Mr. Howe told me, it was upon those occasions his common way to begin about nine in the morning, with a prayer, for about a quarter of an hour, in which he begged a blessing upon the work of the day; he afterwards read and expounded a chapter or psalm, in which he spent about three quarters; then prayed for about an hour, preached for another hour, and prayed for about half an hour. After this, he retired, and took some little refreshment for about a quarter of an hour or more, (the people singing all the while) and then came again into the pulpit, and prayed for another hour, and gave them another sermon of about an hour's length; and so concluded the service of the day, at about four of the clock in the evening, with about half an hour or more in prayer."

At a certain time after the year 1654, a remarkable change took place in the circumstances of our author. Being detained by business in the metropolis, he was on the Lord's day sitting among the congregation at Whitehall Chapel, when the eagle eye of Oliver Cromwell alighted on him; and he received a message immediately after service, summoning him to an interview with this extraordinary man. Cromwell requested him to preach on the next Lord's day, and overruling the various and sincere excuses of Mr. Howe, actually wrote a letter to the people of his charge, accounting for their pastor's absence. The result of the whole was, that he was constrained to become the domestic chaplain of the Protector, in which office there is every reason to believe that he was faithful and conscientious. A remark of Cromwell is recorded, which shows at once the readiness of Mr. Howe to assist those who were in distress, and his exemption from all designs of self-aggrandizement. "You have obtained many favours for others," said the Lord Protector, "but I wonder when the time is to come, that you will move for any thing for yourself, or your family." The faithfulness of the Christian preacher was, however, not altogether promotive of his advancement as a court favourite. On a certain occasion he boldly inveighed against a doctrine which Cromwell maintained, with regard to special impressions on the mind that certain particular requests in prayer will be answered—declaring this "particular

faith, in prayer" to be unfounded in Scripture—and from that moment he ceased to be noticed with any cordiality.

Upon the restoration of the Stuarts, he returned to his former charge at Torrington; whence he was in 1660 summoned to answer to a charge of seditious and treasonable preaching. From this difficulty, he was, however, speedily delivered.

The year 1662 was signalized by the *Act of Uniformity*, which took place August 24. On that day Mr. Howe, with a decision which was characteristic, took a solemn and affectionate leave of his charge. Although one of the most liberal of the Non-conformists, and by no means disposed to pare to the quick the ceremonial excrescences of the establishment, he found the terms of conformity altogether intolerable. At the same time many of his brethren, who had been accustomed to admit far less latitude in externals, bowed their necks to the yoke. No man ever acted more thoroughly upon the golden maxim of Augustine, *In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in omnibus charitas*. His language upon this subject is always the same. He was for the union and communion of all visible Christians; and for making nothing necessary to Christian communion, but what Christ hath made necessary, or what is indeed necessary to one's being a Christian. And he maintained "that such a union must be effected, not by mere human endeavour, but by an Almighty Spirit poured forth, which" he adds "after we have suffered a while shall *Kαταρτισαι*, put us into joint, and make every joint know its place in the body, 1 Pet. 5, 10. Shall conquer private interests and inclinations, and overawe men's hearts, by the authority of the divine law, which now, how express soever it is, little availeth against such prepossessions. Till then, Christianity will be among us a languishing, withering thing. When the season comes of such an effusion of the Spirit from on high, there will be no parties. And amidst the wilderness desolation that cannot but be, till that season comes, it matters little, and signifies to me scarce one straw what party of us is uppermost."

This pious and laborious man could not entirely neglect the gift that was in him, and accordingly preached at the houses of his friends in Devonshire, and was soon followed by a citation from the bishop's court. He pursued a manly course, and placed himself in the way of the prelate, who received him with much courtesy, as an old acquaintnace, and pressed him to state his objections to conformity. Mr. Howe, though

no less a lover of peace than Archbishop Leighton, was more a lover of order, and could not, like the latter, submit to the indignity of abdicating his own ministerial character. He stated to the bishop that he could never consent to re-ordination. "Why, pray, sir," said the bishop to him, "what hurt is there in being twice ordained?" "Hurt! my lord," replied Mr. Howe, "the thought is shocking; it hurts my understanding; it is an absurdity. For nothing can have two beginnings. I am sure," said he, "I am a minister of Christ, and am ready to debate that matter with your Lordship, if you please, and I can't begin again to be a minister." His Lordship knew his man, and was discreetly pleased to drop the subject.

In 1665 Mr. Howe, Dr. Bates, and others, incurred the heavy censure of the more rigid non-conformists, by taking the oath that it was not lawful, upon any pretence whatever, to take arms against the king. His first publication was the sermon entitled, "On Man's creation in a holy, but mutable state." In 1671 he accepted an invitation to Ireland, where he became the chaplain of lord Massarene, in the parish of Antrim. Here he published a discourse which, for originality of thought and ingenuity of reasoning, is inferior to no production of his pen—"The vanity of man as mortal." The proposition which the preacher unfolds is this, "that the short time of man on earth, limited by a certain unavoidable death, carries with it that aspect and appearance, as if God had made all men in vain; if we consider it by itself, without respect to a future state." Ps. lxxxix. 47, 48. It would be difficult to select from the relics of that age, a more noble specimen of exalted pulpit eloquence. The author here leads us into depths where all is new and awakening, and the veins of rich and brilliant thought which are laid open, reveal masses of weighty truth, which the reader is ready to imagine have lain hitherto unexplored. Howe was possessed of a satiric faculty, which sometimes enlivens his most elaborate discussions. The poignant remarks which follow, may serve as a specimen of the manner in which he castigates the irreligion and debauchery of the age.

"Can we, in sober reason, think we were made only for such ends as the most only pursue?—Would not men be ashamed to profess such a belief, or to have it written in their foreheads, these are the only ends they are capable of? Then might one read—such a man born to put others in mind of his predecessor's name, and only lest such a family should want an heir. Such a one to consume such an estate, and de-

vour the provenue of so many farms and manors. Such a one to fill so many bags and coffers to sustain the riot of him that succeeds. Some created to see and make sport, to run after hawks and dogs, or spend the time which their weariness redeems from converse with brutes, in making themselves such, by drinking away the little wit and reason they have left; mixing with this genteel exercise, their impure and scurrilous drolleries, that they may befriend one another with the kind occasion of proving themselves to be yet of the human race, by this only demonstration remaining to them, that they can *laugh*.—Others made to blaspheme their Maker, to rend the sacred name of God, and make proof of their high valour and the gallantry of their brave spirits, by bidding a defiance to heaven, and proclaiming their heroic contempt of the Deity and of all religion—the ancient religious sentiments of all former ages, are dreams and follies to their admired new light. Their wise and rare discoveries, that they and all things came by chance; that this world hath no owner or Lord, are reason enough with them, to mock at the eternal Being, and attempt to jeer religion out of the world, and all other men out of their reason and wits—as they have themselves.”

But how strikingly does the preacher change his key, when he speaks of the indifference with which the man of God looks upon the transient trifles of this world! The passage which we subjoin, it would be difficult to surpass by any thing of its kind:

“He hath still the image before his eye, of this world vanishing and passing away; of the other, with the everlasting affairs and concerns of it, even now ready to take place, and fill up all the stage. He can represent to himself the vision—not from a melancholic fancy or crazed brain, but a rational faith, and a sober, well-instructed mind—of the world dissolving, monarchies and kingdoms breaking up, thrones tumbling, crowns and sceptres lying as neglected things. He hath a telescope through which he can behold the glorious appearance of the Supreme Judge; the solemn state of his majestic person; the splendid pomp of his magnificent and vastly numerous retinue; the obsequious throng of glorious celestial creatures, doing homage to their eternal king; the swift flight of his royal guards, sent forth to the four winds to gather the elect, and covering the face of the heavens with their spreading wings. The universal, silent attention of all to that loud-sounding trumpet that shakes the pillars of the world, pierces the inward caverns of the earth, and resounds from every part of the encircling heavens; the many myriads of joyful expectants arising, changing, putting on glory, taking wing, and tending upwards, to join themselves to the triumphant heavenly host; the judgment set; the books opened; the frightful amazed looks of surprised wretches, the equal administration of the final judgment; the adjudication of all to their eternal states; the heavens rolled up as a scroll; the earth and all things therein consumed and burnt up.”

The treatise “Of delighting in God,” which is so well known, and has been so frequently published in a separate form, appeared first in the year 1674. In the year following he returned to London, and took charge of a congregation there. It was at this period that he gave to the world the first

part of his great work, *The Living Temple*, in which he brings all the resources of his strong and fruitful mind to bear upon the controversy with the atheists of the Epicurean school.

In the year 1680, Mr. Howe was drawn into a controversy with the celebrated Stillingfleet, who, like many other attendants on courts, found his former opinions concerning dissent, not a little inconvenient, and amidst the glare of noble society received a singular illumination on the point of non-conformity. During the excitement produced by the expectation of a Popish succession to the throne, he preached and published a sermon entitled, *The Mischiefs of Separation*; in which, notwithstanding his well known arguments on the other side, he represented the dissenters as schismatical, seditious, and dangerous men. This discourse was answered by Owen, Baxter, and Howe; and the letter of the last of these was so remarkable for its mildness, that the Dean himself, acknowledged in a subsequent publication, that "he discourses gravely and piously, without bitterness or rancour, or any sharp reflections, and sometimes with a great mixture of kindness towards him, for which and his prayers, he heartily thanks him." Yet there is no want of boldness in the argument, nor the slightest disposition manifested by the author to make undue concessions. Dr. Stillingfleet, in order to forestall any reproaches on account of what he had formerly written, acknowledges that there were some things in his *Irenicum* which evinced youthful inexperience. To which Howe replies—"this retractation, however, cannot make that which was true before become false. The reason of things is sullen, and will not alter to serve men's conveniences:"—"let him answer his own reasons. To say the truth, the gravity and seriousness wherewith that book was written, appears to have so little of the *youth* in it, in comparison of the jocular and sportful humour of some of his latter writings, when he hath been discussing the most weighty and important cases of conscience, that it seems as a prodigy in nature, and that he began his life at the wrong end; that he was old in his youth, and reserved his puerility to his more grown age."

For a number of years subsequent to this, the persecution of the non-conformists was most violent, and Mr. Howe, who tenderly felt all that regarded them, as his own personal interest, used his pen and his influence to save them from internal animosities, and the virulent attacks of their enemies. A number of excellent sermons comprised in these volumes were

published during this period. Strange as it might appear to an unprejudiced lover of religious freedom, there are many in our own land, who accuse the dissenters of unprovoked, and therefore, schismatical separation from the Church of England. It is hard to conceive by what means intelligent men can so blind their eyes to the facts in which all histories of those times concur. True, they went out from a Church which desired them to remain,—and this is the sum of the argument against them: but the conditions upon which they might have adhered to the hierarchy were such as were intolerable to their consciences. They went out indeed; but it was as the Israelites went out from Egypt. Among other tyrannical acts, they were prosecuted, not only for attending their own *conventicles*, but for absenting themselves from the sacrament of the Church. A letter written in the year 1684, by Howe, to the Bishop of Lincoln, contains a warm and triumphant defence of his brethren. Among other things he says:

“I think that few metaphysical questions are disputed with nicer subtlety, than the matter of the *ceremonies* has been by Archbishop Whitgift, Cartwright, Hooker, Parker, Dr. Burgess, Dr. Ames, Gillespy, Jeanes, Calderwood, Dr. Owen, Baxter, &c. Now is it impossible that a sincere and sober Christian may, with an honest heart, have so weak intellects, as not to be able to understand all the punctilios upon which a right judgment of such a matter may depend? If your Lordship were the *Paterfamilias* to a numerous family of children and servants, among whom one or other very dutiful child takes offence, not at the sort of food you have thought fit should be provided, but somewhat in the sauce or way of dressing, which thereupon he forbears; you try all the means which your paternal wisdom and severity thinks fit, to overcome that aversion, but in vain; would you finally famish this child, rather than yield to his inclination in so small a thing?—I cannot but be well persuaded, not only of the mere sincerity, but eminent sanctity of divers, who would sooner die at a stake, than I or any man can prevail on them to *kneel* before the consecrated elements at the Lord’s table. Would your Lordship necessitate such *perdere substantiam propter accidentia*? What if there be considerable numbers of such in your Lordship’s vastly numerous flock; will it be comfortable to you, when an account is demanded of your Lordship by the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls concerning them, only to be able to say:—Though Lord I did believe the provisions of thine house purchased for them, necessary, and highly useful for their salvation, I drove them away as dogs and swine from thy table, and stirred up such other agents as I could influence against them, by which means I reduced many of them to beggary, ruined many families, banished them into strange countries, where they might (for me) serve other Gods; and this, not for disobeying any immediate ordinance or law of thine, but because, for fear of offending thee, they did not in every thing comport with mine own appointments, or which I was directed to urge and impose upon them?”

As the prospects of the Dissenters became daily more and more gloomy, Mr. Howe accepted, in 1685, an invitation from lord Wharton to accompany him in his travels upon the continent. After a tour of some months, he took up his residence at Utrecht, where he regularly preached to the English refugees, and communicated theological instruction to a number of youth. Upon King James' Declaration for liberty of Conscience, in 1687, he was recalled to his former charge in London, where, in 1688, had the satisfaction of addressing William III. in the name of the Dissenting ministers; and in 1689 the still higher satisfaction of witnessing the successful attempt to free the non-conformists, by the "Act for exempting their Majestys' Protestant subjects, dissenting from the Church of England from the penalties of certain laws." Still he was not satisfied that all evils would be done away by the mere enactment of laws for toleration. On the one hand, the dissenters in their exultation at the results of the "glorious revolution," were naturally in danger of acquiring an arrogant and even intolerant spirit. On the other, the High Church party, of which Sacheverel was in some sort the organ, greatly regretted the grant of immunities to the non-conformists, and alleged "that this toleration granted by law, was unreasonable, and the allowance of it unwarrantable." In order to promote harmony and peace, Mr. Howe issued from the press a letter of "Humble requests both to Conformists and Dissenters, touching their temper and behaviour towards each other, upon the lately passed indulgence;" in which, with truly Christian meekness and in the spirit of a peace-maker, he earnestly deprecates all magnifying of their differences, harsh and uncharitable judgments, pharisaical arrogance and controversial acrimony.

No attempts, however, of the friends of peace could repress that overheated zeal which had been too long fostered among the dissenters; and the very means used for uniting the various parties, proved in the end the occasion of discord. One of the most desirable changes was, that the Congregationalists and the Presbyterians might drop their disputes, and coalesce upon that wide field of doctrine which they occupied in common. To further a pacification of this kind, *Heads of Agreement* were drawn up, and extensively adopted; and, with every indication of harmony, the united brethren exchanged professions of good-will, and joined weekly in religious services. This took place in the year 1691. Scarcely, however, had these tokens of reconciliation been manifested, when a painful

separation took place, upon grounds chiefly doctrinal; and their joint assemblies were dissolved. Mutual charges were heard, of Antinomianism on the one hand, and Arminianism on the other, and the gentle voice of peace was drowned amidst the clamours of vehement debate. The lesson which is taught by such ruptures, is as plain as it is important, and may be enforced by an extract from the life of our Author:

“Several papers were hereupon drawn up and subscribed, in order to an accommodation. There was a first, a second, and a third paper of this sort; and these very papers created new altercations and debates, that were carried on with no small heat and pettishness; and a number that stood by, could hardly tell what it was they contended about. Several new creeds were framed, and still objected against by some or other, either as too large or too strait; too full or too empty. The world was wearied out with pamphlets and creed-making, and the Bishop of Worcester and Dr. Edwards were appealed to, and gave their judgment; and yet the jealousies that were on foot were so strong, that they did not of a long time abate or decrease.”

An anecdote is quoted from Stillingfleet, which is applicable, not only to this controversy, but to many which have been agitated in the Reformed Church. “There is,” says he, “a remarkable story in the History of the Synod of Dort, which may not be improper in this place. There were, in one of the universities of that country, two professors, both very warm and extremely zealous for that which they accounted the most orthodox doctrine; but it happened that one of them accused the other before the synod, for no fewer than fifty errors, tending to Socinianism, Pelagianism, &c.; and wonderful heat there was on both sides. At last, a committee was appointed to examine this dreadful charge; and, upon examination, they found no ground for the charge of Socinianism, or any other heresy, but only that he had affected too much the use of ambiguous and scholastic terms, and endeavoured to bring in the way of the schoolmen in his writings; and, therefore, the synod dismissed him with that prudent advice, ‘rather to keep to the language of the Scripture, than of the schools.’”

It was at this juncture, that Mr. Howe published two discourses on the “Carnality of Christian Contention.” In the preface to these discourses, no less than in the sermons themselves, there is displayed that body of pacific principles, upon which the whole conduct of this eminent servant of God was a

living commentary. At this day, when the attempt is made, in various parts of our land, to erect terms of communion unknown in any previous age, and to exclude from the pale of the visible church, all who do not adopt pledges or resolutions which are deduced from the Scripture only by tedious inference, it may not be inappropriate to quote the following pointed remarks from these discourses:

“Christianity itself should measure the communion of Christians, as such; and visible Christianity their visible communion. Christianity must be estimated principally by its end; which refers not to this world, but to the world to come, and a happy state there.—If any society of men, professedly Christian, make limits of their communion, admitting those that Christ excludes, and excluding those whom he would admit, they break Christ’s constitution, and set up another.—If they be little things only that we add; the less they are, the greater the sin, to make them necessary, and hang so great things upon them; break the church’s peace and unity by them, and of them to make a new gospel, new terms of life and death, and a new way to heaven! And is in effect to say, if you will not take Christianity with these additions of ours, you shall not be Christians; you shall have no Christian ordinances, no Christian worship.”

All exhortations, however, prove fruitless with those who are led away by a zeal which attains its height prior to consideration, and which cannot be repressed by any subsequent representations. At such a time, those who plead for moderation and peace, are stigmatized as lukewarm and suspicious brethren, who have not yet arrived at sufficient warmth of temperature to be capable of just impressions. The attempts at visible union ceased with the year 1694, and some time elapsed before any thing like cordiality was restored.

About this time, Mr. Howe published a treatise, entitled, “A Calm and Sober Inquiry concerning the possibility of a Trinity in the Godhead,” which, with the pamphlets to which it gave rise, occasioned great excitement and warm disputation. Of this bold and intricate treatise, very different estimates have been formed. Here, as on other points, the author with his characteristic independence, forsook the beaten track, advanced original speculations, and used terms which seemed to some sober believers to be unguarded and dangerous. Yet many were convinced that while the difficulties of this mysterious subject were not relieved by his philosophical researches, he was still consistent with himself and with the catholic doctrine. Mr. Howe is not the first instance of a man remarkable for charity and liberality, who has, nevertheless, been often drawn into controversy. Indeed, it was this very temper which

generally led him to take the field. At the commencement of the eighteenth century, it became a question, "whether they that could at all and in any case worship God with the Church of England, should not be obliged to do it for a constancy, or else be incapacitated from holding any place either of profit or trust?" The pen of Howe was, therefore, demanded in the defence of the dissenters against their oppressors, and likewise of the occasional conformists against the attacks of their more unrelenting brethren. This occasional communion, however, is generally thought to have injured the cause of dissent, and was undoubtedly misinterpreted in a gross manner by the party in power; although it had its origin in a spirit of concession and charity.

During the remaining years of Mr. Howe's life, his principal publications were sermons, some of which were commemorative of his pious brethren departed. Such are his funeral discourses on occasion of the death of Dr. Bates, Mr. Baxter, and Mr. Mead. One great labour of his life was completed in the year 1702, when he published the second part of the *Living Temple*; a work no less remarkable for its profundity and force of argument, than astonishing as the production of a septuagenarian. And we take this occasion to offer a few remarks upon these volumes, containing as they do the sober and well digested conclusions of many thoughtful years.

The *Living Temple* is intended as an expanded view of the precious truth, that the good man is the temple of God; and this is, in the first part, defended against the objections of Epicurean atheists. The two great truths involved in this discussion, are, first, that there is a God; and secondly, "that he is conversable with men." And in treating of these the author expatiates over the whole domain of natural religion, establishing very much in the same manner as Dr. Henry More, the being and attributes of God, from the light of nature. The argument is extended through a number of chapters, and we can only give such an outline as may furnish materials for a comparison with those of other celebrated theologians.

1. Something there is which has been from all eternity, necessarily, and of itself, without dependence upon any thing else. Otherwise nothing could ever have come into being. That something has ever been of itself is plain; for if we say that all things that are, or ever have been, without exception, were from another, we contradict ourselves; since *besides* all things that are, or ever have been, there is not another from

whom they could be. Now, that which exists eternally of itself, exists *necessarily*; is of so excellent a nature, as that it could never be out of being. It depends upon no one's choice or power, whether that which is of itself shall be, or shall not be. 2. Whatsoever is not necessarily and of itself, is from and by that which is necessarily and of itself, as the first Author and Cause thereof. 3. Neither this visible world, nor any thing of it, is necessarily or of itself, without depending upon any thing else; and was therefore created, and made by some more excellent Being, that was so, and is quite distinct and diverse from it. In proof of this, it is observed, that whatever exists necessarily and independently must have *at once* all that can be predicated of it; for whence can any addition or change supervene? Now this world is constantly changing and imperfect, and, therefore, had a Maker distinct from itself. It is self-evident that independent and necessary Being is more excellent than all others, and, therefore, this visible world has a Maker more excellent than itself. 4. The things which are plainly not independent but created or deduced, manifest the excellence of their Maker's power, wisdom, and goodness: The greatness of his works shows his mighty power; their nature, exactness, and order, his admirable wisdom; and his own self-sufficiency, and independency on the things made, show his rich and vast goodness in making them.

Such is a faint outline of the principal argument, but to acquire any adequate notion of the close and logical reasoning, the varied illustration, and the bold originality of the author, the reader must be referred to the work itself. Having arrived at the idea of a necessary and eternal Being, it is shown at great length and with singular cogency, that we cannot but attribute to him all perfection. "When we turn our inquiry and contemplation more entirely upon the cause, and bethink ourselves, how came he to exist and be what he is,—finding this cannot be refunded upon any *superior cause*, and our utmost inquiry can admit of no other result but this, that *he is of himself what he is*,—we will surely say then, *he is all in all*. And that perfection, which before we judged vastly great, we will now conclude altogether absolute, and such beyond which no greater can be thought."

The second part of the *Living Temple*, which was published nearly forty years after the first, commences with a laborious and very ingenious refutation of Spinozism, in which the Pantheism of that remarkable man is examined, article by article,

and shown to be self-contradictory, unintelligible, and absurd. The author then proceeds to what may be considered the most important, as it is certainly the most interesting part of his subject, viz. to prove the possibility of a friendly intercourse between God and man; to show that this intercourse, once begun, has been interrupted, and that man has been justly forsaken; and to explain the glorious method of restitution through a Redeemer.

The following description of the human temple of God, in its present ruined state, may be taken as a specimen of the author's happy style, and as a remarkable instance of vigour in a writer of three score years and ten.

“The stately ruins are visible to every eye, that bear in their front, (yet extant,) this doleful inscription: **HERE GOD ONCE DWELT.** Enough appears of the admirable frame and structure of the soul of man, to show the Divine Presence did sometime reside in it; more than enough of vicious deformity, to proclaim he is now retired and gone. The lamps are extinct, the altar overturned; the light and love are now vanished; which did the one shine, with so heavenly brightness, the other burn with so pious fervour. The golden candlestick is displaced, and thrown away as a useless thing, to make room for the throne of the prince of darkness. The sacred incense, which sent rolling up in clouds its rich perfumes, is exchanged for a poisonous hellish vapour; and here is *instead of a sweet savour, a stench.*—What have not the enemies *done wickedly in the sanctuary!* *How have they broken down the carved work thereof,* and that too *with axes and hammers;* the noise whereof was not to be heard in building, much less in demolishing this sacred frame. Look upon the fragments of that curious sculpture, which once adorned the palace of that great King, the relics of common notions, the lively prints of some undefaced truth, the fair ideas of things, the yet legible precepts that relate to practice. Behold! with what accuracy the broken pieces show these to have been engraven by the finger of God; and how they lie torn and scattered, one in this dark corner, another in that, buried in heaps of dirt and rubbish. There is not now a system, an entire table of coherent truths to be found, or a frame of holiness, but some shivered parcels. And if any, with great toil and labour, apply themselves to draw out here one piece, and there another, and set them together, they serve rather to show how exquisite the Divine workmanship was in the original composition, than for present use, to the excellent purpose for which the whole was first designed. You come, amidst all this confusion, as into the ruined palace of some great prince, in which you see here the fragments of a noble pillar, there the shattered pieces of some curious imagery; and all lying neglected and useless amongst heaps of dirt. He that invites you to take a view of the soul of man, gives you but such another prospect, and doth but say to you, **BEHOLD THE DESOLATION,** all things rude and waste. So that, should there be any pretence to the Divine Presence, it might be said, *If God be here, why is it thus?* The faded glory, the darkness, the disorder, the impurity, the decayed state, in all respects, of this temple, too plainly show the great Inhabitant is gone.”

The departure of this aged servant of God was now approaching, and in the expectation of death, he exemplified what he had published as his last work "Christian patience in view of future blessedness." With every expression of joy in the hope of being taken to rest, he expired upon the second of April, 1705.

"In person," says his biographer, "he was very tall and exceedingly graceful. He had a good presence, and a piercing, but pleasant eye; and in his looks and carriage there was an indication of something truly great and venerable." Accustomed as he was to the society of the first men of his age, he was, although a Puritan, mild and courteous, "and never could be of the mind of those who reckon religion and piety inconsistent with good breeding." His deportment is represented as having been far removed from any thing like servility to those in power, or harshness to such as were his inferiors. That vivacity and wit of which his written works afford specimens, made his conversation universally agreeable, and at the same time afforded him frequent opportunities of conveying wholesome reproof. As an instance of this we may quote an anecdote, which, though after told, deserves to be repeated in this connexion. Being present on a certain occasion with a number of fashionable persons, he observed with pain, that one of the company, in expatiating upon the excellencies of Charles the First, mingled with his discourse many profane expressions. When Mr. Howe found an opportunity of speaking, he remarked to the gentleman, that he had omitted one very admirable trait of the prince whom he extolled; and upon being pressed to explain himself, he at length told him that it was this: that he was never heard to swear an oath in common conversation. The gentleman who had offended, seriously promised to avoid the sin in time to come.

The Rev. Mr. Spademan, who preached his funeral sermon, and who was familiarly acquainted with his character, and well fitted to estimate it, represents him as one "who had received from the Father of lights, so great a variety, both of natural and Christian perfections, that he was not only a shining light and ornament of his age, but an inviting example of universal goodness." He had received "an uncommon skill in the word of righteousness, and had peculiar advantages for understanding the oracles of God; a large fund of natural endowments, improved by superadded preparatives unto the study of the Scriptures; a rich treasure of human learning, particularly a

thorough knowledge of Pagan theology, by which he was enabled to descry the shortness and mistakes of human reason, which faculty he well understood to use in subordination unto Christian faith, whose mystery he was able to free from the objection of cavillers. He took care to wash the vessel, that it might be receptive of divine communications. And to these he added unwearied diligence, humility, and prayer, which was the delight and solace of his whole life."

Even from the slender account which we have given of his life, the reader will perceive that he was pacific and liberal in his feelings, and that he laboured for the peace as well as the purity of the Church. In this particular he has been well compared to the "moderate Reformer," Martin Bucer. The most bitter high churchmen acknowledged, that he was "a person of neat and polite parts, and moderate and calm in the smaller matters that were under debate between the Church and his party."* Most earnestly did he strive, throughout his whole life, to prevent the admission of any terms of communion which were not, as such, founded "in plain reason or express revelation."

As a preacher, it was generally granted that he stood in the first rank. He was master of a copious flow of language as well as thought, which exempted him from slavery to written notes; and a large proportion of his published discourses were committed to writing, not *before*, but *after* their delivery. As a writer, he is remarkably free from the attachment to vulgar and excessive comparisons, quaint aphorisms and epigrammatic turns, which blemished the great majority of the Puritan writers. The use which he makes of similitudes is very sparing, and then only when they are forced upon him; and his figures of this kind are strikingly apt and illustrative. This cultivated taste seems to have led him, not so much like Bates, to adorn his style with ornaments free from the reigning defects, as to avoid every thing of the kind. It is not a richly figured manner which suits the higher kinds of eloquence, and the reader of his works is not permitted to pause for the examination of sparkling beauties, but hurried onward by the majestic and accumulating torrent of irresistible argument. The more recondite parts of his writings require, sometimes, very patient and deliberate examination; and the use of long periods, with frequent parenthesis, give an air of awkwardness, which is

* *Wood. Athen. Oxon. II. 1014.*

at first repulsive, to many passages. Yet, in his more practical treatises, no man can be more plain or perspicuous. And in all his works, the thought will amply repay us for the attention which we may bestow.

The masculine vigour of style, the copiousness of argument without repetition, and the exalted piety which characterize these volumes, render them worthy of the perusal of every clergyman. Living as Howe did, at a time when great stress was laid upon the distinctive tenets of Calvinism, it is remarkable that his works contain very little discussion of these doctrines. He has been charged with defection from the truth upon these particular points; but as far as we are able to gather, there is no real divergence from the standards of the reformed Church. He was indeed accustomed to explain the truths of Scripture in a way which was all his own; to reject terms which he thought exceptionable, and to frame new ones; but his originality was far remote from that unholy spirit of speculation which would sacrifice truth, for the sake of striking out new paths, and would forsake every tried way, in order to assert a manly independence on prescribed forms.

These volumes contain a Christian library of rich instruction in practical and experimental religion. Feeling that important truth which is expressed in our formularies, "that truth is in order to goodness, and the great touchstone of truth its tendency to promote holiness,"—it would seem that Howe was never willing to take a merely speculative view of Christian doctrine. His most able and lucid expositions of contested truths are mingled with application to the heart; and leaving the debates of the schools, he often rises to tracts of heavenly contemplation; so that the influence upon the reader's affections bears a due proportion to his mental illumination. The treatises on *Self-dedication*, *Delighting in God*, and the *Blessedness of the Righteous*, are marked with a deep insight into the workings of the heart, and an elevation of true piety, which are characteristic of the age of Baxter, and Owen, and Flavel.

Again we say, it is a happy token for England and America, that the works of the Puritans are coming into favour. It is the height of folly to turn our backs upon all the Christian researches and improvements of those holy men. Our own age, rich as it is in sermons on special occasions, controversial pamphlets, essays on speculative theology, and defences of the outworks of Christianity, is barren in extended treatises which

enter into the minute particulars, and traverse the whole field of vital piety. To convince any impartial man of this, let him be invited to compare volume with volume in any great public library, of the books of the 17th and 19th centuries, respectively. Where we have a tract our fathers had a treatise; where we have an essay in twelves, they had a folio, upon practical and constitutional theology. It is common to attribute this to the *cacoethes scribendi* then prevalent, and the passion for ponderous tomes. We are told that the extent of these works is occasioned by repetition, tedious diffuseness, and unmeaning verbiage. Far from this—it owes its origin to the able and profound discussion of a thousand points, which are at this day left absolutely untouched. The private Christian—to give an instance in one department—is now left to struggle with his own temptations, and resolve, as he may, his own cases of conscience. In that day, eminent theologians spent years in digesting and elucidating the various points of casuistry which occurred or might occur during their ministry—witness a whole folio of Baxter, upon this single subject. We have, it is true, many able essays upon practical subjects, in an easy and popular style; which may be perused in a day, and which, as far as they go, are highly useful, by such writers as James, and Douglas, and Hall; but who can point to such books as Howe on the *Blessedness of the Righteous*, Baxter's *Saint's Rest*, Owen on *Spiritual Mindedness*, Flavel's *Fountain of Life*, and Bates on *Spiritual Perfection*?

If any are so grossly ignorant as to charge the great non-conformist divines with a want of learning, we can only raise our hands, and remand them to the study of Church history. We have no fear of contradiction when we say, that for acquaintance with classical antiquity, with the theology of preceding ages, including that which may be called patristical, and (new as it may be to some who have been taught to believe that the principles of interpretation have been revealed only in Germany) with the original languages of the Scripture—their leading men may rank with any whom the world has ever seen.

There is, at this day, a morbid dread of whatever is ancient in theology; as if each race of men was to receive some new inspiration with regard to divine truth. Because a path has been long trodden, it must *for that very reason* be forsaken; and if any man is so blinded by the dust of antiquity as to prefer the theology of the reformers, he is forthwith pitied as a slave of

authority, who has not sufficient ingenuity or daring to frame a creed for himself. Nay, the venerable persons of whom we have been speaking are set aside as men whose souls were fettered with prejudice, and who, destitute of all adventurous originality, tamely followed their predecessors. Such a conclusion as this betrays a strange misconception of the age of the Puritans. It was a period when the very watchword was *The Bible is the Religion of Protestants*: in which authority in matters of faith was indignantly cast off as a galling yoke, and trampled under foot, while independence of thought so far prevailed as in too many instances to result in the wildest excesses.

It was an age in which every layman was bold in the investigation and discussion of Scriptural doctrine, and in which scarcely two eminent theologians were found to symbolize upon all points. True, they did, in a remarkable manner, concur in the great, distinguishing tenets of our Church; but what does this evince? Not, surely, that those who framed our formularies slavishly cast themselves into a given mould; but that there must be some wonderful power in the arguments for a system which could thus unite so many of the most independent, learned, and pious men. And what, we would ask, could we expect the result to be, supposing that system to be demonstrably true? Are the evidences of truth so rare or so abstruse, that the very coincidence and harmony of men upon the presentation of them, furnish suspicion of want of reflection, or even of collusion? In opposition to all this, we avow, that the fact of such unanimity is to us, *ex facie*, the ground of a strong presumption in their favour: just as the concurrence of the Westminster Assembly of Divines (men, who, with a few trifling exceptions, had all received episcopal ordination) in the platform of Church Government which we have received from them, is to every impartial mind a cogent argument for the soundness of these conclusions.

Perhaps it may not be out of place to add, that the interpretation of the Scriptures was pursued with a degree of zeal, learning, and pious caution, which have been surpassed in no other age or country. It cannot be denied, that the modern exegesis was not yet revealed; and in saying this, we do, in the estimation of many, pronounce sentence of condemnation upon the Puritans. We scarcely know whether to be more provoked or amused, when men who can, with difficulty, read a paragraph of the Hebrew Bible, with all the aid of the recent apparatus, gravely sit in judgment upon scholars like those whom

we have named. There are certain theologians who banish from their libraries, with great contempt, the labours of Poole and Owen, and Ainsworth, and Meade, and Henry; while they cannot too highly laud Rosenmüller, and Paulus, and Ammon, and Kuinoel, and Eichhorn, and De Wette. Should any one suggest a doubt as to the wisdom of communing with men who are Pelagian, Arian, Socinian, or Deistical, he is contemptuously smiled upon, as far behind the age, and uninitiated into the mysterious art of transmuting poison into nourishment, in a word, a slave to old and exploded systems. Until within a few years, interpreters of the Scriptures, like all other men, were judged by their fruits; but now, it has been discovered, that, although the *results* at which German critics arrive, are false and often impious, the *principles* which they teach are the only safe and true ones. Upon the same grounds an astronomer must prefer an instrument which, at every celestial observation, conducts him to false conclusions, but which is new and glittering, to the old, and perhaps, rusty sextant of his father, which never yet betrayed him into error. To speak plainly and soberly, we deprecate the indiscriminate introduction of the modern Socinianism of Germany. Let us gladly avail ourselves of the philology, especially the lexicography and the mere criticism of their scholars; their archaeological, geographical, and historical labour; but let us not blindly accustom our minds even to *contemplate* with calmness and complacency, enormous errors, dangerous to the souls of men, and abominable in the sight of God. Let us select and use such of their productions as contain the results of philological research, but let us not vainly expect in the *commentaries* or extended expositions of neologists, to find any substitute for the pious labours of our forefathers. Happy should we be to see our youth, and especially, candidates for the holy ministry, turning from these dangerous pursuits, to the wholesome instructions of the seventeenth century.

ART. III.—WHAT CONSTITUTES A CALL TO THE GOSPEL MINISTRY?

THIS question has often perplexed and distressed candid and pious minds. Many a man has anxiously examined the interrogatory in its direct application to himself, without being able

for a long time, and perhaps never with entire satisfaction, to answer it. The question recurs again and again, how shall I ascertain whether I have been called, or am called to devote myself to the work of the gospel ministry?

In itself the question is one of very grave importance, and to many persons of absorbing interest. The subject is worthy of careful discussion, as it respects the peace and duty of individuals, the interests of the church and the souls of men. The practical answer to this inquiry, whether right or wrong, has a controlling influence over the subsequent life and efforts of many men. There can be no doubt that many wrong decisions have been made on this subject, which have brought feeble, uneducated, imprudent, or ungodly men into the ministry, to provoke the anger of God against themselves, and to be a curse to others. Nor can it be doubted, that by wrong decisions of this question, many have been kept back from entering the ministry, to their own spiritual injury and great loss to the church. If the inquiry had been rightly pursued and decided in all cases, there would have been no ungodly or incompetent ministers in the church: nor would there have been any lack of faithful, well qualified ministers and missionaries in the field of labour. It is, therefore, a subject which should be better understood by the church, and especially by her sons, on whom are soon to devolve all the responsibilities and labours of her ministry. At this time, when there is really a very great deficiency of ministers, and candidates for the ministry, and when the cause of education is beginning to assume its appropriate place among the benevolent exertions of the church, there seems to be especial necessity for the discussion of this subject. It is a discussion seldom heard from the pulpit or the press, in the judicatory of the church, or in the parlours of Christian families. Hence, when the question presses upon the conscience of a pious youth, he is perplexed, knows not how to decide it, and in many instances postpones it until he is obliged by the delay to decide in the negative, perhaps much to his own discomfort, and the loss of the church. In other cases, the question is decided in the affirmative by the fond wishes of parents or friends, who have never weighed the subject, and much injury is done, both to the youth, and the church of the living God. These suggestions are sufficient to show the importance of the question and of an enlightened discussion, which shall bring the subject distinctly before the members of the church.

In answer to the inquiry it should be observed, that in its particular application to any individual, its practical solution must be made by himself. Great mischief has been the result of deciding this question by proxy. No one, except himself, can certainly know his views, feelings, and many circumstances, which must be known in order to form an enlightened decision. Principles, however, may be stated, connexions and relations of facts described, and circumstances detailed, which are applicable to almost all cases, and the abstract question so decided, that an honest discriminating mind may be essentially aided in the inquiry; and directed to an enlightened and correct decision in his own case. Such is the object of this article.

It is a first principle in the discussion of this subject, not in any case to be invaded, that a call to the gospel ministry is from God. He, who instituted the office, provides, qualifies, and calls the man to fill it, and perform its functions. It is God's sovereign right to call whom he pleases to his work and special service. This is illustrated in the priesthood under the Old Testament dispensation. No man took this office upon himself, but he who was called of God, as was Aaron, that is, by special appointment and direction of God. This will be very evident to all those who may consult the provisions of the Mosaic statutes. (See Exod. xxviii. 1. Lev. viii. 2. Num. xvi. 5—48.—xvii. 3—11.) Both the fact and the sovereignty of God's providence are justly illustrated in the New Testament institution and history of the ministerial office. Although there is no priesthood in the Christian dispensation, nor family succession in office, there is a ministry to be fulfilled only at the call of him who instituted the same. Accordingly, Christ called twelve disciples, mostly fishermen of Galilee, qualified and commissioned them to preach the gospel to every creature. He called also to the apostleship the persecuting Saul of Tarsus, together with all the first preachers of the gospel whose names are recorded in the early history of the dispensation. All those were specially and also miraculously called. We are not, however, to infer from those facts, that miraculous interpositions were always to be continued in the church for the purpose of supplying her with a regularly called ministry. But we are to infer that He, who first called men to this office, will continue to call and qualify men for this same trust. Scarcely any branch of the church has been so corrupted as to deny this doctrine; and it may

safely be concluded that whenever this doctrine is denied by any community, it has ceased to be a branch of the church of Jesus Christ.

The practical question now to be solved is, how shall we ascertain whom God calls, and how he calls them to the work of the ministry? This is to be solved by facts and principles developed in the ordinary providence of God's dispensations. There may, however, be some extraordinary cases of exception. God can convert persecutors into friends, as the case of Paul instances. But extraordinary cases require extraordinary evidence, and come not within the general rules of judgment. The object is the same in all cases, the care is the same in itself and the evidences are connected with the same result, viz. to ascertain the fact of the call.

The *first class* of evidences, which we mention and which are indispensable, are the *necessary qualifications* for the office. Of these some are *natural*, some *gracious* or *supernatural*, and others *acquired*.

The first *natural* qualification, which we mention, is a *good intellectual capacity*. By this we mean one which reaches mediocrity without any doubt, or rises above such an estimate. The intellect is susceptible of much improvement, but weak minds can never become strong, naturally blunted and droning powers can never become acute and active.

When the duties of the ministerial office are duly estimated, it will be readily seen that good natural talents, especially intellectual, are indispensable to their appropriate discharge. There is a constant demand for laborious mental effort. The investigation of truth; the interpretation of God's revelation, in the wide range of its doctrine, precept, and promise; and the illustration of such an extensive system in a manner profitable to others, must require a vigorous mind as well as patient and laborious application. No individual, whose capacity is below what may fairly be considered mediocrity, should ever consider himself called to the gospel ministry. It is contrary to the ordinary procedure of God's dispensations, to suppose he does not adapt his means and instruments to the ends to be accomplished by them. The harmony and order displayed throughout God's government, are connected with the principle of adapting means to the ends. It is true that means and instruments are not efficient in their agencies, but this militates not against the general law of adaptation. It is also true, that in the ministry there are some cases when an extraordinary

degree of supernatural and acquired qualifications compensate, in a great measure, under peculiar circumstances, for the lack of intellectual talent. But these facts furnish no argument to dispense with* competent intellectual capacity, in all ordinary cases. God has no where taught us to disregard appropriate means, because the excellency of the power is of God and not of us. Nor are we authorized to deduce general rules from extraordinary cases—they are to be estimated by themselves; ordinary cases by ordinary rules. On this ground, it will be readily perceived, that in all ordinary cases, which comprise almost the whole that are called to the ministry, good natural talents are indispensable.

Good discretion is another important qualification of this class; by which we mean a sound judgment and a due circumspection of manners. It may be called prudence, or wisdom in avoiding errors, and in selecting means to accomplish ends which are correct and proper, including also judicious self-government. This qualification is to be estimated according to the age and circumstances of the individual, but no imprudent man can be extensively useful in the sacred office. Men will not trust him in the common concerns of life, and it is not to be supposed that God, who knows the disposition, will call him to the most important of all trusts. The directions given to Timothy and Titus enjoin these qualifications, in high and constant exercise, as indispensable.

Discretion undoubtedly admits of much improvement by knowledge and experience, but much depends on the constitution of the mind and its early habits. A mind, constitutionally imprudent and obstinately habituated to indiscretion, should consider the evidence complete for its exemption from the ministry. God does not sanction indiscretion any where, and he calls no man of incurable imprudence to this difficult work. Still we are aware that the grace of God often does much in correcting indiscreet tendencies in the natural disposition: and perhaps it may, therefore, be said, that when this is the only objection to the verity of the call, a man should commend himself to the grace of God, and seek to overcome the difficulty in his preparation for the office, and in the exercise of its functions. This may be true in its application to imprudence which arises from an ardent temperament, or even habitual carelessness, but not to that which arises from defective judgment, or a manifest want of correct discernment. Persons of the former character may sometimes be called; the latter never.

A discreet mind is so fully set forth in the qualifications described and often repeated in the New Testament, that we must believe it essential.

Good common sense is also a qualification indispensable and of immeasurable importance. This differs somewhat from discretion or prudence, although it might include the elements of a discreet mind and a judicious exercise of all the mental faculties in the ordinary concerns of life. It includes more, and intends a readiness and accuracy in discerning the relations of thoughts, feelings, and actions, by which a man acquires a correct knowledge of men and things in their character and tendencies, in judging of the proprieties of social intercourse; and a facility in accommodating himself to the circumstances, habits, and even prejudices of men. It is sometimes described by its practical result—a correct knowledge of human nature.

This qualification is illustrated in the history of the apostle Paul, and is distinctly implied in the Scriptural directions given to ministers of the gospel. Every man, who carefully reads the directions to Timothy and Titus, will perceive that what we call common sense must be involved in the character enjoined. It is also obvious that the man, whose official business it is to treat with men of diverse temperaments, knowledge, and habits, should know how to estimate character and accommodate the manner of his instructions to the widely different classes. Without this qualification, a man, with the best intentions, may not only fail of doing good, but do positive mischief. We have no doubt that this property of character may be greatly improved by observation and experience, but a great deficiency can never be supplied. It depends on a well-balanced judgment and a well-adjusted sensibility. A man may have strong intellectual power and correct moral principle, and yet be destitute of this character. The consequence will be, that such a man's conduct will be disproportioned, and his judgment can never be trusted. Any man who is naturally destitute of common sense, as now defined, will always be a novice in the world, and ought not to be in the ministry. A poet has well described this character of a well-balanced mind:

“Something there is more needful than expense,
And something previous e'en to taste—'tis sense,
Good sense, which only is the gift of heaven;
And though no science, fairly worth the seven.”

Without this qualification, a minister of the gospel cannot so manifest the truth as to "commend himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God." A large portion of those ministers, who, in our estimation, have mistaken their call, are more deficient in this respect than in any other. A vast amount of mischief has been done to the interests of the church, by the introduction of men into the sacred office, who are destitute of common sense. They may be men of piety, learning, and strong intellect, yet their influence is abridged, neutralized, or destroyed. Give us a ministry, deficient in talent, learning, and every thing else, save the fear of God, rather than in common sense. We can bear with ignorance and weakness, if need be, but with impudence, and that folly which is opposed to common sense, we cannot bear. It is like vanity, which is not often considered a vice, but is more universally detested than all the vices together.

In addition to those natural qualifications already mentioned, *good organs of speech*, and sufficient soundness of constitution to endure *laborious study and vigorous bodily effort* are necessary. By *good organs of speech*, we mean such a degree of perfection in the organs and such a command over them, that the voice may be distinct, easy, and inoffensive. We do not mean to fix a high standard of elocution, nor intimate that ministerial success depends on that excellence of speech, which consists in perfect organs and fine intonations of voice, but that a prominent, and unpleasant defect in the organs and voice disqualifies for the public preaching of the gospel. We know that some impediments in speech may be overcome by persevering effort in cultivating the art of speaking, as the history of Demosthenes and some others proves, but there are others which, either from the construction of the organs, or from want of skill in management, can never be overcome. Such persons as have unconquerable impediments in speech, should never consider themselves called to the work of the ministry. We do not rank this in importance with the other qualifications mentioned, but it is a consideration to be estimated in its place; and under certain circumstances it may be controlling. A competent readiness of speech, both in the construction and command of the organs, and in the communication of thoughts, is necessary to usefulness in a minister of the gospel.

It should be remembered, that a constitution too feeble to endure *vigorous bodily and mental effort*, cannot fulfil the

duties of the sacred office. Many seem to consider the ministry favourable to feebleness, ease, and indolence. But nothing can be more preposterous; the ministry is a laborious employment, putting in requisition more vigour of mind, more constant effort, and more resolution, than any ordinary station in human society. God does not call men to the ministry, who are, by feebleness of constitution, physically unable to perform its duties. It is, however, true, that most youth, who have sufficient health to study, may improve their vigour and firmness of constitution, under the blessing of God, by appropriate regimen and active exercise. But if a man be unfitted by feebleness for other employments, he is unfitted for the office of the holy ministry. Such, as it seems to us, are the principal *and most important* natural qualifications; but we admit, nay we insist that all these do not constitute a call to the ministry: nor is the possession of them, in the highest degree, complete evidence of the call. They are only pre-requisites, but as such are to be carefully and honestly considered in deciding the practical question.

The *supernatural or gracious* qualifications may be summarily expressed in few words; *a living, active, controlling, and consistent piety*. All this, in a much higher than the ordinary degree, is indispensable to that high and holy employment. Let us look at those characteristics a little more carefully.

The principle of grace in the heart is absolutely indispensable to the minister of Christ: for all the directions of inspiration enjoin or presuppose a pious heart. "To the wicked, God saith, what hast thou to do, to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldst take my covenant into thy mouth?" The nature of the case shows plainly that an ungodly minister can never be qualified for the godly duties of his office, but must be a curse to the church. He knows not God and obeys not his voice. An un sanctified man cannot be heartily and seriously engaged in the ministerial work. A coward might sooner be a good soldier, or a traitor be a trust-worthy officer, than an unconverted man a faithful minister. Surely God does not call to this holy office, those who are unrenewed, however learned and accomplished they may become.

But evidence of regeneration is not enough to answer the purpose in this inquiry. A man, who is to be an example to Christ's flock, must not only have grace in his heart, but such as is *living and active*. Weak graces may support a man

through an even and common course of duty; and a little strength may bear a light burden. But it is no *even* course of duty, no light burden, that rests on the minister of Jesus Christ. A man, who is to be a leader against "principalities and powers, and against spiritual wickedness in high places," must have no weak attachment to his Master, no small degree of grace, to encounter the adversary and watch against his wiles. To undertake such a work, he must possess a glowing, active piety, which will lead him humbly and constantly to rely on the promise of Christ, and the influence of the Holy Ghost; to meditate much on the instructions with which he is furnished, and live near the mercy-seat.

Moreover, his piety must be *consistent and controlling* in its influence over the feelings and passions, over the desires and volitions, over the daily habits and enterprises. In examining the case before us, a reasonable doubt of the existence of personal religion in the heart, or a wavering, unsteady, influence of religious principle, should settle the question at once in the negative. On this point, a young man cannot be too careful, or too critical in the examination. We mean not to intimate, that the faith or hope of assurance must be always ascertained before a man is authorized to believe that he is called to devote himself to the ministry. This is not to be expected; but a comfortable, abiding hope, both lively and humble, accompanied by evidences of a gracious state, which relieves the mind from perplexing doubt and distressing anxiety, should be considered indispensable. We need not, in this place, detail the evils which result from a total want of gracious qualifications, nor use arguments to prove that vital piety is necessary in a candidate for the gospel ministry; because, in our branch of the church, for the youth of which this article is particularly intended, the prevailing sentiment is strongly maintained, that piety is an essential requisite for the ministry. But it is necessary to direct the minds of our youth to the fact, that the present state of the church and the world, demands a high order of piety. The ministry to be trained up for the exigency of the present time, must be actuated by great self-denial, a burning zeal, and a firm reliance on the grace of God; all evinced by a consistent conversation, a persevering watchfulness, and fervent prayer. Something should be said to direct the attention and prayers of the church to this important subject. The church of God should be more influenced with the truth, that the spirit of serious, deep, and living piety, so in-

dispensable in the rising ministry, as well as in those already in the field of labour, is the gift of God, the fruit of the Holy Spirit. Deeply impressed with this sentiment, and the vast importance of these qualifications, the church ought to pray fervently and perseveringly for a double portion of that good Spirit, whose influence qualifies for the ministry, to rest on our youth to be called and trained for the sacred office.

The necessity of unquestioned piety for the ministry is, generally, if not universally, acknowledged in the Presbyterian church, but we think the importance of its consistent, active, and controlling character, is not sufficiently estimated. We wish to bring this thought distinctly before the praying members of the church, that they may bear it on their minds with devout earnestness when they approach the mercy-seat. We desire to bring this thought prominently before the minds of our young men, who are beginning to look towards the ministry. We wish them to understand, that all other evidences of their call to enter this office, unaccompanied by humble, fervid, and consistent piety, are of very doubtful character. If this be wanting, no matter how strongly they may feel impressed with the notion that they are called to preach the gospel, we credit them not. Men of doubtful or inconsistent piety are not called to so high a trust. Let them seek some other employment, and not impose themselves upon the church as pastors sent of God. We deprecate a cold-hearted ministry as a curse.

When we speak of those qualifications which are *acquired*, in distinction from those last mentioned, we mean those attained by human agency under the guidance and in reliance on the Spirit of God. We do not mean acquisitions of science or theological knowledge: these are necessary to the discharge of ministerial duty, but they may be attained, after the question of the call is settled, in a course of preparation, which may never be omitted. We mean *habits of self-control, diligence, and facility in acquiring knowledge*—in other words, some degree of improvement in the natural and gracious qualifications. The faculties should be so far developed, and the graces become established, that both the possessor and others may be able to judge more satisfactorily of their character, and what will be their prospects when ripened by study and experience.

Self-control, or government of the appetites, passions, and tongue, is essential to the character of him who ministers in

holy things. Those, who are to be "examples of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity," must learn the art of self-government. They must possess the elements of such a character before they devote themselves to the sacred office, or they have not good reasons to consider themselves called of God to the work.

As for *habits of diligence and facility of acquiring knowledge*, their necessity may be readily seen. Christ has no use for idle drones, and men of sluggish minds, in this laborious service. Men, whose habits are unconquerably idle, and who will not devote their minds to the acquisition of knowledge with intensity and perseverance, may vegetate away their lives in some other pursuit; the ministry is no place for them; Christ does not call them to mope in his work. It is placing too much in jeopardy to expect that a man of idle habits and sluggish intellect, will be roused to diligence and mental energy by an introduction to the sacred office. Such an expectation is not warranted by the word of God, the nature of the case, or by experience.

We mention *facility* in acquiring knowledge in this class, because it does not always depend on the strength of intellect, and must be ascertained by sufficient experiment. There is ordinarily an opportunity for ascertaining this fact in the early stages of education. But let it be remembered that a man's mind must be disciplined to intense and accurate investigation, and a readiness in directing the attention from one subject to another. This will be readily conceded, when it is recollected that the greatest portion of a minister's time for study consists of fragments and short intervals between the active duties of pastoral labour; and if these are lost, his course will certainly be retrograde. Lost, they certainly will be, without this discipline. Its elements are diligence, facility of learning, and intensity of thought. These must be acquired to a good degree in early life, or in all ordinary cases they will not be acquired at all. Most other qualifications, that are acquired, may be assigned to a course of preparation, especially in the cases of young men. Sometimes the question is pressed upon a man's conscience after the age of twenty-five or thirty years. In all such cases the ripeness of the judgment, and the habits of mind and business will have developed the features of character; and it will then be very difficult to break up old habits and establish new ones. Of such cases we shall say something before we close this article. We now proceed with the cases of youth.

After all that we have said, the practical difficulty in deciding the question is not removed. Not one, nor all, of the qualifications mentioned, can constitute a call to the ministry, but they are prerequisites, without which no call can be proved. And we have been the more particular and prolix on this part of the inquiry, because we think it is altogether too much neglected. It is important that these qualifications should be well considered, that time and expense may be saved when young men have been led by some inexplicable impulse, to undertake the preparation for a work, to which they were never called, and for which they could never be qualified.

But how shall a young man estimate his own qualifications? We answer this question very briefly. A young man, desirous to enter the ministry, should examine his mind, disposition, habits, and gracious affections, with great care, frequency, and prayer: he should deal honestly with himself. But if, after all, he is unable to decide on all the parts of his character to his own satisfaction, let him select some pious, intelligent, and judicious friend of his acquaintance, and state the case for his counsel. Let him seek for one who will neither flatter, nor deal harshly with him; one who will be honest and faithful. The mere statement of his case to a friend may serve to satisfy him; if he should get no advice; and the observations of a judicious friend may present the main points of his character, or some relations of the inquiry in such a light as to produce entire satisfaction.

We shall now state distinctly what constitutes a call to the ministry, and intimate some of the evidences which are satisfactory in favour of its reception.

The call consists in the influence of the Holy Ghost enlightening the mind to apprehend the duty, and directing the feelings to desire and seek to be employed by Christ in the holy ministry. This is a call to the sacred office, and nothing else can be substituted in its place. It may sometimes be counterfeited, and young men may for a time be deceived, and the church may be deceived in them, but the result will undeceive both. Against such deception every possible effort should be made to guard our young men, and the church.

But the practical difficulty is not in giving an abstract definition of the call itself; it lies in ascertaining the evidence of the Spirit's influence, enlightening and directing the mind. To this point we make a few remarks. It now becomes a question of fact.

The qualifications being presupposed, without which it is needless to inquire at all, we say that the fact is to be ascertained in the same way that every other influence of the Holy Spirit is to be ascertained; by the effects produced on the mind. Miraculous interpositions, audible voices, dreams, or unaccountable visions, are not to be expected, sought, nor regarded. The dispensation and the age in which we live have no such character. Those evidences did belong to the introduction of the gospel dispensation, and were given for a special and temporary purpose. If, in our time, they are supposed to exist, and affirmed actually to have been witnessed, we more than suspect the truth of both the supposition and affirmation. Supernatural appearances, and audible voices from heaven, are imaginary, and come not from the Spirit of God. The great Head of the church has furnished his people with a perfect rule of faith and conduct in the revelation of his will, and sufficient guidance in the special, but not miraculous influence of the Holy Spirit. It is true that men may dream of facts and principles of duty in accordance with revealed truth. When a man's mind is deeply exercised from day to day, and has become familiar with the subject, but not satisfied, it is not strange, that in restless sleep, his thoughts should pursue the perplexing topic. It may sometimes happen, that the imagination, unfettered by the severities of wakeful inquiry, will form a happy combination of facts and circumstances, which may serve to extricate the subject from its difficulties. The clue being thus furnished, the mind, in the due exercise of all its wakeful energies, may come to an enlightened decision. Such things have occurred, though rarely, in the common concerns of life, and possibly they may have sometimes been connected with the solution of this question. But such things are entitled to regard, no further than they will bear the scrutiny of the most critical and devout examination. We are not prepared to say that the Holy Spirit, or those "ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to the heirs of salvation," never operate on the imagination to govern and regulate its wayward and discursive flights. But it is certainly not their ordinary method of guidance. What we mean to affirm, and earnestly to maintain, is, that impressions of the imagination cannot be trusted in this case. When, therefore, any man relies upon such supposed evidences of his call to the ministry, we are sure that he errs, if not in the result, certainly in the method

and evidence of its attainment. The principle is wrong, and the process unsatisfactory.

The great practical question must be determined according to the principles we have suggested, by the *character* of the views and feelings; the *inducements* which associate most readily and habitually with the desire; and the *circumstances* which obviously attend the case. Let all these be carefully examined.

The *character* of the *views and feelings* should be scrutinized with the utmost care, great seriousness, and earnest persevering prayer for divine direction. The test, by which they are all to be estimated, is the revealed will of God. No preconceived apprehensions of the nature, responsibility, pleasures, or privations of the ministerial office, can be admitted as the rule of estimation. The rule is prescribed in the gospel, and must not be forsaken; the whole directions relating to the subject must be consulted; the terms of the commission; the instructions, by precept and example, for its execution; and the account to be rendered.

The *views*, which are produced by the influence of God's Spirit, will accord with the inspired descriptions in the book of truth. The *feelings*, induced by the same influence, must be impressed with the sentiment of amazing importance attached to those descriptions of means in the accomplishment of God's gracious designs.

The ministry is a vastly important work, solemnly responsible, requiring laborious diligence, untiring patience, and great self-denial. The candidate must have some just views of the relations to God and to the church involved in the ministry. We do not mean to say that he must appreciate all its duties, perplexities, trials, honours, and pleasures; this cannot be without experience in the work. But he should have just views as far as they extend, and these should be somewhat more enlarged than is common to persons of his age and advantages. Looking into the instructions of the New Testament, he will perceive the relation of the office to the salvation of immortal souls: and then looking upon a world lying in wickedness, he will perceive the appropriateness and importance of the ministry as a means of bringing sinners from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God. He will perceive the need of many more labourers in the field, that "the harvest is plenteous, but the labourers few;" and the necessities of perishing millions will lead him to feel desirous

of being employed as an humble instrument to rescue some precious souls from the slavery of sin and Satan, and bring them to Christ.

The *feelings* must be those of commiseration for perishing sinners, great anxiety for their salvation, a tender regard for the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, and a serious earnestness to be instrumental in promoting the glory of God. A desire to glorify God and promote the salvation of souls, must be the controlling principle and governing anxiety of his mind. The ministry must not be desired ultimately, nor principally, for the sake of gratifying friends, nor for gaining advantages of study and mental improvement; nor for the sake of ease, emolument, or respectability; nor for the sake of gratifying a taste for argument, philosophy, or eloquence; but with singleness of heart to please God. The honesty and pureness of the desire form an essential character of the feelings: let them be thoroughly examined and conscientiously estimated.

This desire for the ministry, excited by divine influence, will frequently arise and be associated with the most serious moments and duties. It will often kindle into earnestness in the exercises of devotion, in reading God's word, and in contemplating the great want of ministers in the church and missionary field. The more difficulty a man finds in settling the question of duty, and the longer he postpones the decision, the more frequently will the desire recur. And the feelings of anxiety connected with thoughts of the ministry, will be excited not only when the employment and subjects of meditation are naturally suggested, but in the bustle of business, and ordinary occupations. Sometimes, from the perplexity and obstacles attending the inquiry, there may be an effort to repress the feelings and banish the thoughts connected with this inquiry, but they will again recur, and in many cases more frequently from the effort to repress them. This is a character of the feelings and manner of their development which deserves to be well considered.

The *strength*, as well as the purity and frequency of the desires, should be particularly observed. Those, who are called by the Spirit of God, will feel neither faint nor sluggish wishes, but strong aspirations of the heart, often eager, energetic and absorbing, carrying them often before the mercy-seat to plead for direction. The desire often becomes so strong and eager, that no difficulty can discourage hope, no effort can banish the anxiety, and no object can divert the mind from its

absorbing interest in the question. This may not be the constant and uniform character of the desires, but if difficulties and doubts attend the inquiry, the strength of the anxiety will increase; and whatever may be the intervals of anxiety, the intensity of the feelings will increase at each recurrence.

Men always have some *inducements* to cherish any desire, and to seek any object or employment. In this case they should be carefully examined. The deceitfulness of the heart, even when partially sanctified, and the subtleties of the adversary will often perplex and disturb the mind: it will, therefore, be necessary to examine, most critically, all the bearings of this question. All selfish gratification, all worldly ends, and all unhallowed ambition, should be separated from the inducements to the ministry. There may, sometimes, be difficulty in ascertaining the reasons which have the strongest influence over the feelings and desires. A tempting adversary, and the unsanctified propensities of the heart, may endeavour to corrupt the desires by mingling secular, or some other improper inducements along with the glory of God, in promoting the salvation of souls. The inquiry here should be, what are the inducements which most naturally occur to the mind, and associate with the desires and feelings? Sometimes an occurrence, which has been forgotten, may have excited very early predilections for the ministry, without any hope of piety existing at the time, and without any just sense of the vast importance and responsibility involved in the work. In the course of preparation, or in the progress of business, in which such a youth may have engaged, the Holy Ghost may have renewed and sanctified his heart, and turned his anxieties into another channel, and toward a higher object, although involving the same office. Then his views and feelings will be associated with the glory of God in man's salvation; but still the accustomed worldly motives may frequently intermingle with his better inducements, and perplex his mind on the question of duty. The best remedy and preventive for such perplexities, are prayer and watchfulness against unhallowed feelings, whether arising from the cause abovementioned, or any other. It may be stated that a detection of unhallowed, ambitious feelings in the heart, is not conclusive evidence that God has not called the man to his work; but if they predominate, and form a prevailing habit of the mind, they are utterly inconsistent with the supposition of a call from God. They belong not to the class of feelings and desires induced by the Spirit of

God: they militate against the evidence of a call, so far as they become habitual and strong, or are indulged. The truth is, corruptions will occasionally mingle with the holiest duties, and the best desires of men, but they may not be allowed or cherished in any degree, nor the fact made an apology for any insincerity. Many unholy considerations often trouble the Christian, and none more than him who begins to look towards the ministry of reconciliation. All the inducements, therefore, as well as the desires, should be examined most seriously and devoutly, before the question can be answered, and the estimate fully and satisfactorily made.

Providential *circumstances* are also to be considered, and may sometimes have a controlling influence in deciding the question. Events in God's providence may change the relations and prospects of an individual so entirely as to leave no room for further inquiry. They may remove all probability of attaining the requisite qualifications; new responsibilities may be brought upon a man in some new relations, which militate altogether against preparation for the ministry. Other circumstances in providence, may be intended to try the integrity, perseverance, and energy, of those desires and feelings, which tend to the sacred office. They may seem prospectively adverse, but are calculated to develop the character and qualifications for usefulness in the sacred work.

In other cases, events occur which remove obstacles, and open the way to gratify a desire long secretly cherished, but which seemed to be forbidden by the providence of God. All providential circumstances, which have a direct bearing on the object in view, should be carefully examined, and prayerfully estimated. But ordinary events should not be made to decide questions which require so much personal examination: and it may be requisite to state the whole case to some judicious friends, for their counsel.

But let it be remembered, that the obligation is personal, and the ministry must be undertaken voluntarily, from one's own conviction of duty. The only reliance on another's advice in this case, which can be allowed, is to aid in discovering the path of duty; and God employs the sound judgment of pious friends, as well as other dispensations of his providence in leading to this discovery. But the more independently of all advice the question can be fully and satisfactorily settled, the more firm, uniform, and persevering are likely to be the efforts in attaining the desired object.

There is a class of cases of somewhat frequent occurrence, on which we proposed to make a few remarks. We mean those in which men have this question pressed upon their minds late in life; after the judgment is matured, habits are formed and arrangements of business have been made. These are often more difficult to decide than any others. But some of them are the most easy; and we have often wondered at the difficulties which press upon minds cultivated and disciplined by education, study, and professional engagements. We now allude to such as have received an early education with other views, and have been employed in the professions of law or medicine, or in the instruction of youth. Sometimes men of this description are called to engage in the ministry, and yet have great difficulty in deciding the practical question. Perhaps it is sufficient to refer their case to another class; and let them try their qualifications, the character of their feelings and desires, and their circumstances, according to the suggestions which we have already made.

But there are some, who have had less advantages in early life, whose minds are tried on this subject. From the nature and circumstances of their case, there must be more difficulty in solving the question. Perhaps there would be no difficulty in deciding on such cases, if there were not great want of ministers in actual service. Then, it is fair to conclude, the evidence of the call would be so extraordinary and distinct, that there would be no room for doubt. This conclusion is in accordance with the common procedure of God's government, in which he adapts his directions to the exigency of the times. We could not exclude all such from the sacred office, nor would we encourage them on slight grounds to seek it.

There are now situations in the Church, which are destitute of pastors, and are likely to remain destitute, in which a man of sound discretion, vigorous enterprise, ardent piety, and moderate acquirements in literature and science, might be very useful in the ministry. It is commonly easy to ascertain the character of a man's judgment, common sense, piety, and energy, at the age now supposed. But if there should be a doubt of the character after the maturity of twenty-five or thirty years, we should consider it an excluding fact. Of all these qualifications, it should be said in such a case, they must be much above mediocrity. No man should consider himself called away from the common occupations of life, at so late a period, whether from agricultural, mechanical, or mercantile pursuits,

or from the instruction of youth, unless he is acknowledged to possess some qualifications of high order, which give him influence in society, and the confidence of the Church. There is one difficulty, however, which such men should confidently examine. It is the breaking up of established habits and engaging in a new employment, amidst entirely new associations. This is never easily done. Its practicability at every age depends on the mental discipline and facility of acquiring knowledge. If, at the age now contemplated, a man's mind be not disciplined to accurate thought, and ready expression, he will find it next to impossible for him to be either comfortable or useful in the ministry. With a prospect so extremely doubtful, no one should consider himself called to undertake the duties of the sacred office.

It is sometimes said, that men of cultivated minds and taste, cannot live and be useful among rough, uncultivated, and poor people, we must, therefore, have some men of moderate acquirements, who will be satisfied with coarse fare, uncouth manners, and the privations incident to such places. But the force of this argument in its principal intention, we deny: it is used as an apology for introducing ignorance into the pulpit. It is indeed, true, that habits formed in cultivated society, and in the acquisition of a thorough education, may lead a man to desire a place congenial to his taste, especially as such places afford a more dense population, and a larger sphere of usefulness, but it is not true, that he cannot live and labour wherever his Master calls him to go. If his heart be thoroughly imbued with the love of Christ, and a desire to be instrumental in saving precious souls, he will be ready to sacrifice any worldly pleasure, and to practise any self-denial involved in a plain course of duty. The truth is, such comparisons are out of place, when used to justify the introduction of unqualified men to the ministry. There can be no apology for introducing ignorance and boorish habits into the sacred office. Piety and poverty cannot consecrate such to be instructors and examples in the Church of God.

Still we would not infer, that no man, without a thorough classical education, or the time and means of attaining it, is ever called to the gospel ministry. Men, possessing a high order of native talent, sound discriminating judgment, ardent piety, and persevering industry, may be very useful in this office, with a limited stock of learning. Some of our most useful men, in active pastoral duties, are of this description.

And more of them might be employed to great advantage in the Church. But in such cases, the evidences of the call should be clear and decisive, leaving no doubt in the mind of the individual himself: and we think, in this case, the public estimation of his character should be well considered. It is a good rule for such a man to adopt, that unless the path of duty is made very plain before him, he should remain in the employment where providence has placed him. When once a man has arranged his plan, entered upon his course of business, formed, and adjusted his habits to his employment for several years, he should have very substantial reasons for leaving a lawful employment, and undertaking so entire a change. Examples of most disastrous character are not wanting in the ministry, where the experiment has been made, with complete failure.

With these remarks, we commend this whole subject to the most careful and devout attention of all such as think of dedicating themselves to the gospel ministry. We commend it to the fervent prayers of the church; and record our earnest supplication, that the Lord would call, qualify, and send forth able and faithful ministers of the New Testament, to supply the great deficiency of spiritual labourers in his vineyard.

ART. IV.—ARABS OF THE DESERT.

Notes on the Bedouins and Wahabys, collected during his travels in the East, by the late JOHN LEWIS BURCKHARDT.
London: 1830. 4to. pp. 439.

THESE notes of the persevering Burckhardt relate chiefly to the Arabs of the desert, and furnish an account of their condition as late as 1816, soon after which the author died in Egypt, whilst contemplating the exploration of the interior of Africa. They are mere memoranda, which might have formed an appropriate appendix to his volume of travels in Arabia; but as they embody a larger number of particulars respecting these interesting Nomades, than any other traveller has been able to furnish, we shall undertake to condense them for our pages.

The volume commences with a classification of the Bedouin tribes of the Syrian desert. Of these the most powerful are the Aenezes, who live in the northern part of Arabia; generally passing the winter on a plain bordered by the Euphrates;

sometimes crossing it and encamping near Bagdad; and in the spring usually found towards the frontiers of Syria, stretching their line of tents from Aleppo to Damascus. They seldom, however, remain on the same spot a longer time than while the scanty herbage supplies pasture for their camels and flocks. The population of the northern Aenezes is estimated at about three hundred and fifty thousand, spread over an extent of forty thousand square miles. The number of tents in an encampment varies from ten to eight hundred. The tents are covered with stuff manufactured from black goat's hair, which is impervious to rain: they are divided into apartments for each sex, of which the men's may be designated as the parlour, the women's as the kitchen.

The Bedouin's summer dress consists of a cotton shirt, over which a woollen mantle, or a long cotton or silk gown, is worn. A turban, made of a square handkerchief or shawl, completes the male costume. The Aenezes never shave their hair, but suffer it to hang in tresses to the breast. They wear leathern girdles around their naked waists. In winter they put on a pelisse of sheep-skins. The females dress in cotton gowns, have large handkerchiefs around their heads, puncture their lips, cheeks, and arms, and dye them blue; they are adorned with rings in their noses and ears, and with glass or silver necklaces and bracelets.

The most usual weapon of the Arabs is the lance, which they procure from Gaza in Palestine, and from Bagdad; sabres, knives, clubs, guns and pistols are also in their armoury. Many of them have shields and steel coats of mail, with helmets.

Flour boiled with water, or camel's milk; or with butter and dates, bread, and dried wheat boiled with butter and oil, constitute their main diet. Of animals, they eat the gazelle and the jerboa; (probably the mouse of Levit. xi. 29. 1 Sam. vi. 4. Isa. lxvi. 17;) on extraordinary occasions, a lamb or camel is killed. Wild asses, ostriches, and lizards, are eaten by some tribes. The stork, partridge, wild goose, and a species of eagle, are also found in the desert.

Blacksmiths and saddlers are the only mechanics among the Arabs, and their's are regarded as degrading occupations, unfit for a native. The men tan their own leather, and the women weave their cloth. Their water and milk bottles or bags, are universally made of leather. Their property consists principally in horses and camels: the wealth of individuals varying from the

abject poverty of possessing one camel, to the easy circumstances of thirty or forty, or the opulence of hundreds. The fortunes, however, of a race against whom every man's hand is raised, as well as theirs against every man, are necessarily precarious: and the invasion of a hostile tribe, an unsuccessful attack, or a midnight robbery, often reduces the most wealthy to indigence in a single hour.

“It may be almost said that the Arabs are obliged to rob and pillage. Most families of the Aenezes are unable to defray the annual expenses from the profits on their cattle, and few Arabs would sell a camel to purchase provisions; he knows, from experience, that to continue long in a state of peace, diminishes the wealth of an individual: war and plunder, therefore, become necessary. The sheikh is obliged to lead his Arabs against the enemy, if there be one; if not, it can easily be contrived to make one. But it may be truly said, that wealth alone does not give a Bedouin any importance among his people. A poor man, if he be hospitable and liberal according to his means, always killing a lamb when a stranger arrives, giving coffee to all the guests present, holding his bag of tobacco always ready to supply the pipes of his friends, and sharing whatever booty he gets among his poor relations, sacrificing his last penny to honour his guest or relieve those who want, obtains infinitely more consideration and influence among his tribe, than the miser who receives a guest with coldness, and lets his poor friends starve. As riches among this nation of robbers do not confer influence or power, so the wealthy person does not derive from them any more refined gratification than the poorest individual of the tribe may enjoy. The richest sheikh lives like the meanest of his Arabs: they both eat every day of the same dishes, and in the same quantity, and never partake of any luxury unless on the arrival of a stranger, when the host's tent is open to all his friends. They both dress in the same kind of shabby gown and *messhlakh*. The chief pleasure in which the chief may indulge, is the possession of a swift mare, and the gratification of seeing his wife and daughters better dressed than the other females of the camp.”

The Arabs of Sinai are the only tribe who are not robbers by profession. An article of dress or furniture may be left without risk in the open field. Some years ago one of that race bound his own son, and precipitated him from the summit of a mountain, because he had been convicted of stealing corn from a friend.

“Bankruptcy, in the usual acceptation of the word, is unknown among the Arabs. A Bedouin either loses his property by the enemy, or he expends it in profuse hospitality. In the latter case he is praised by the whole tribe; and as the generous Arab is most frequently endued with other nomadic virtues, he seldom fails to regain, by some lucky stroke, what he had so nobly lost.”

The state of science among them is very low. It is extremely rare to find an Arab who can read or write. Most of them know the names of the constellations and planets, but are not farther advanced in astronomy. Heroic and amatory poetry are in high esteem, and is often recited by their minstrels to the accompaniment of a sort of guitar. Singing constitutes a favourite amusement in their religious and other festivals, the principal of which is that on the occasion of circumcision.

Medical knowledge is rare: written charms are in principal vogue, and some few indigenous herbs are used. The small-pox makes frequent ravages, but vaccination is now adopted in Syria, and will probably soon be resorted to by the tribes of the desert. The treatment of fevers and diseases of the stomach is abandoned, if the application of red-hot wire, or heated wood is not successful. They never practise venesection; but in cases of headache draw a few drachms of blood from the forehead by incisions. A species of leprosy is still occasionally found and is deemed incurable. Some are born with the disease. The Arabs declare, that if it once commences its ravages in a family, it is never eradicated, but that it does not descend from the parent to the child, but passing the intermediate generation, attacks the grand-child. The leper is as much abhorred and avoided as he was under the Levitical law, and this share of the misfortune involves even the uninfected members of his family. Old age is rare.

The children are trained from their infancy to the independence, toil, and cunning, which will make them distinguished thieves and freebooters. The profession of robbery is considered honourable, and the term *robber* is one of the most flattering distinctions that can be conferred on their youth. They are at the same time indoctrinated in the Wahaby religion, which our author calls the Puritanism of Islam; the ceremonies of which the Bedouins strictly observe; reciting the daily prayer, and observing the fast of Ramazan with due austerity. They dare not touch swine, blood, or corpses. Each

family usually sacrifices a camel or seven sheep, for each adult person of their number who has died during the year.

With respect to the peculiarities of the creed of this new sect of Mohammedism, Burckhardt was not able to procure full information, but has collected a hundred and fifty pages of 'materials for its history.' It was introduced among the Aenezes about thirty years ago, from the Wahaby Arabs, who take their name from Abd el Wahab, who, under the impression that the true Moslem faith had become corrupted, undertook, towards the end of the last century, to restore its pristine purity. Saoud was his first convert, married his daughter, and became the political chief of the new sect. After the manner of the great Prophet, they raised an army to correct the theological errors of his backslidden disciples, and their orthodox arms spread dismay in Arabia. The aberrations charged upon Mohammedans were principally these: that they offered veneration, almost divine, to the prophet and to many saints; invoking them, and paying sacred honours at their tombs. The graves of many sheikhs had been covered with small oratories, in which the Mussulmans assembled, and at length offered sacrifices in honour of the dead, as saints. The Wahabys made these buildings the first objects of destruction in their progress, crying out whilst thus engaged, "God have mercy upon those who destroyed, and none upon those who built them!" Even the tomb of Mohammed himself, at Medina, was attacked, but its solid structure defied the efforts of the soldiers. The Wahabys charged their apostate brethren with a Pharisaic punctuality in prayer, purifications, and fastings, whilst they neglected the poor, indulged in forbidden pleasures, disregarded the administration of justice, were too lenient to infidels, indulged in inebriating drink and lewdness, and departed grossly from the pure morals required by their religion. Wahab did not pretend to add to, or alter, any of the principles of Islam, but was resolutely bent on effecting a return to the strict requisitions of the Koran and the Sunne.

Fanaticism is the same in Arabia as in America. The followers of Wahab went on in their zeal of reformation, until they found mortal heresy in the most insignificant innovations. Their zeal was directed against the smoking of tobacco, and the wearing of rich clothing: the former practice being disapproved of by the *olemas*—the "Fathers" of Moslem—and the latter contravening the sumptuary precepts of the prophet himself.

These rigorous changes, combined with the political power

by which they were promoted, were gradually successful until the Wahabys governed the greater part of Arabia. Saoud, "father of mustachios," died in middle age, in 1814. He was an excellent man for an Arab. He was kind to his family, warm and sincere in his friendships, and inexorably just as a chief; but his bigotry was so intolerant as to allow no intercourse between his sect and the heretical Mussulmans. He compelled his adherents by force to punctuality in their devotions, regularly performed the pilgrimage to Mecca, and made it a capital offence to break the fast of Ramazan. Among his judicious schemes were his efforts to diminish the frequency of divorces, and to abolish usury. His followers were distinguished by the plainness of their dress and equipage: they reject music, dancing, singing, and all kinds of games, and live with each other on terms of entire equality.

Polygamy is a privilege of the Bedouins, but few of them have more than one wife at once, though each man may divorce his wife at pleasure, and re-marry any number of times without disgracing either himself or his repudiated companion. Burckhardt saw men about forty-five years of age, who were known to have had fifty wives in this mode of succession. If a young man leaves a widow, his brother generally offers to marry her; though this is not required by law or universal custom. Notwithstanding this disorganizing facility of divorce, Arab children hold their parents in great respect, and show particular affection to their mothers.

The independence of the sons of the 'wild man' of Paran, is not controlled even by civil government. Each tribe has its chief sheikh, and every camp a sheikh, but these officers have no power over individuals, and are only selected as leaders in battle, and guides in their progresses. Their advice is respectfully received, but he does not utter a command. Private quarrels are sustained by the respective families of the hostile parties, and their dispute is settled by open violence. The Bedouin boasts that he has no master but the Lord of the Universe, and the most powerful chief would not venture to incur the retribution of the friends of the poorest of his subjects, by attempting to punish him. They have *kadis*, however, to whom they refer their great disputes, and before whom criminal offenders are brought, and mulcted in sheep or camels for their transgressions.

The law of retaliation is enjoined by the Koran, and the heir of a man unjustly slain, is allowed to put the homicide to death.

The Arabs have given a dreadful extension to this privilege, under the name of 'the blood-revenge,' by which the representatives of the deceased claim expiation from any successive generation of the murderer. Sometimes a pecuniary recompense is accepted in lieu of life, and if it is not, the slayer, with all those liable to the blood-revenge, are allowed three days and four hours to escape. Many hundred tents are often removed in consequence of a single murder, and the fugitives remain in exile for ever, if a reconciliation be not effected with the relatives of the dead. Families have thus wandered for more than fifty years, and when two generations have passed away without an acceptance of the proffered price of blood.

Burckhardt furnishes a curious account of the thievery of these tribes, which is pursued by them as a lawful vocation, and with no disgrace attached to detection, as amongst the subjects of Lycurgus. We abridge several pages on this subject.

"The Arab robs his enemies, his friends, and his neighbours, provided that they are not actually in his own tent, where their property is sacred. To rob in the camp or among friendly tribes is not reckoned creditable to a man; yet no stain remains upon him for such an action, which is, in fact, of daily occurrence. If an Arab intends to go on a predatory excursion, he takes with him a dozen friends. When they reach the camp, three of them go at midnight to the tent that is to be robbed; one excites the attention of the watch-dogs, and by flying before them withdraws them from the camp. A second advances to the camels, who are lying before the tent, cuts the strings that confine their legs, to prevent their rising, and makes as many rise as he wishes, which they always do without the least noise. He then has only to lead one, the rest follow him out of the camp. The third companion, stands in the mean time, before the tent-door, ready, with a club, to knock down any person who might come forth. Having gotten them from the camp, each seizes a tail of the strongest of the camels, which puts the animals on a gallop, and they are thus dragged to the rendezvous of the party. If the adventurous three are surrounded before they escape, the *rabit* or first one seized is asked, (the question being usually accompanied by some blows on the head) on what business he has come; to which the common reply is, 'I came to rob, God has overthrown me.' He is then taken into a tent and beaten till he renounces his *dakheil*—that is the privilege allowed every person in danger, of touching a third person, or any thing he has about him, spitting on him,

or throwing a stone upon him, exclaiming at the same time ‘I am thy protected:’ which obliges this third person to defend him, which he does at all hazards. This renunciation is valid only for one day, and must be renewed every successive day. The captive is then placed in a kind of grave in the ground of the tent, as long as his body, and about two feet deep, where he is chained by his feet, his hands tied, and his hair twisted to two stakes, and fastened in the ground. Poles are then laid across, and heavy articles heaped on them, leaving him only a small space for breath. He is kept thus—sometimes six months—until his captor exacts the utmost ransom the *rabiet* can pay, which generally includes his whole property. If, however, he can contrive to spit at any one in the tent, or even receive a morsel of bread from a child, or eat part of the same date with another person, without the renunciation of *dakheil*, he is instantly released, though the patron thus made be one of his captor’s household. Sometimes a female relation has been known to come secretly to the tent of the captive, with a ball of thread, tie one end to the foot of the prisoner, or throw it in his mouth, and then winding it off till she comes to another tent, awakes the owner, touching him with the thread, and telling him that it is under his protection. He is obliged to rise, follow the clew, and claim the prisoner as his *dakheil*. If any man should hurt the *dakheil* of another, his whole property would not be thought by the kadi sufficient to atone for such an offence—greater than if he had injured the protector himself.”

“When the robbers believe they are likely to be detected, or from any other cause, abandon the enterprize, they enter any of the tents, awake the people in it, and declare, ‘We are robbers, and wish to halt.’ ‘You are safe,’ is the reply. A fire is immediately kindled, coffee prepared, and breakfast placed before the strangers, who are entertained as long as they choose to stay. At their departure, provision is given to them sufficient for their journey home. Should they meet on their return, a hostile party of the tribe, which they had intended to rob, their declaration, ‘We have eaten salt in such or such a tent,’ is a passport that ensures them a safe journey; or, at all events, the testimony of their host would release them from the hands of any Arabs, whether of his own or some friendly tribe.”

Hospitality is the most sacred virtue of the desert; and it is stated, that a violation of these rites has not occurred within the memory of any living person. The life and property of a

stranger may be safely confided to an Aeneze; and however importunate the guides may be for presents, they are most punctiliously faithful to their employers. Yet, such is their inordinate love of gain, that no dependance is to be placed on their veracity in matters of merchandise; and they cheat each other at every opportunity. They are not chargeable, as a nation, with any excess of sensuality; being rather abstemious than otherwise. In his tent, the Arab is lazy and indolent, leaving his wife and daughters to perform the drudgery of the domestic concerns: but seated on his mare, no toil is too great for him. A striking characteristic of the Bedouin is his patience under poverty and suffering. He is too proud to show discontentment or to utter complaint: never begs for assistance, but strives with his utmost labour to retrieve his losses. Their belief in fate and a controlling Providence, enables them to meet every adversity, with a stoical endurance. But this resignation does not lead the Arab, as it does the Turk, to apathy; they are incited to stronger exertion by calamity, and reproach the Turks with the proverb, 'He bared his back to the musquitoes, and then exclaimed, God has decreed that I should be stung.'

We do not find many new illustrations of the natural history of the Bible in this volume. The female camel is the most valuable possession of the Arab, and next to it in estimation, is a fleet mare. With respect to the capability of camels to endure the want of water, it is said, that this faculty varies according to their different races: those from cold climates requiring drink every second day; but that all over Arabia four whole days in summer, or possibly, in some cases, five, constitute the utmost extent of time that they can endure the privation. In the winter they seldom drink, excepting when on journeys; the early succulent herbs supplying them with sufficient moisture. There is no territory, however, according to this traveller, in any route through Arabia, where wells are farther distant from each other than three and a half days journey. He never knew of water being found in the stomach of a slaughtered camel. He heard an incredible tradition of a camel travelling two hundred and fifty miles in a day, but had every reason to trust another account of a camel, which, for a wager, went a hundred and twenty-five miles in eleven hours. He says, that the natural gaits of a camel are not so swift as those of the horse: that its natural pace is an easy, gentle amble of about five miles an hour, at which rate it will continue for many

days and nights. Messengers have thus reached Aleppo from Bagdad, a journey of twenty-five days for caravans, in seven days; and from Cairo to Mecca, a usual journey of forty-five days, in eighteen days, without changing their animals.

Locusts abound in the desert; sometimes ravaging all the vegetation, and even penetrating the dwellings, and devouring the leathern vessels. As they come invariably from the East, the Arabs suppose they are produced by the waters of the Persian Gulf. They are still used for food when boiled, salted, and dried. Mr. Madden says, they are often ground and made into bread. Burckhardt mentions, that the general impression of the abundance of horses in Arabia, is very erroneous. The breed is limited to the fertile pasture grounds, such as those in Mesopotamia, on the banks of the Euphrates, and the Syrian plains. He supposes, that the aggregate number in all Arabia, as bounded by Syria and the Euphrates, does not exceed fifty thousand.

We cannot go farther into the details furnished in the notes before us. The outlines we have given are sufficient to show, that the character of this people has not been changed in the thirty-seven centuries, which have elapsed since the angel of the Lord proclaimed to the exile-mother of their ancestor—‘Behold, thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name *Ishmael*, because the Lord hath heard thy affliction: and he shall be a wild man, his hand against every man, and every man’s hand against him: and he shall dwell in the presence of his brethren.’ The tribes of the desert are the living proofs of the faithfulness of Him who heard Abraham’s prayer, and announced, ‘Behold, I have blessed *Ishmael*, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly: twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation.’

ARTICLE V.—MEMOIR AND SERMONS OF THE REV.
EDWARD PAYSON, D. D.

A Memoir of the Rev. Edward Payson, D. D., late Pastor of the Second Church in Portland. By Asa Cummings, Editor of the Christian Mirror. Second Edition, Boston, Crocker & Brewster. New York, J. Leavitt, 1830, 8vo. 12mo. pp. 400.

Sermons by the late Edward Payson, D. D., Portland. Shirley and Hyde, 1828, 8vo. pp. 503.

WE think that no man can rise from the perusal of the works which we have placed at the head of this article, but with deep, and in some respects, melancholy emotions. It will not be so much, that he has been conversing with a man naturally of melancholy temperament, though it will not be strange if he rises with some of the shades hovering over him, which occasionally darkened Payson's path. It may not be, that he is looking upon the only memorials that remain of a personal friend. But it will be, that this shining light, so far as the earth is concerned, is extinguished; that this burning, rapid, ethereal heaven-born spirit, that so well knew the way to the human heart, and so faithfully rebuked crime, and so victoriously raised the standard of the Messiah whenever he went forth to spiritual battles, has gone where the din of conflict is unheard. That warrior sleeps in death. He left the scene at an early age, and left it too, we fear, because he did not hear the cautious voice of prudence, till it was too late. The tongue sleeps in death, unable to speak for its master; and the eye is closed unfeared by the sinner, made speechless and dim to all human appearance, by a zeal too ardent for the frail body, and by disregarding the lessons of colder, but more useful wisdom.

These works are all that remain as memorials of this faithful and successful minister of the Gospel. To us he was personally a stranger. Yet we had heard of his name; and as a most successful and pungent preacher, his fame was known extensively in the churches of this country. As a tribute to his well earned reputation, he was invited to two of the most important stations in our land. And we doubt not, that it will be conceded that he was one of the most successful preachers that have adorned the American pulpit. We know the disadvantages under which

we attempt to form an estimate of character, when we have only the embodied form of thought; when we sit down as critics to review, with hearts cold and barren, the doings of a man of singular piety; when we have not seen the man, nor been admitted to the confidence of private friendship, nor heard his voice in the thronged assembly, nor beheld the kindling of his eye, the fervor of action, the power of the persuasion that bears men onward to the point at which it aims.

Yet we sat down not so much to look at the man, as to search for the elements of success in the gospel ministry. With that view, we have turned over the pages of these works with singular interest, and we propose to lay the results of our reflections before our readers. We wish to concentrate on our pages the rays of light, whether they glow in the North, or burn in the South, or strike upon us aslant from the regions of the setting sun, that we may hold up before the ministry now in the field, and those who are soon to enter the field, every great and illustrious example of men, who, in the religious cause have nobly toiled and died. We see already in action, many who are called to the grand work of proclaiming, like Payson, saving truth to mankind; and, an unusual portion of them men in comparatively early life; and it is with no invidious intention, that we say, we desire to see burning in their bosoms, more of the godlike spirit which animated the heart of this successful man of God. We see rising around us, many, who will soon stand as he did, the ambassadors of peace to a dying world; and we desire as much as may lie in us, by the example of such men, to impress upon them the truth, that the ministry is the grandest of all human employments; but grand only, when it concentrates to the single purpose of saving souls, every original faculty of thought, and every energy which the utmost stretch of all the powers may impart; and *most grand* when it weeps, like Payson, over dying men, and finds out the secret place of tears, and bears upon the conscience all of tenderness and awe furnished by the condition here, and the impending doom hereafter; and when, by the grace of God, it draws hosts of weeping sinners to the altars and the cross.

Of Payson as a man, we propose to say little. They who wish to know what he was, will find a most interesting portraiture in the little volume which sketches his life. We wish that our humble recommendation, would avail enough to put this biography into the hands of every minister in the land.

We do not speak of Dr. Payson as a man of splendid original endowments. Aside from what may be considered as the

moral part of his character, we do not know that he would have been particularly eminent. He possessed a sound understanding; a masculine, thorough, and what Locke calls, "large roundabout sense," a lively imagination, a memory remarkably tenacious, and a power of employing full and flowing imagery to illustrate and adorn, what he wished vividly to present. This last trait, in a special manner, we think, was much increased by his religious feelings. He was one of the instances, where the *heart* prompted the man to look at all things as fresh from the hand of God. Creation was seen to be spread out before him, to win him to ardent devotion; and as his eye rested on those works, he drew from them arguments and illustrations, to bear upon the consciences of men, and win the wandering world to God and heaven.

That Payson might not have risen to eminence in other professions, we do not deny. But we think, that neither at the bar, nor in the senate, would he ever stood as high as in the sacred ministry. It was not that his talents were, by nature, peculiarly fitted for the desk; it was, that they were devoted without reserve to the honour of God; that every attainment was consecrated; that every power of thought was directed to the great purpose of saving men from death. Religion, in his case, as it might do in every case, called up energies that would otherwise have been dormant: gave vigour to what at the bar, or in the political assembly, might have been no more than ordinary pleading, and no singularly eminent powers of debate; and urged the mind onward to new tracks of thought, and led him to task all the powers of invention to find access to the heart of man. There is, we think, no fact better established, than that piety may thus of itself urge the mind onward into otherwise unknown fields of thought; and give resurrection to powers of mind that might have otherwise slept for ever. It is to the human faculties, what the rays of a vernal sun are to the material creation. It scatters the chills of the long dreary frosts; quickens into motion the juices long congealed; dissolves the far-spreading snows; carpets the earth with living green; fills the air with perfumes, and the groves with melody; and excites into rapid and lovely being far spread wastes and solitudes that slept in the chills of death. The love of God restores the vital functions to the heart dead in sin; opens the blind eyes on the beauty of new worlds; unstops the ear to the harmony of the skies, and spreads out fields of thought, where the mind may for ever range, and the fancy expatiate in bound-

less regions. When this principle seizes upon a man devoted to the holiest work among mortals, it impels him onward to immense sacrifices to rescue the guilty; and calls up every slumbering faculty to save a world from wrath. The very occupancy of the mind with a vast theme, expands its powers. The very passage of a *large* conception, or holy purpose, through the soul, leaves a vivifying power in its track. The very *aim* to effect a gigantic undertaking, gives birth to energies not suspected of having a being; and frequently amazes the world with the display of powers that were not supposed to have had an existence.

Nor are we speaking of any unnatural, or uncommon operations of mind. We have only to cast the eye over the world, and see how the pressure of some vast thought, or the pent-up action of some quickened faculty, or some compelling and awful array of dangers, have quickened into being powers that, *but* for such compulsory process, would for ever have slumbered and have been unknown. Milton long revolved the great purpose of "writing something which the world would not willingly suffer to die." The result was, that he laid all the treasures of ancient learning under contribution, and ranged the earth and the heavens, and reared a monument in Paradise Lost, that shall rise with increasing majesty to the end of time. The pressure of the hosts of Xerxes almost on the single arm of Leonidas, brought forth prowess that has rendered him the model of the defenders of freedom in every clime. The snows of the Alps lying in the path of the youthful Napoleon, uncrossed by armed men, except by the daring Hannibal, were no barrier to the inventive genius of the beardless hero, when the mild skies of Italy, and the spoils of the once splendid capital of the world, were before him. Our own great chieftain in battle—he that has become the model of the world when in arms, and that has rendered dim the illustrious names of ancient defenders of freedom—fixed his eye on the independence of his country, and the pressure of the vast emergency gave firmness to his soul, and vigour to the arm nerved for war. In peace he would always have shone. But no ordinary perils of war, no love of glory, no will of a despot, could have brought forth the vast powers in battle, which are now the admiration of the world. We might look over the history of all illustrious men; we might take them one by one, and fix the eye on some single great purpose which has fired the imagination, nerved the arm, or called forth latent powers for purposes of debate,

or science, or glory. And we shall find that this is the great commanding *principle* which gives birth to these powers, and develops the otherwise latent faculties of the soul. It is this which determines the character of the man. Other circumstances might have made of the same original *stamina*, a different man; called forth different powers, or led him to wield them for different ends. In the vast abyss of *eternity*, they may yet be called forth; and we think it no improbable, or far fetched supposition, that the new circumstances of the redeemed in heaven, may give manifestation to latent energies of thought, of the possession of which, men on earth were unconscious; and one part of the eternal advance of the blessed, may be the developing of what there was not time or circumstances to call forth on the earth.

Now it is the conception of some such exclusive purpose, that we think, gives character, and success, to the more successful among the ministers of God. It is, that the mind becomes fixed on the all-absorbing themes of the profession; and that from the nature of the profession, the single purpose *must* develop whatever of eloquence, or feeling, or reasoning, or fancy, the soul may possess that can be brought to bear on the work. Napoleon was seized with the love of empire, and all the qualities of mind which he ever exhibited, can be traced to this single purpose, as if *this* was the forming hand that had shaped every power of his mind. If we could conceive this *object* to have been removed from him, and all the faculties which were developed with reference to it, all our conceptions of *individuality* in the man, would be at once annihilated. Howard was seized with a vast project of benevolence; and all we *know of him* is confined to the single project. Byron, was fired with the love of song—song of a singularly dark and misanthropic hue; and to conceive this peculiar aim of this gifted bard, stricken out, annihilates all that we know of Byron. Ledyard, early fixed his mind on schemes of hazard, and travel; and we cease to have any idea of the *man*, when we forget his descending the Connecticut river in a canoe; his encountering alone the snows of Siberia; and braving, for an object equally valueless to himself, the sands of the Equator. Now who can maintain, that had there been in some of these instances, a reversal of the project or designs of this life, there would not also have been a different development of powers? Or, rather, who will maintain that any thing like these peculiar faculties would have been developed, if *some other* great principle had

seized upon the mind? Say, that Napoleon, or Howard, or Ledyard, had possessed only the common purposes of the men of their rank in early life, and their names would now, with those of unnumbered millions, have been forgotten. When we speak of ministers of the gospel, with any reference to the proper effect of their great work, we instinctively look at the grasp which the great purpose of saving man, has taken on the soul, and *that* is the gauge which we have learned to apply to the success of their preaching, and to the developement of their talents. It is from this fact, that among all the great men who have made a permanent and vast impression on the world, we discern similar talent, similar spirit, and similar success. They belong to a single order; they are placed, in the classifications of men, by themselves; they have certain great features which we can contemplate as belonging to that order, and that only. The mind instinctively fixes on such men as Paul, and Luther, and Calvin, and Knox, and Edwards, and the Tennants, who seem to have been struck out in the same act of creation, by the hand of God, and placed on an elevation above all other men. To the end of time they will stand apart from the world beneath them. The single great purpose which has armed their minds, far more than any original stamina of intellect, has given all that we know of their names, and *but* for that purpose, they might have been unknown. Such a man, in his spirit at least, we think also was Payson.

Now, in contemplating such an order of men, there are certain great features which we think have been developed by the *purpose* of being faithful to God and man, in the work of the ministry. These are high endowments, which we love to contemplate more than we do the endowments of any other gifted mortals. Our chief pleasure in looking at the ministry, is, in the contemplation of this devoted class of men. We discern in them, a grand elevation of soul, a common freedom from narrow-minded prejudice, a noble and daring independence above what in other professions, and among inferior men, trammels thought; an eye steadily fixed on the great object; an indomitable resisting, and an unfailling surmounting of obstacles that lie in their path; and a steady summoning of every faculty to the great purpose of saving men. We discern there, a charity which ascends above petty differences of opinion; and which embraces all who love the Lord Jesus. Defenders of truth they were; gigantic strugglers for the freedom of the human mind; and for liberty from long and inglo-

rious thralldom; but they struggled where they expected an impression to be made, whether in victory or defeat, on millions of human spirits, and on the perpetual welfare of man. It has been with no small measure of saddening emotion, that we have compared the mighty strugglings of that devoted body of men, and their gigantic efforts for intellectual and spiritual freedom, with the contests of other theologians, defending points of truth, with equal zeal, and in fierce debate, but defending them as mere abstract matters of conflict, putting forth Herculean strength to gain the victory, but most Pygmean endeavours really to benefit mankind. Such, unhappily, we think, have been too many of the conflicts which have distracted the churches of our Lord Jesus. We regard the time as hastening on, when, in every denomination, men of this high rank, shall arm themselves for the tremendous conflicts which await the church with the dark, unfettered spirits of Atheism and Deism, of licentiousness and crime, that are marshalled for the battle, and that come up on the land to defy the armies of the living God.

Payson we esteem to have been a man of this elevated rank, if not in the first order of native endowment, of the first order, at least, in the spirit which we believe will be prevalent as we approach the long anticipated days of brightness, which await the Church even while *militant*. In presenting an outline of his memoirs we wish to set him as a man, a christian, and a pastor, before our readers, and to offer some suggestions on the secret of his success.

We would remark, then, that few men in the ministry, have been so extensively blessed as Dr. Payson. The following summary of his success during the time that he was the Pastor of the church in Portland, is given by his biographer.

“In no year of his ministry, did his church receive less than ten new members, and in only one year so small a number; while, at another time, the yearly increase was seventy-three, and in the year of his death, seventy-nine; and the average number was more than thirty-five a year during the whole of his ministry. If there were an entire suspension of divine influences at any time, it was of temporary duration. Judging from the accessions made to the church, there must have been a constant and gradual work of God. If the term of his ministry be divided into periods of five years, the number added in each period differs from that of every other period, by a comparatively small number. The difference is in favour of the first two periods, when, with fewer bodily infirmities, he ceased not daily, and from house to house, to testify repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.” p. 341.

It should be remembered, that in addition to this, he was

engaged in several revivals of religion, and was the instrument of producing them in several neighbouring parishes.

Now, when we look at Dr. Payson with reference to the success with which it pleased God to crown his labours, one of the first things that strikes us, is his familiar acquaintance with the sacred Scriptures, and his profound reverence for the Book of God, above all systems of human framing, and all the speculations of men. "He did not," says his biographer, "decry systems of divinity as useless, but regarded them with watchful jealousy, and felt it unsafe to trust to them." If we were to judge of the sermons, which have been presented to the public as specimens of his manner of addressing men, we should think that few men have ever lived, who more unshrinkingly advanced what he honestly believed to be in the Bible. The impression is irresistible, that his practice was to look at the Bible with reference only to its legitimate meaning; fearlessly to form his judgment of its proper interpretation, alike unawed by the fear of sinners and the apprehension that the word of God would lead him into error; and with the full belief that any truth of the Bible, would be found secured by its great originator and locator, from contravening any other proposition of revelation. He seems to have felt it to be his duty, to separate a single portion of truth from all other truths; to give it its just point, and edge; to remove the obstructions in its way to the heart; and then to have suffered it to make its appropriate impression, with the deep conviction, that God would shield his own truth, and that one section of it *could not* be found contradictory to another. On the subject of his reverence for the sacred Scriptures, his biographer has remarked:

"Most men, however discordant their principles, profess to have derived them from the Scriptures; but with Mr. P. this was something more than pretence. The Bible was with him the subject of close, critical, persevering, and, for a time, almost exclusive attention, his reading being principally confined to such writings as would assist in its elucidation, and unfold its literal meaning. In this manner he studied the whole of the Inspired Volume, from beginning to end, so that there was not a verse on which he had not formed an opinion. This is not asserted at random. It is but a few years since, that, in conversation with a candidate for the ministry, he earnestly recommended very particular and daily attention to the study of the Scriptures, and enforced his counsel by his own experience of the advantages which would accrue from the practice. He observed that before he commenced preaching, he made it his great object to know what the Bible taught on every subject, and, with this purpose, investigated every sentence in it so far as to be able to give an answer to every man who should ask a reason for it." p. 59.

And in his diary

"I have long been in a lethargy, but I trust God is now bringing me out of it. Find great and unusual sweetness in the Bible, of late, for which I have long been praying; and likewise a deeper sense of the importance of time, another blessing for which I have long been seeking. The enemy, taking advantage of my great weakness, threw me into a most sinful frame of mind; but on application to him who stills the waves, the tumult of my mind was stilled, and there was a great calm.

"Was assisted in prayer through the day. My heart seemed ready to break with its longings after holiness. Found unusual sweetness in reading the Scriptures." p. 121.

Our object, is rather to exhibit Payson as a *Pastor* than as a private christian. But the two things are so inseparably blended, that it is proper to remark here, that he was by nature, endowed with singular sensibility, that he was deeply susceptible of the tender and thrilling emotions of the soul; that his whole temperament was one eminently ardent; and that as a result, in his *religious* feeling he was subject to alternate depressions and elevations. His mind was seldom borne calmly and coolly onward to an object. He grasped it at once, with every faculty; put forth all his powers; and often exhausted himself in the effort, and sunk into something like despondency. As the result of a mind so finely strung, he was subject to seasons of deep and most painful depression. Many of his expressions in his diary remind us of the overwhelming emotions of Brainard. And connected with this, we may here add, that his dying raptures, have probably been unequalled by the anticipated joys of heaven enjoyed by any saint, for centuries in the church. It would be useless to speculate on the value of a temperament like his, compared with the more staid and plodding intellects and hearts that labour long and patiently before they see the result of their labours. This we may say, that in the case of Payson, it is all that we have to contemplate of the man. Never did he utter a more certain truth, than when he said *he lived "extempore."* His powers kindled and burnt with intense radiance; all his faculties were urged onward to the object immediately in view; and when that object was accomplished or removed, the same intensity was turned inward and preyed upon the singularly sensitive nervous frame. In him we find a most striking individuality. He is placed beyond limitation in his movements; nor should we consider a structure of mind that could imitate him, an eminently happy endowment. Yet there are some things remotely allied to this sensitive and even melancholy temperament, that had so direct a bearing on his ministerial success

and character, that it is our duty to present them to our readers.

This sensitiveness and ardour, was connected with a deep and most affecting view of the dreadful enormity of sin. From the following expressions in his diary, we believe that few men have ever felt so much of the sense of the awful depravity of the human heart.

“June 16. Had no heart to confess my sins; could find no words which would do any thing towards it. Saw no hope—scarcely any possibility of being either happy or useful. Tried all day to study, but could neither write nor read, and was completely discouraged. It seemed as if I must give up preaching.

“June 17. Had some life this morning, but was harrassed with wandering thoughts. Seemed to myself more vile than any other creature existing. Expected an occasion for a funeral sermon, yet could effect nothing. Seldom, if ever spent a more painful day. Was ready to say, What profit shall we have, if we pray unto him; for I prayed once and again, but found no relief. In the evening, felt a little better, but then was ready to sink, and seemed fit for nothing but to be fuel for God’s wrath.”

“June 19. Suffered more of hell to day then ever I did in my life. O such torment! I wanted but little of being distracted. I could neither read, nor write, nor pray, nor sit still.” p. 87.

“June 22. Very unusual degrees of fervor this morning. Very unwell all day, and did little in my study. In the evening was overwhelmed with a sense of my own unworthiness. O how wretchedly my life passes away!” p. 88.

“July 20. Overwhelmed, sunk, discouraged with a sense of sin. All efforts seemed to be in vain. Discoveries of my vileness, instead of humbling me, as might be expected, only excited discouragement and unbelief; while the manifestations of God’s love only make me proud and careless, my wretched soul cleaves to the dust.”

“July 22. O, what an inconcievable abyss of corruption is my heart. What an amazing degree of pride and vanity, of selfishness and envy, does it contain.” p. 91.

Again:

“I would not part with the privilege of preaching Christ crucified to perishing sinners, and of administering to the consolation of God’s afflicted people, to be made monarch of the world. But O the agonies, the unutterable, inconceivable agonies, which must be endured by those who attempt, with such a heart as mine, to perform this work. I shudder with horror, to think of the scenes through which I have been obliged to pass, and shrink back from those through which I must yet pass, before I reach the rest prepared for the people of God. It is, however, some comfort, that the time, when I shall quit this scene of trial, cannot be far distant. Nature cannot long hold out under what I endure; and I trust that, ere many years, I shall be safe in the grave, where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest. If, meanwhile, I may be preserved from insanity, and from wounding the cause of Christ, by falling into open wickedness, it is all I ask for, and perhaps more than I have any reason to expect. It is a dreadful thought

that no Christian on earth, however holy, humble, and watchful he may at present be, has any security against falling into open sin before he dies. As to resolving that we will not thus fall, it avails nothing. As well might a stone resolve not to fall, when the power which upheld it is removed." p. 166, 167.

Yet from these states of deep depression, the transition was often sudden to the highest exercise of the Christian life. Immediately after such views respecting his own state, we find him giving utterance to his feelings in the following language:

"June 25. Thinking it would be more convenient to keep my weekly fast on this day, sought the divine presence and blessing. Felt some warm affections towards my Saviour at first, but afterwards could neither realize my wants, nor pray to have them removed. Continued in this frame till towards night, and was then favoured with a deep sense of my utter vileness. Was also enabled to plead, even with agony of soul, to be freed from the power of a selfish nature. Could not think of being any longer subject to it.

"June 26. Much favoured. Felt insatiable desires after holiness, and that I might spend every moment of future life to the divine glory." p. 88.

"July 1. Much sweetness in prayer this morning. Felt broken and contrite for sin. P. M. Was greatly sunk and depressed. Seemed to be a poor, miserable, useless wretch. Went and poured forth my sorrows at the feet of my compassionate Saviour, and found relief. O how gracious is our God.

"Never before felt so much of the spirit of the gospel. Felt like a pure flame of love towards God and man. Self seemed to be almost swallowed up. Felt willing to go any where, or be any thing, by which God could be glorified, and sinners saved. Felt my hopes of being useful in the world strengthened. O how lovely, how kind, how condescendingly gracious did my God appear. Gave myself up to him without reserve, and took him for my only portion. Blessed be his name for this season." p. 89.

"Aug. 15. Rose in a sweet, tranquil, thankful frame, blessing God for the storm of yesterday, and the calm to day. O, how great is his wisdom, how great is his goodness! Had faith and freedom in prayer. Yesterday, I thought God himself could hardly carry me through. But to-day—O how changed!"

Yet even these emotions were often, not of long continuance.

"It is not," says his biographer, "without a degree of shrinking, that we follow him in his sudden transition from scenes like these into the very depths of distress—awaking the following morning, 'weak, dejected, melancholy, regarding himself as useless in the world, born only to sin, and abase the mercies of his Saviour and God, to disgrace the religion which he preached, and bring dishonour on the blessed name by which he was called;' in a word, 'oppressed with a load of guilt, so that he did not dare to retire to his chamber till driven thither, and even there, while prostrate in the dust, could hardly refrain, in the bitterness of his soul, from praying to be released from the body.'" p. 90.

In these deep views of his own vileness; in his communion with God in secret; and in his rich and full experience of the

dressed, and to excite and direct the devotional feelings of his worshippers."

"But a thousand forms, of his prayers even, could never teach another to pray like him. He neither found for himself, nor could he mark out for others, a 'royal road' to the throne of grace; and the 'gift of prayer,' for which he was so eminent, was not attained without corresponding efforts on his part. It was by his daily *retired* practice, that he became so skilful and prevailing a pleader with his God. There can be no doubt on this point. His journal, through several successive years, records repeated seasons of prayer for almost every day, together with the state of his affections, and the exercise or want of those graces which constitute the 'spirit of supplication.' It requires much of a devotional spirit, even to read these perpetually recurring descriptions of his 'wrestling in prayer,' of his 'near access to the mercy-seat,' as well as of those difficulties which sometimes barred his approach; for, to an undevout mind, they would present nothing but a wearisome, disgusting, endless monotony. When the inventive character of his mind is considered, its exquisite delight in every thing that was original, these records exhibit the most infallible evidence of his love for devotion. His continuing *instant in prayer*, be his circumstances what they might, is the most noticeable fact in his history, and points out the duty of all who would rival his eminency. There is no magic about it. 'The arrow that would pierce the clouds must go from the nerved arm and the bent bow.' But if prayer, to be successful, must be ardent, so must it be not fitful, but habitual." p. 188.

We might detain our readers here, if our space would permit, by exhibiting Dr. Payson as a man singularly devoted to God in his family; eminently bearing the Spirit of Jesus into all his social intercourse; making it a fixed resolution, that his intercourse with his people should be strictly religious; devoting much time to fasting and prayer; and seizing upon all the circumstances of affliction in his own history, and among his people, to advance his personal piety, and to promote the cause of God. On all these points, however, we are compelled to refer only to the interesting Memoirs which we have placed at the head of this article.

Dr. Payson was eminently distinguished as a warm friend of revivals of religion. In these scenes are seen most of the man, the Christian, the Pastor. And as it is with special reference to that subject, that we have wished to present him to the ministers of the gospel who may peruse our pages, we deem it proper, to exhibit somewhat more at length, his feelings in regard to revivals, and the means which he used to promote them. Here, however, as his biography is little more than an account of his toils to promote the work of God, we must, of course, extract but a small part of what *might* be presented.

The *desire* for a revival of religion, was one of the most

deep-wrought, ever-active feelings in the life of this holy ambassador for God. It seemed to pervade his whole life; to originate all his plans; to keep in lively exercise all his inventive powers; and, in fact, so all-pervading was this feeling, that we rise from perusing his memoirs with the feeling, that the most that we *know* of Dr. Payson, is, that he lived, toiled, prayed, and died, for revivals of religion. As expressive of his *desires* on this subject, we present the following extracts from his diary and letters.

“Never felt more gratitude, more humility, more love to God, and benevolence to man, than at this time. Indulged some hopes that God would pour out his Spirit, but hardly expected it. Saw that all the mercies I received, were bestowed for the sake of my Lord Jesus alone; and that in myself, I was far more deserving of hell than all that happiness. Could not praise God as I wished, but my soul panted, and almost fainted with ardour of desire to glorify him, and be wholly devoted to his service.” p. 101.

“Sept. 27.—Sab. Was favoured with great and unusual assistance, both parts of the day, and the people were remarkably serious and attentive. Came home overwhelmed with a sense of the astonishing goodness of God. Felt grateful, humble, and contrite, and was enabled to ascribe all the glory to God. In the evening, was favoured with great faith and fervency in prayer. It seemed as if God would deny me nothing, and I wrestled for multitudes of souls, and could not help hoping there would be some revival here.

“Sept. 28.—Found that my labours have not been altogether without effect. Was favoured with the greatest degree of freedom and fervency in interceding for others. I seemed to travail in birth with poor sinners, and could not help hoping that God is about to do something for his glory and the good of souls.

“Sept. 29.—Was considerably affected with a view of the awful condition of sinners, and was favoured with some freedom in praying for them. I know not what to think, but at present there seem to be some indications in Providence, that this is to be my station in the vineyard. I desire to bless God that he scarcely suffers me either to hope or fear the event, but to feel resigned to whatever he may appoint.

“Sept. 30.—Felt much of a dependent, confiding, child-like spirit. God is doing great things for me. I never enjoyed such a season before, as I have for these three days past. My heart overflows with love and thankfulness to God, and pity for poor sinners.” p. 106.

“Jan. 2, 1809.—Rose very early, and enjoyed a sweet season in secret prayer. Spent the day in visiting. In the evening felt the worth of souls lie with peculiar weight on my mind, and was enabled to wrestle fervently for divine influence.

“Jan. 3.—Was favoured this morning with such a view of the worth of souls, that I could not rest at home, but went out to visit my people, and stir up the members of the church to pray for divine influences. Never felt such love for the people of God, as this day. Seemed willing to wash their feet, or perform the lowest offices, because they belonged to Christ. Longed, all day, to do something for the glory of God, and the conversion of sinners. Wished for health, that I might employ my time for God.”

“Jan. 7.—During the past week, the word of the Lord has been like a fire shut up in my bones. I long to preach, but cannot. O that I may be patient and resigned.” p. 142, 143.

“I do not think you understand my feelings about a revival. Unless I am very much deceived, I have no controversy with God respecting it. But ought a minister to feel easy while his people are perishing, and Christians are dishonouring their Master? Did not Paul feel great heaviness, and continual sorrow of heart, for his countrymen? All the joy and gratitude he felt, in view of what God had done for him and by him, could not remove that sorrow. And the prophet would weep day and night for the daughter of his people. Instead of feeling less, it seems to me that I ought to feel more, and to have no rest. But I do not murmur at God’s dealings. I only wonder that he ever did any thing for me or by me, and that he has not long since, cast me out of his vineyard.

“Our unconverted friends should feel that our whole deportment, and even our very silence, declares that we earnestly seek their salvation.” p. 242.

“Dec. 16.—Since the last date, I have passed through a greater variety of scenes and circumstances than in almost any period of equal length in my whole life, and have experienced severer sufferings, conflicts, and disappointments. Some time in February, I began to hope for a revival; and after much prayer for direction, and, as I thought, with confidence in God, I took some extraordinary, and perhaps imprudent, measures to hasten it. But the event did not answer my expectations at all; and, in consequence, I was thrown into a most violent commotion, and was tempted to think God unkind and unfaithful. For some weeks, I could not think of my disappointment with submission. There were many aggravating circumstances attending it, which rendered it incomparably the severest disappointment, and, of course, the most trying temptation, I had ever met with. It injured my health to such a degree, that I was obliged to spend the summer in journeying to recover my health. This, however, did not avail, and I returned worse than I went away, and plunged in the depths of discouragement. Was obliged, sorely against my will, to give up my evening lectures, and to preach old sermons. After a while, however, my health began to return, though very slowly. God was pleased to revisit me, and to raise me up out of the horrible pit and miry clay, in which I had so long lain; and my gratitude for this mercy far exceeded all I felt at my first conversion. Sin never appeared so odious, nor Christ so precious, before. Soon after this, my hopes of a revival began to return. About a month since, very favourable appearances were seen, and my endeavours to arouse the church seemed to be remarkably blessed. My whole soul was gradually wrought up to the highest pitch of eager expectation and desire; I had great assistance in observing a day of fasting and prayer; the annual thanksgiving was blessed in a very remarkable and surprising manner, both to myself and the church. From these and many other circumstances, I was led to expect, very confidently, that the next Sabbath, which was our communion, would be a glorious day, and that Christ would then come to convert the church a second time, and prepare them for a great revival. I had great freedom in prayer, both on Saturday night and Sabbath morning; and, after resigning professedly, the whole matter to God, and telling him that, if he should disappoint us, it would be all right, I went to meeting. But what a disappointment awaited me! I was more straitened than for a year before; it was a very dull day, both to myself and the church; all my hopes seemed dashed to the ground at once, and

I returned home in an agony not to be described. Instead of vanquishing Satan, I was completely foiled and led captive by him; all my hopes of a revival seemed blasted, and I expected nothing but a repetition of the same conflicts and sufferings which I had endured after my disappointment last spring, and which I dreaded a thousand times worse than death. Hence, my mind was exceedingly embittered. But, though the storm was sudden and violent, it was short. My insulted, abused Master pitied and prayed for me, that my faith might not fail; and, therefore, after Satan had been permitted to sift me as wheat, I was delivered out of his power; and, strange as it even now appears to me, repentance and pardon were given me, and I was taken, with greater kindness than ever, to the bosom of that Saviour whom I had so insulted. Nor was this all; the trial was beneficial to me. It showed me the selfishness of my prayers for a revival, and my self-deception in thinking I was willing to be disappointed, if God pleased. It convinced me that I was not yet prepared for such a blessing, and that much more wisdom and grace were necessary to enable me to conduct a revival properly, than I had ever imagined before. On the whole, though the past year has been one of peculiar trial and suffering, I have reason to hope it has not been unprofitable, and that I have not suffered so many things altogether in vain. I have seen more of myself and of Christ than I ever saw before; and can, at times, feel more of the frame described in Ezekiel xvi. 63, than I ever expected to feel a year since. The gospel way of salvation appears much more glorious and precious, and sin much more hateful. I can see, supposing a revival is to come, that it was a great mercy to have it so long delayed. My hopes, that it will yet come, are perhaps as strong as ever, but my mind is on the rack of suspense, and I can scarcely support the conflict of mingled anxieties, desires and expectations. Meanwhile, appearances are every week more favourable, the heavens are covered with clouds, and some drops have already fallen. Such are the circumstances in which I commence the ninth year of my ministry; and, surely, never did my situation call more loudly for fasting and prayer than now." p. 312, 313, 314.

"Was exceedingly distressed, but felt no disposition to murmur, or be impatient. Withdrew to my chamber, to weep and pray. It seemed clear, that I was the great obstacle to a revival. I have not "rendered again according to the benefit done unto me, but my heart has been lifted up; therefore is there wrath upon my people." Threw myself in the dust at God's feet. Derived some comfort from often repeating these words, 'I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious.' It seemed sweet, as well as reasonable, that God should be a sovereign, and do what he will with his own."

So great was his anxiety on this subject, that he regarded it—and we doubt not justly—as one of the things which preyed upon his health, and hastened him to the grave.

"In one conversation he dwelt particularly on the causes which had operated to undermine and destroy his health. Among them was his great and increasing anxiety for a general and powerful revival of religion among his people; his incessant labours to secure so great a blessing, and the repeated disappointments he had experienced from year to year. We would seem, said Dr. Payson, to be on the eve of an extensive revival, and my hopes would be correspondently raised; and then the favourable appearances would vanish away. Under the powerful excitement

of hope, and under the succeeding depression arising from disappointment, my strength failed, and I sunk rapidly under my labours." p. 340, 341.

In his ardent desires for a revival of religion, Dr. P. adopted some measures which, in other hands, at least, are of doubtful propriety, and which he himself afterward so esteemed. The following scene occurred at the commencement of a revival.

"We have a great revival commencing. We have been expecting it some time; and, a few weeks since, at the close of a suitable sermon, I informed the congregation that I believed God was about to bless us, and told them that the quarterly fast of the church was at hand, and that, if they would consent to unite with the church in the fast, we would meet in the meeting-house, instead of the conference room, where we usually assemble on such occasions. At the same time, I invited those who were willing to meet the church to signify it by rising. About two-thirds of the congregation instantly rose. It was a most solemn scene. The church, to whom the measure was altogether unexpected, were almost overwhelmed with various emotions, and scarcely knew whether to be glad or sorry, to hope or fear. You may well suppose that the interval between the Sabbath and the fast was a trying season to me. I felt that I had completely committed myself—that my all was at stake—that, if a blessing did not attend the measure, every mouth would be open to condemn it; and it seemed as if I could hardly survive a disappointment. I should not have taken such a step, had I not believed that I had sufficient reason for trusting that God would bear me out in it; and I thought if he did not bear me out, I never should again know what to expect—never should feel confidence to pray. I expected severe trials, but had few fears, of the event. The trials came, but they did not come in the way that I expected, and therefore I was surprised and overcome by them. The day of the fast was the most dreadful day of my life—the day on which I had most dreadful proofs of more than diabolical depravity of heart. The meeting-house was full, but things did not go on in the manner I had hoped and expected. I thought all was lost; and I now wonder that I lived through it—that a broken heart, as Mr. Newton says, disappointed pride and madness are called, was not the consequence. For some days, I saw and heard nothing encouraging, and my distress was unabated; but at the next inquiry meeting, I found more than sixty inquirers. This number, within a week, was considerably increased, and eight or ten have obtained comfort. The prospect is now more encouraging than it has been since my settlement."

Another plan for promoting the work of God, is thus described:

"As to my desires for a revival, I have not, and never had, the least doubt that they are exceedingly corrupt and sinful. A thousand wrong motives have conspired to excite them. Still I do not believe that my desires were ever half so strong as they ought to be; nor do I see how a minister can help being in a 'constant fever,' in such a town as this, where his Master is dishonoured, and souls are destroyed in so many ways. You can scarcely conceive how many things occur almost daily, to distress and crush me. All these are nothing, when my Master is

with me; but, when he is absent, I am of all men most miserable. But now he is with me, and I am happy.

“We have just set up a meeting on a new plan. Notes, to this effect, are put into a box at the door:—‘A member of this Church desires prayers for the conversion of a husband, a child, a parent,’ &c. as the case may be. These notes are then read, and prayers are offered. We have had but one meeting; the evening was rainy, but nearly forty notes were given in, and it was the most solemn meeting we have had for a long time. Among the notes were two from persons who think they were deceived when they made a profession of religion, desiring prayers that they may be truly converted. The Church has also had a day of thanksgiving, lately, to acknowledge what God has done for us, and it was a comfortable season. These things give me some encouragement; but we have been so often disappointed, that I scarcely dare to hope.”
p. 213.

Whatever may be thought of these plans, yet they show the character of the man.

“And as a bird each fond endearment tries,
To tempt its new-fledged offspring to the skies,
He tried each art, reproved each dull delay,
Allured to brighter worlds, and led the way.”

His own judgment of these measures has been expressed in the letter which we have placed on page 236.

We would most gladly record on our pages, the account of the exit from the world of this eminently holy man, and successful preacher of the gospel. But the scene is incapable of being presented in an abridged form, and we have not room to exhibit the account entire. We can only say, that they who have a desire to see what religion *can* produce in the agonies of a long and painful disease; how the triumphs of faith may sink the agonies of death into forgetfulness; how it can raise a departing soul above all the fears of dying, the pangs of departing from beloved friends; and disarm death of its chills, and almost wrest the barb from the hand of this fixed, dark, and slow-moving monarch; how it can open the eyes upon the cloudless glories of an eternal world, will find few such exhibitions of its power, as he may see in the dying moments of Payson. We give a single extract as illustrative of feelings which almost make us forget that the spirit which gave utterance to them was a mortal united to our flesh, and an inhabitant of our world. It is from a letter which he dictated to his sister a little time before his departure.

“Were I to adopt the figurative language of Bunyan, I might date this letter from the land of Beulah, of which I have been for some weeks a happy inhabitant. The celestial city is full in my view. Its glories beam upon me, its breezes fan me, its odours are wafted to me, its sounds strike upon my ears, and its spirit is breathed into my heart. Nothing sepa-

rates me from it but the river of death, which now appears but as an insignificant rill, that may be crossed at a single step, whenever God shall give permission. The Sun of Righteousness has been gradually drawing nearer and nearer, appearing larger and brighter as he approached, and now he fills the whole hemisphere; pouring forth a flood of glory, in which I seem to float like an insect in the beams of the sun; exulting, yet almost trembling, while I gaze on this excessive brightness, and wondering, with unutterable wonder, why God should deign thus to shine upon a single worm. A single heart and a single tongue, seem altogether inadequate to my wants; I want a whole heart for every separate emotion, and a whole tongue to express that emotion." pp. 355, 356.

In this spirit died that eminently holy man, and successful preacher of the gospel. We are not, we think, expressing a sentiment contrary to the Bible, when we say to all ministers of the Son of God, that *such* a death was the appropriate and regular close of a life of eminent devotedness to God; of his long anxieties and toils for revivals of religion; of his single-hearted devotedness to one Great Master; and of his unshrinking fidelity to the souls of men. We ask, is it improper to say, that a *like* triumphant exit from this world of crimes, and from beneath this broad shadow of death that stretches over all lands, may not be the inheritance of *every man* that, like Payson, pants for God, like the the hunted deer for the water brook; and lives, and moves, and has his being, only to honour God's holy Son in the redemption of men? O how many thorns might be plucked from dying pillows by Payson's living, indomitable, fidelity! How bright a sun might there shed his beams, if it had been suffered to shine with a steady radiance on the *living* as well as the *dying* man of God, if its pure and holy lustre were sought by the ministry as intensely in health, as in sickness, in the toils of a profession that knows no indulgence to be given to the flesh, as well as in the dark moments, when the hand of God presses us onward to judgment.

That this holy man had no faults, we certainly are not disposed to aver. We reckon among his *leading* errors, his disregard for his health; his want of regularity in the duties of his office—more especially in his studies; his labouring, when by all the rules of prudence, he should have been recruiting his exhausted frame; and as a consequence, the fact, that he thus, as *we* think, has abridged, by many years, a life which otherwise might have contined still to urge forward, among men, the work of redemption; and extinguished a light, which might have shed its beams still farther upon "a darkened world."

As our object is chiefly to exhibit Dr. Payson as a minister of the gospel, we shall present to our readers an analysis of one

of his sermons, as an instance of his fidelity in addressing the souls of men. It is the sermon entitled, "The difficulty of escaping the damnation of hell." The exordium is in the following words:

"My hearers, I am not without apprehensions, that the passage, which I have chosen for the subject of this discourse, will sound harshly in your ears; and that its first effect will be to excite in many breasts, feelings by no means favourable to the reception of truth. But it is a passage which was uttered by the compassionate Saviour of sinners; and I cannot, I dare not, pretend to be more merciful than he; I dare not suffer either a false tenderness, or a fear of giving offence, to prevent me from calling your attention to his words,—words, which, if properly regarded, cannot fail to produce the most salutary effects. The words, to which I refer, are recorded in Mat. xxxiii. 33.—'How can ye escape the damnation of hell?'"

After presenting the occasion on which the words were uttered, he states the object of the discourse to be, to produce a conviction in the minds of his hearers, that their situation was exceedingly dangerous; that the obstacles which opposed their salvation were exceedingly great and numerous; and that the improbability of their escaping the wrath to come, was by no means small.

The first argument which he uses, is, that his hearers were even then under condemnation. He observes—

"It is necessary that you should be roused from that careless, secure state, in which all men naturally live; that you should see religion to be all-important, and thus be led to attend to it with earnestness. To use the language of inspiration, you must be awakened; for with respect to your spiritual and eternal interests, you are asleep. Now, it is evident, that no man will attend seriously to religion, unless he sees it to be an object of importance. No man will exert himself to escape a danger, which he does not perceive, no man will think seriously of flying from the wrath to come, until he sees that he is exposed to this wrath. And it is equally evident, that no man, who, in a spiritual sense, is asleep, will see that he is exposed to this wrath, until he is roused from his slumbers, until he becomes awake to eternal realities." p. 288.

He then adds:

"The speaker has been labouring for many years to effect this object, by every means in his power, but with how little success, you well know. Nay, more, God has long been using means to rouse you. He has called to you, 'Awake, thou that sleepest; rise up, ye that are at ease; be troubled, ye careless ones; wo to them that are at ease in Zion.' He has enforced attention to these calls by the dispensations of his providence. He has sent mercies and afflictions. Many of you he has visited with sickness, and thus brought you near to the eternal world; and he has caused all of you to witness, in repeated instances, the death of friends and acquaintances. But all in vain. You still slumber on, and dream of worldly objects, while death is daily approaching to hurry you to the bar of God. You still feel a strong unwillingness to have your false peace

disturbed, and to commence a religious life. To every messenger of God, to every friendly monitor you reply, I pray thee have me excused. A little more sleep, a little more slumber, a little more folding of the hands to sleep." pp. 289, 290.

He proceeds to say, that "it is necessary, not only that you should be roused to think seriously of religion, but that you should be induced to pursue it with constancy and perseverance." On this topic, after a brief illustration, he adds:

"Here again, we may appeal to your own observation and experience. Many of you have, at different times, been roused from your natural state of careless security. You have been made to see that religion is important. You have felt something of the powers of the world to come, and resolved to attend to your eternal interests. But no sooner were these impressions made, than they began to be effaced; in a few days, or at most, in a few weeks, they were entirely gone, and your slumbers became more profound than before. Similar effects of this propensity to lose serious impressions you have often witnessed in others. How many in this assembly have you seen attending to religion, for a while, with earnestness, and then again treating it with entire neglect." pp. 291, 292.

Another difficulty, he adds, is that of obtaining a deep and thorough conviction of sin.

"How difficult," says he, "it is, for instance, to convince a consumptive man of his danger. How difficult to make men sensible of their own faults, or to make fond and injudicious parents see the faults of their children. But there is no truth more disagreeable to men, no one, therefore, of which they are so unwilling to be convinced, as that which asserts their exceeding sinfulness. To see their sins is mortifying, is painful, is alarming. They will, therefore, shut their eyes against the sight as long as possible. Many sins they will deny themselves to be guilty of; what they cannot deny, they will extenuate, and for those which they cannot extenuate, they will make a thousand excuses. If the fallacy of one excuse is shown, they will fly to another, and from that to a third, and fourth; and when all their pleas and excuses are answered, they will return and urge them all a second time, with as much confidence as at first." pp. 293, 294.

Again; men are blind to their own lives. The most abandoned men are entirely blind to their own vices.

"You know," says he, "the Scriptures assert, in the most unequivocal terms, that the hearts of men are full of evil, that they are desperately wicked, that they are enmity against God; yet these assertions do not convince you that your hearts are thus sinful. What will ever convince you of it? God will give you no new revelation of the fact, and his ministers can say nothing more than you have already heard, hundreds of times. And yet you must be convinced of it, or your condemnation is certain. Here then is another, and apparently an insuperable obstacle which opposes your escape, and which renders it exceedingly improbable, that you ever will escape final condemnation." pp. 295, 296.

But still, he adds, if all these difficulties were removed, there are obstacles no less insurmountable to oppose the salvation of

sinner. There is the propensity to rely on our own righteousness. There is the propensity to suppose the mere *subsiding* of anxious emotion, to be religion. There is a readiness to obtain *relief*, however it may be proposed. There is, therefore, a gradual sinking down into indifference, mistaken at first for religion, but which terminates in the conviction of all others, and at last, of the individual himself, that he was deceived.

To all this, is to be added the fact, that there is "a sinful, hard, unbelieving heart, which is full of enmity against God, and of opposition to his truth; and which will never believe, or submit to God, until its enmity and opposition are taken away." Hence, when the sinner is awakened, there arises a conflict between him and God; a long, deep, and deadly struggle, between man and his Maker; a terrible and obstinate resistance to the Holy Ghost, in which God often forsakes the man, and gives him a disastrous victory. This state is thus described:

"I have seen them in this state for several days, unutterably distressed by a sense and fear of God's wrath, while their understandings and consciences waged an ineffectual war with their obdurate hearts, and made vain attempts to subdue them. At length their hearts gained a fatal victory; their conviction of the truth was banished, the voice of conscience was silenced, and they returned to their former courses, and their last state became sevenfold worse than the first. The same obstacle, my careless hearers, will oppose your salvation with a strength and violence, of which you can, at present, form no conception. Terrible proofs of its power I have often witnessed when attending the sinner's dying bed. I have seen them, when they knew that their disease was mortal, and that they had but a few days to live, fully convinced that hell would be their portion, unless they repented—agonizing in view of their approaching fate; expressing, no doubt, that the Saviour was ready to receive them, if they would apply to him with sincerity, and yet, refusing to apply to him, and at last, dying in despair, rather than accept, on these terms, his offered grace. While I have been holding up to their view the power, the compassion, and love of the Saviour, his precious promises, and his readiness to receive all who come to him, they have replied, yes, it is all true, but my hard, wicked, unbelieving heart will not repent, will not believe, will not pray. I can repeat prayers with my lips, but my heart feels them not. My hearers, how great, how insuperable, must be the obstacle, which, in such circumstances as these, can prevent a sinner from accepting salvation on the terms of the gospel. Whether you now believe it or not, O sinner, the same obstacle opposes your salvation, and you will one day be convinced of it." pp. 300, 301.

Having thus stated the difficulties in the way of the sinners conversion, he closes the sermon by a pungent and tender appeal to those whom he had been addressing. From this part of the discourse, we make the following extracts:

“And now my careless hearers, would it answer any purpose, I could sit down and weep in anguish over the picture I have drawn, or rather, which the pencil of inspired truth has drawn of your situation. To see immortal souls thus situated, to see their way to life thus blocked up by their own folly and sinfulness, to see so many powerful causes thus combining to thrust them down to endless, remediless ruin, is a sight, over which even angels might weep; nay, more, it is a sight, over which the Lord of angels has wept with unavailing compassion.

“O then, believe not your own deceitful hearts; but believe the angels, believe the Scriptures, believe God, believe the Saviour, when he tells you, that strait is the gate, and narrow the way, which leadeth unto life, and that few there be, who find it. If you will not believe all these witnesses, if you refuse to pay any attention to this warning, it will furnish another proof of the greatness of those obstacles, which oppose your salvation, and of the improbability of your escape. I have no hope of ever being able to set before you truths more alarming, more adapted to rouse you from your slumbers than those which have now been exhibited. The word of God contains nothing more alarming, and did you really believe it, the archangel’s trump would not rouse you more effectually than these truths. And shall they not rouse you? Will you still sit unconcerned on the verge of the abyss, with the wrath of God abiding on you, while you are so far from safety, while so long and difficult a journey is before you, while precipitous mountains rise, and deep gulfs sink, and powerful enemies lie in ambush, and numberless snares are spread between you and heaven? Will you sit thus, and lose the precious hours, while the night of death is approaching, while the shadows of evening are already stealing upon some of you, and while none of you are sure of a week or a day? O ye gay, thoughtless triflers! is this a situation for carelessness and gaiety? O ye, who are labouring to be rich! is this the place, in which you would lay up treasure? O ye immortal spirits! condemned already, and hastening to hear the confirmation of your sentence at the tribunal of God, can you find nothing more important than the trifles which now engross your attention? If you have not cast off all regard to God’s word, if you are not infidels in theory, as well as in practice, you cannot, methinks, contemplate with perfect indifference, the view which has been given of your situation.” pp. 303, 304.

“Do any reply, the difficulties to be surmounted are so great, and the probability of our surmounting them so small, that we have no courage to make the attempt. It will, therefore, be best to give ourselves no concern respecting it, but to enjoy life while we can. And do you thus talk of enjoyment in such a situation, and while exposed to such a fate as this? Well may we say of such enjoyment, it is madness. It is far more irrational and preposterous than the mirth of criminals, confined in a dungeon, and doomed to die, who attempt to drown their fears by noise and intoxication. There is no necessity for your adopting this desperate resolution. Though your destruction is probable, it is not yet certain, and nothing but your own folly can make it so. It would indeed be certain, the obstacles before you would be insurmountable, were there not an Almighty, Sovereign Helper, who can assist you to overcome them, and who is ready to afford you assistance. While, therefore, you justly despair of saving yourselves, go to him, and implore his help. Go, and tell him, that you have ruined yourselves by disobeying him; that you have raised impassable mountains between yourselves and heaven; that you do not deserve his assistance; that you are justly condemned already,

and merit nothing but eternal condemnation. This, however, which is the only safe course, I fear your sinful hearts will not consent to pursue. I fear, that, however you may now feel, you will dismiss your serious thoughts, and banish the subject from your minds, almost as soon as you leave this house. This I cannot prevent. My arm is too weak to draw you out of that fatal current, which is rapidly sweeping you away to destruction. I can only sit on the bank and weep as I contemplate the increasing strength of the current, and breathe out, in agony, cries to that God, who alone can rescue you from its power, and prevent it from hurrying you into that bottomless gulf in which it terminates. And come, you my Christian hearers; come all, who have been rescued from this fatal current; all, who can feel compassion for the perishing immortals, come, and assist in crying to him for help. That you may be excited to this, look at the scene before you. Look around, and see how many of your children, acquaintance and friends, are swept away towards perdition, while they sleep and know it not, and no voice, but that of God, can rouse them. Do you know whither they are hastening? Do you know what hell is? Do you consider how improbable it is, that they will escape its condemnation? Do you consider, that, unless grace prevents, they will, in a few years, be lifting up their eyes in torment and despair? Surely, if you know and consider these things, one universal cry of, 'God have mercy upon them,' will burst from every Christian heart." pp. 305, 306, 307.

ART. VI.—REVIEW OF THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT
DEFENDED.

The People's Right Defended: being an Examination of the Romish Principle of withholding the Scriptures from the Laity. Together with a Discussion of some other points in the Romish Controversy. By "Wickliffe." To which is appended a Discourse on Transubstantiation, by the Right Rev. John Tillotson, D. D. Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. Philadelphia: Printed by W. F. Geddes, 1831, 12mo. pp. 228.

WE are not among the number of those who consider all opposition to the progress of Popery, in the United States, as either imprudent or unnecessary. That it is a system of deplorable error, we have no doubt. That it is as insidious as it is otherwise corrupt, we are very sure. That it is singularly adapted to captivate depraved human nature, cannot be questioned. That some Protestants have already been led astray by its plausible delusions, we have the best reason for believing; and that many more will be in danger of similar seduction, we cannot but fear. If, then, we are commanded to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints;"

VOL. III. No. II.—2 I

if it be the duty of the friends of truth to put the people on their guard against prevalent and popular errors, and if this duty can in no way be so well fulfilled as by preparing new manuals of instruction, when needed—manuals adapted to the exigencies and taste of the times; then we ought to rejoice when such works make their appearance. They can scarcely fail of exerting a useful influence, proportioned to the extent of their circulation.

It seems to be one of the principles of the Divine government that truth shall, for the most part, be propagated by conflict and discussion. The advocates of error are permitted to rise up, to scatter their poison, and to seduce many unwary souls. This rouses the friends of truth, who, perhaps, had sunk down into supineness and negligence. But awakened and excited by the trumpets of the hostile embattled hosts, they gird on their armour, and take the field of controversy. In this way, the truths called in question are examined, explained, elucidated, impressed on the public mind, and more firmly established than ever. Who can doubt that, in this manner, the Pelagian controversy was over-ruled for the illustration, defence, and extension of the doctrines of grace? And who is not prepared to admit, that, in a thousand cases, since that time, by the “running to and fro” of zealous polemics, even of angry polemics, “knowledge has been increased,” and truth brought forth to light with new splendour? Who is not familiar with the fact, that, after a long stagnation of the elements, even a furious tempest becomes useful in restoring action and salubrity to the atmosphere?

There is a peculiar state of things among us, with regard to the Popish controversy. It has been long out of date in this country. Multitudes of very good people have been in the habit of feeling as if the whole subject, though deeply interesting in other lands, and in former times, had become, on this side of the Atlantic, in a great measure obsolete, and, therefore, not deserving any particular attention. They have felt as if the number of Romanists in our country was so small; their influence so inconsiderable; the popular sentiment so adverse to their superstitions and claims; a competent amount of light with regard to these claims so generally diffused, that the whole subject might be very safely dismissed from their attention. The consequence is, that a degree of apathy in reference to this matter prevails, which certainly bodes no good to the great interests of truth and righteous-

ness. Meanwhile, the advocates of Romanism, more, however, from importation than conversion, are growing in numbers in almost every part of the United States; and are manifesting a very marked increase of confidence and of zeal. When their preachers have an opportunity of speaking in the presence of Protestants, they seldom fail to gloss over all the principal errors imputed to them with a degree of art and plausibility which would seem to render all opposition unnecessary, and even uncandid. They make no scruple of positively denying the serious charges brought against them, founded on the acts of the council of *Trent*, and the works of their own *Bellarmino*; and endeavouring to persuade their credulous hearers that these charges have never had any other origin than ignorance or malice. Many believe their representations, and wonder why it is that Protestants are so much *prejudiced* against the Romanists. From this state of mind, the transition is easy to an adoption of their splendidly dazzling and plausible system, and a union with their body.

We verily think, then, that the religious public of our country, ought to be instructed and warned on this subject; and that he is really a benefactor to the church of God, who conveys this instruction and warning in a clear, forcible and judicious manner. This, in our opinion, has been done by "Wickliffe," in the publication before us. He wisely judged it best not to attempt an exposure of *all* the corrupt tenets and practices of Romanism; which could not have been done without swelling his work from a convenient manual to several *octavos*, or a ponderous *quarto*. He has made the withholding the Scriptures from the laity the prominent object of animadversion, as the title of the book indicates. But he has not confined his attention to this object. "Some other points in the Romish controversy" have been brought profitably under review. And the whole forms a volume well adapted to engage and reward the attention of those into whose hands it may come.

The substance of this volume was originally published, in numbers, in the "Southern Religious Telegraph," a respectable weekly paper, edited at Richmond, Virginia. Those numbers we read, in their original form, and thought them well adapted to be useful. We are glad that the public voice has called for their collection, enlargement, and republication. We hope the book will be read by many who stand in need of

the instruction which it gives, and that it will do much good many days hence.

The Introduction and Appendix are the principal things which have been added to the original work. The former is well adapted to answer its purpose. It is enriched with some luminous and powerful remarks, from the pen of the Rev. Dr. *Green*, extracted from his Review of the well-known publication of the Rev. *J. Blanco White*; and very ably showing the seasonableness, and great importance of enlightened and judicious publications on the subject of Romanism.

The body of the work contains nine chapters. In the first the *Supremacy of the Pope* is examined in an able and satisfactory manner. The following is a specimen of the author's reasoning and style, in treating this radical claim of the Romanists:—

The supremacy of the Pope is argued from his being the successor of Peter. Here two difficulties present themselves, the one is—that there is no good evidence that Peter ever was at Rome. It certainly does not appear from scripture; indeed, there is nothing in scripture which would lead to such a supposition. Paul wrote one Epistle to Rome, and five from Rome, yet he makes no mention of Peter being there, and in his Epistle to the Col. iv. 11, after naming several, adds “these only are my fellow workers, unto the kingdom of God, which have been a comfort unto me.” Peter was not at Rome when Paul said “at my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me.” He was not there just before Paul's death, who writes to Timothy that all the brethren did salute him, and naming many of them he omits Peter. There is no evidence from scripture that he ever was at Rome; and it is far from being probable, that he would have visited heathen Rome and have said nothing about it, and have given no account of his labours there; and as the evidence of scripture is negatively against his being there, the burden of proof is upon the shoulders of those who assert the fact. But admitting he was there, still there is no good evidence of his ever having been Bishop of Rome. Here then you will perceive, are two points to be *proved*. It is not enough that it be shown that he was there, but it must be incontestably *proved* that he was *Bishop of Rome*.

The only shadow of proof is that from Eusebius, who states that he presided at Rome twenty-five years. But Eusebius professedly gives the whole of his statement on the authority of Irenæus, who flourished in the second century. It is ultimately from Irenæus that we learn any thing of the early history of the Roman See, and he gives no such statement that Peter ever was Bishop of Rome, or that he handed down his divine prerogative (whatever that might be) to his successors in that diocese. On the contrary, he tells us that the two apostles, Peter and Paul, jointly founded the church at Rome; and, when thus founded, they *jointly* delivered the Episcopate of it to Linus. “Fundentes igitur et instruentes beati Apostoli (Petrus et Paulus) Ecclesiam (Romanam), Lino episcopatum administrandæ ecclesiæ tradiderunt. Succedit autem ei Anacletus, etc.” Peter and Paul are certainly represented here as both and equally engaged in the performance of certain acts, viz: found-

ing a church and delivering the episcopate of it to another, and if so, they did it *jointly*. The word *jointly*, therefore, as used in the free translation given above, does not refer to the manner in which the authority passed from them to Linus; but to the manner in which the Apostles acted in delivering that authority; namely, they did not deliver it *singly*, but *jointly*, for surely the conjunction which connects Paul with Peter in the performance of this work, is a copulative, and expresses a joint action. Faber says that, with respect to either of the two co-founders ever having been Bishop of Rome, Irenæus is totally silent: And he understands Irenæus as saying that these Apostles acted in this matter in virtue of their *joint* authority. pp. 19, 20, 21.

The second chapter discusses the Papal claim, that salvation is confined to those who are in communion with the Bishop of Rome. This chapter is the shortest and least satisfactory in the volume. It contains enough, however, to convince every impartial reader, that the claim which it exposes is really made, notwithstanding every insidious protestation to the contrary; and that it is equally presumptuous and unscriptural. Indeed, the respectable author might have said, and proved, that those denominations of professed Christians who are most exclusive and confident in confining salvation to such as are within their own pale, are precisely those, all the world over, in whose communion, in the estimation of all serious Christians, it is peculiarly hazardous to men's eternal interests to be found.

The *third* and *fourth* chapters are employed in exhibiting the **FACT**, that the Church of Rome prohibits the reading of the Scriptures by the Laity. This charge against the Romanists is well stated, and ably supported; and the various subterfuges to which individual writers or preachers, among them, have resorted to gloss it over, and try to make it appear a false allegation, faithfully exposed. The following extract is to the point, and decisive.

That what we have stated to be a principle of the Romish Church, we shall now endeavour to make appear from their own words. The decrees of the Councils, especially of that of Trent, every priest on his admission to holy orders, binds himself to believe and defend. Now, what says the infallible church on the subject before us? The fourth rule of the *index libr. prohibit.* made in pursuance of the order of the Council of Trent, and published by Pius IV., runs thus: "Since it is manifest by experience, that if the Holy Bible be promiscuously permitted in the vulgar tongue, by reason of the rashness of men, more loss than profit will thence arise. In this matter let the judgment of the Bishop or Inquisition be stood to, that with the advice of the parish priest or confessor, they may grant the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue, translated by Catholic authors, to such as they shall understand, can receive no hurt by such reading, but increase of faith and piety; which faculty let them have in writing. But he that without such faculty shall presume

to read, or to have the Bible, he may not receive absolution of his sins, except he first deliver up his Bible to the ordinary." Here we have the church's own words; we care not what a Romish priest may say on this subject. We have the words of the church, and we can judge of their meaning as well as he can, though he denies it, yet these very words of the church contradict him.

Monsieur de Maire, Counsellor, Almoner, and Preacher, to the King of France, in a book published by authority, says: "this rule is founded in ecclesiastical right, and no man can transgress it, without contradicting that obedience which he owes to the church and the Holy See, from which it hath received its confirmation. For as much as this rule was not made but in prosecution of the decree of the Council of Trent, &c. no man can deny but that it has been approved by the Holy See, and authorized by the bulls of Pius IV. and Clement VIII, who, after they had viewed and diligently examined it, published it to the world, with order that it should be obeyed." "If there be any thing," continues de Maire, "that can hinder this rule from having the force of a law, it must be either, because it has not been published, or, being published, has not been received, but neither the one nor the other can be said, since it is evident that this is the old quarrel we have with our heretics; this is that which our church has always been upbraided with by the enemies of the faith; this is that which is the subject of their most outrageous calumnies; this is that which has been acknowledged by all wise men; that which has been earnestly maintained by all the defenders of Catholic truth; that which no person is ignorant of; that which the whole world publishes; there being no point of belief more common, nor more general among the faithful, than this of the *prohibition to read the Bible without permission*: and this belief (says he), so common, is a certain proof, not only of the publication, but of the reception of this rule." This prohibition, then, to read the Bible without permission, is in force now. It is an infallible decree, and must for ever be in force: who has repealed it? what council of equal authority has set it aside? The Spanish Expurgatory Index goes still farther. It prohibits the Bible in the vulgar tongue, not only printed, but in MS. without any provision for permission. pp. 41, 2, 3.

THE PROPRIETY OF WITHHOLDING THE SCRIPTURES, is the subject of the *fifth* and *sixth* chapters. Here, again, "Wickliffe" has done himself honour by the clear and forcible manner in which he has conducted his argument. The following brief specimens will serve to show the general character of this part of the work.

In the New Testament, Christians are exhorted to let the words of Christ dwell in them richly, and in all wisdom. We are commanded to search the Scriptures. Timothy, from a child, had known the Holy Scriptures. It is required that the commandment be made known to all nations for the obedience of faith. And in looking over our Saviour's discourses as recorded by the Evangelists, we find a constant reference to scripture in this form, "ye have read" so and so, "have ye not read?" and the like. After reading these passages, can any one believe that the scriptures were not read by the people? Josephus, the learned Jewish historian, speaking of the ignorance of some people of their laws, says, "but for our people, if any body do but ask any one of them about

our laws, he will more readily tell them all, than he will tell his own name, and this in consequence of our having learned them immediately as soon as ever we became sensible of any thing, and of our having them, as it were, engraven on our souls." In Acts xvii. 11, we are told that the Bereans were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and *searched the scriptures daily, whether* those things were so. Here we see that the Bereans not only received the word from the Apostles as they preached it, but they searched the scriptures for themselves, and for what? to yield an implicit and blind belief in what was taught them? No, but to see whether or not, it was according to scripture. The great force and excellency of the apostle's preaching was, that it condemned the Jews out of their own scriptures. He referred them constantly to the law and to the testimony, and thus showed from their own scriptures that Jesus was the Christ. The comment of the Rhemish translators on this passage is strangely absurd, as we have before seen; they say that this text is used by heretics (Protestants), to prove that the hearers must try and judge by the scriptures, whether their teachers and preachers doctrine be true, which they think were the most foolish doctrine in the world. They contend that the people did not read the scriptures to dispute with the apostle, and to try and judge of his doctrine. Now, if this be not a flat contradiction of the text, it is not good English. The apostle says they searched whether what he taught was true or not: the Romanists say *they did no such thing: whom shall we believe?*

There is a text which papists frequently adduce to show that the scriptures should not be read by all, which proves directly the contrary. This may seem strange, but it is true. The text is 2 Peter, 3. 16. "In which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are *unlearned and unstable* wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." Here the papist triumphantly asserts, that the apostle discountenances the reading of the scriptures by the unlearned and unstable; but does not this text manifestly prove that in those days they did read them? How else could they possibly have wrested them to their destruction? Could they do it without ever having read them? And, besides, does the apostle, on this account, or because there were many things hard to be understood, say one word discountenancing the reading of the scriptures? No, neither of these reasons induced him to hint such an idea: and yet these reasons operate very powerfully with papists in not only *hinting*, but also *decreeing*, the prohibition of the practice. In the verse preceding, the apostle says that "his beloved brother Paul, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you:" then he states that many things he said were hard to be understood, and that the unlearned, &c. wrested them to their destruction; and in the succeeding verse, still addressing those to whom he said Paul had written, he says, "*ye, therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye, also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness.*" Now here is an important thing to be noticed. It is plain that those to whom Paul had written, are here warned by the example of those who had wrested the scriptures to their own destruction, and are cautioned against doing the same thing. Now, to whom was Paul's epistle, here spoken of, addressed? to the *clergy*? Then *they* are placed upon a level with the people, and cautioned, as equally liable to be so led away by the wicked as to wrest the scriptures to their own destruction, (which I verily believe they often do.) They should be withheld, therefore, from the *clergy*, for the same

reason they are now withheld from the *people!* But will papists admit that their *clergy* are thus warned by the example of the unlearned and unstable? If not, it must be the *people* that are thus cautioned and exhorted to take warning by the example just stated. If so, two inferences follow, both equally destructive to the papal cause: the first is, that, as those cautioned are the same as those to whom Paul addressed his epistle here spoken of, they must also have been the *people*; and, if so, what right have the clergy to withhold from them what Paul expressly addressed to them? The next inference is, that the *people*, thus cautioned, *must have had the scriptures*, and must have been in the *habit of reading them*, else what meaning is there in the caution to *beware*, and to take warning by the example of the unlearned? If the scriptures had been withheld from them as they are now from the people, they would have needed no such caution, neither would the unlearned and unstable have had an opportunity of wresting them to their destruction. So much for that famous passage, so confidently relied on by papists in support of their prohibition. pp. 64, 5, 6, 7.

A little further on, the following apposite and pointed passages occur.

The Bishops assembled at Bononia advised Julius III. not to permit a mortal to read more of the gospel than is contained in the mass, and that he labour with all his might that as little as possible be read in the cities under his dominion: And they assigned this reason, "that, as long as the people were satisfied with that little, affairs succeeded according to his (the Pope's) wish, but the contrary, when men began to read more. "In brief," continue the Bishops, "this is the book which hath raised the tempests and storms with which we are tossed, and the truth is, if any man shall diligently consider that book, and shall take a view of those things which are done in our churches, he will see that there is a vast disagreement between them, and that our doctrine is not only altogether different from that, but which is more, is often contrary to it." Of this same opinion was Peter Sutor, the Carthusian doctor; "since many things" says he, "are delivered to be observed, which are not expressly [*taught*] in the Holy Scriptures, will not the *unlearned*, observing these things, be ready to murmur, complaining that so great burdens are laid upon them, by which their gospel liberty is sorely abridged! And will they *not be easily withdrawn* from observing the constitutions of the (Romish) church, when they shall see that they *are not contained in the law of Christ?*" This same Peter Sutor says, "the translating of the scriptures into the vulgar tongue is a rash, useless, and dangerous thing," and gives this reason for it, that "the people will be apt to murmur when they see things required as from the apostles, *which they can not find a word of in scripture.*"

Andradius, who was the interpreter of the Council of Trent, speaking of the prohibition by the Synod of Tholouse, says, the taking of it away would be destructive to faith. We are now able to understand Bellarmine when he says, "the people would not only receive no benefit, but would also receive *hurt* by the scriptures." We confess that we are unable to answer the objection now under consideration. It is, we admit, strictly true, that the general reading of the scriptures would induce many, very many, to leave the communion of the Romish church, and would prevent any from ever joining it. But for all that, we cannot think that the scriptures should be withheld from the common people;

for the fault belongs not to the scriptures, but to the Romish church. Two cannot walk together except they be agreed. Now, the Pope and the Bible have long been at variance, and I think they will never be reconciled; and this is confessed by the Bishops of Bononia, abovementioned, in their advice to Julius III. They say, "But to confess the truth, (which must be kept as a secret) in the time of the apostles, and for some years after the apostles, there *was no mention of the papacy*, or the cardinalship, much *less were these their doctrines, their laws, their customs*, no, *nor the empire over the nations* that we now obtain. But all ministers of all churches (of the Roman no less than of others) did voluntarily obey kings and princes and magistrates." And a little further on, they say, "certainly we scarce retain in our churches so much as a *shadow of the doctrine and discipline* which flourished in the times of the apostles, but have brought in *another quite different from it.*" These confessions of the Bononia Bishops were intended only for the Pope's ear, but were afterwards divulged to the world by a distinguished Bishop of that church, who was sent a short time before by the Pope as his legate to reduce the heretics in Germany.

We shall conclude this chapter with the following extract from a sermon, by the Rev. Mr. Fowler, of England, on 1 Thess. v. 27, which represents the opposition of the Church of Rome to Christ in a very striking light. "The Lord Jesus Christ commands the people to search the scriptures, the Pope commands not. Christ commands them to search Moses and the prophets, the Old Testament; the Pope forbids them to search either Old or New. Christ says, "in them ye think ye have eternal life;" the Pope says there is more danger of eternal death. Christ gives this reason, they testify of me; the Pope saith no, they are very dark and obscure, very short and defective, therefore no competent witness. Christ saith, let my word dwell in you richly; the Pope saith no, not dwell, not even in your houses. Christ saith teaching and admonishing one another; the Pope saith brabbling and perverting one another. Christ saith whatever you do in word or deed, do it according to my word; the Pope saith, do my word: observe our decrees, or else I will burn you. Christ commands, in my text, that this epistle *be read*; the Pope commands the contrary. Christ saith, *to all the brethren*; the Pope saith no, not to any lord, duke, or prince. (Franciscus Encœnas, a learned Spaniard, was near being put to death for presenting the New Testament to the Emperor, Charles V.) Christ saith, *I charge you to read*; the Pope saith, *I charge you not to read*. Christ saith, *I charge you under my curse*; the Pope saith, *I charge you not to do it* under the curse of the church. Christ saith *I charge you under the pain of hell fire*; the Pope saith, *I charge you do not*, under the pain of hell and the stake too." pp. 95, 6, 7, 8.

The *seventh* and *eighth* chapters are on the INFALLIBILITY of the Church of Rome. This part of the discussion is, we think, one of the best portions of the volume. The following passages are spirited and conclusive.

There is another difficulty connected with the claim to infallibility, which has never yet been fairly and openly met, and one which we call upon papists to clear up. A church that is infallible *must be unchangeable*. Now the difficulty lies here; as the doctrine and spirit of the church of Rome is unchangeable, they must admit that the doctrine and spirit of the church in the dark ages (the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centu-

ries), is the doctrine and spirit of the church *now*, and was the doctrine and spirit of the *apostolic church*. They must admit that what the church now is in Spain and South America, and what it ever has been in Italy, is not only the same as in the days of the apostles, but also the same as she now is in this country. Are the advocates of infallibility prepared to admit this? But we will not stop here. An infallible church is bound, and if consistent, is willing to sanction and make herself now responsible for all her regularly authorised acts and decrees, from the earliest periods of her existence to the present time.—They are bound to say that when the council of Constance condemned to the stake John Huss and Jerome of Prague, they did what the apostles would have done in similar circumstances: and what a Romish council would now do in similar circumstances: They must make the act their own, or else they must condemn it, and say they did wrong. Let them publicly and formally condemn that act of the council of Constance, and all the decrees of condemnation to the stake, of all the councils; or their silence must be construed into a sanction of such conduct, and of the principles which prompted it. Here, then, they are in this dilemma: either they must sanction and confirm these decrees, or else give up her claim to infallibility. Bellarmine, who is of the highest authority in the church of Rome, says that “heretics ought to be exterminated root and branch from the earth; but where the number of papists is so small that they cannot safely attempt it, there they are to be quiet,” and on this principle the church has acted. Look at their treatment of the poor, unoffending, and pious Waldenses; look at the massacre in Paris in the time of Gregory 13th. Look at the horrible and bloody persecution which followed the revocation of the Edict of Nantz. Look at the Inquisition and all its tortures. Read the narrations of Romish cruelty in Limborch’s history; narrations that chill the blood and sicken the heart of him who can feel a pang of sympathy for the sorrows and woes of others. Look at all these, and ask the church to sanction them; call upon papists to confirm or condemn them; bring them to the point; let the church acknowledge she did wrong; let her condemn these transactions, and we will no longer make use of them as arguments against her infallibility, for then none will be needed. Is the church prepared *now* to sanction and mother all the abominations, and corruptions, and superstitions, and massacres; which she once sanctioned? If so, let her do it; if not, where is her infallibility? pp. 102, 3.

If we were Papists, we should certainly feel no small difficulty in meeting the following appeal.

We remarked, in the former part of this discussion, that it was demonstrably impossible for the Romish Church to make out her claim to infallibility from the scriptures. When the church is asked, how is it known that you are infallible? her reply is, the scriptures say so: but how am I to know that your interpretation of scripture is correct, seeing there are so many learned and good men of quite a different opinion? The answer is, that the interpretation of the church is infallible. Here then, we see the scriptures prove the church, and the church proves the meaning of the scriptures; which is reasoning in a circle. So, also, when they are asked, how do you know infallibly that the scriptures are from God? They reply, that the infallible church says so; which is the circle again. This circle argument is an old one, but it is none the worse for that: for if it has stood so long unanswered, it has a far better claim to infallibility than the Romish Church. The only way in which most

of the Romish writers attempt to answer this argument, is to throw it upon private reason, and then stand upon the broad ground of Deism. A learned Archbishop of our country, (Carroll's Address to Rom. Cath. in America), however, attempts to answer it in another way; but, in getting out of one circle he falls into another. His argument is, that the Catholic church has ever, from the days of the apostles, down to the present time, decided on matters of controversy, and exercised the right of excommunicating; and the exercise of such prerogative, unless the church was infallible, would be vain and nugatory: therefore, *the church is infallible!!* Now, in the first place, the learned Archbishop very illogically argues from matter of fact to matter of right; that because the church did so and so, therefore she had the right to do it. But, in the next place, even this does not mend the matter, for he proves she is infallible because she always exercised the right of deciding controversies, and excommunicating; and then turns about and proves that she possessed that right because she is infallible; "for," says he, "the exercise of such prerogative, without she was infallible, would be vain and nugatory." He then triumphantly, though, I think, very *unseasonably*, asks, "where now is the circle of false reasoning?" Had I been at his elbow, I might have replied, "there it is, just warm from your own pen." He then boastingly adds, "Is not infallibility first demonstrated from other considerations, before it is demonstrated from scripture?" Here then we see, that in supporting this claim, the ground of scripture is entirely abandoned. The claim must be first established from *other considerations* before scripture is resorted to: Scripture is but secondary evidence, and may be cited merely to confirm other testimony! Now, then, we see how it is they get out of the circle: they break through and plunge into another. We charge them with proving infallibility from scripture, and scripture from infallibility. But they say, no: we do not prove infallibility from scripture, but "from other considerations," after which we infallibly pronounce on scripture; then, and not till then, is it infallible proof of our infallibility. Such reasoning as this, shows that they have been whirled round in this circle, till their heads have become dizzy. pp. 121. 2, 3.

The *ninth* chapter is on the doctrine of TRANSUBSTANTIATION, in which the usual arguments against that doctrine are well stated, and in which its absurd, contradictory, and unscriptural character, is sufficiently established.

The author has annexed to this volume "A Discourse against Transubstantiation," by Archbishop TILLOTSON. This is generally considered as one of the best pieces that ever proceeded from the pen of that justly celebrated man. "Wickliffe" has rendered a good service to the cause of truth by thus contributing to its popular circulation.

On the whole, we can cordially recommend this volume to the attention of our readers. They will be well rewarded for its purchase and perusal. The author has drawn his materials from some of the best sources; but he is more than a mere compiler. He has thought and spoken for himself; and has proved himself a well informed and able advocate of the truth.

The style of the work is, in a few cases, faulty, and typographical imperfections occur more frequently than we could wish: but, amidst so much general excellence, we feel no disposition to descend to verbal criticism. We have no doubt that our vigorous youthful champion will improve every successive edition of his work; and we hope, for the sake of that holy cause which he espouses, that the public favour will call for a number of them.

Having paid our cordial respects to this volume, and given a brief view of its contents and its merits, we feel inclined to take this opportunity of expressing a thought or two on what appear to us the best means of resisting Papal claims and influence.

We have no doubt that, among these means, the circulation of *good books*, is demanded and important. The Romanists circulate *their* books. They must be met in a corresponding manner. And an instructive Manual, such as that before us, or a pointed, judicious Tract, may find its way to persons and places from which the living teacher would be excluded. No plan, therefore, we think, ought to be adopted which should supersede the use, and the constant use, of such books as tend to bring instruction and conviction on the points in controversy between the Protestants and Papists.

We are free to confess, however, that our principal reliance, under the Divine blessing, is on other means, which, unless we are deceived, the holy Providence of God is directing and guiding to the most salutary results. When, therefore, we have heard alarming apprehensions expressed of the growing strength and influence of the Papacy in the United States, and still more alarming predictions of what they will probably realize in future; we have not been able to make the views of these gloomy prophets our own. When we see the Bible sent to every part of our beloved country; finding its way to every hamlet and hovel; and the Sabbath-school and Tract systems, scattering their benign influences from Maine to Louisiana, and from the Atlantic to Missouri;—we cannot believe that, amidst such light, the darkness and thralldom of Romanism are about to settle extensively over this land. Our main hope, then, under God, is in a continuance and extension of these noble efforts. The Bible and Romanism cannot live together. As well might light and darkness, Christ and Belial try to maintain fellowship. Put a Bible in every family; establish an efficient Sabbath-school in every neighbourhood in the United

States in which there are children enough to form it; in every one of them let Biblical instruction, in all its simplicity and richness, be constantly imparted; and teach all the rising generation, from their mother's lap, that the BIBLE, the BIBLE, is the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the common legacy of all Christians; the common charter of our hopes; and the best pledge and safeguard of our rights, civil and religious. Let our whole population be brought, as far as possible, under the power of such instruction, and Romanists will be able to prevail but little with their blinding and perverting arts. The man, then, who contributes to the circulation of the Bible, to the enlightened and faithful instruction of the rising generation, and to the diffusion, in every form, of simple, pure, scriptural truth, contributes just so much to resist the progress of Romanism.

It were greatly to be wished, in the mean time, that Protestants, of all denominations, were more aware than we fear they are, of the insidious plans of Romanists, and more careful to guard against their success. Among other artifices, of which they will understand and calculate the influence, they are fond of establishing *seminaries* in every part of the country, and of inviting all denominations, either gratuitously, or on very easy terms, to come in and partake of their advantages. And this is generally done under a solemn pledge, that no efforts whatever, will be made to detach any who may become their pupils, from the religious principles and connexions of their parents. It is not many weeks since we saw a public notification, from a body of Papists in the city of Philadelphia, announcing to the community, that they were about to erect a large and commodious place of worship, in a growing part of the city; and that, with this new erection, there would be connected two *seminaries*, one, probably, for male, and the other for female children, INTO WHICH ALL DENOMINATIONS OF CHRISTIANS WOULD BE FREELY ADMITTED. And, although we do not remember to have seen in the annunciation of this plan, any *pledge* of the kind just alluded to, yet we suppose that such a pledge is either to be considered as understood, or will hereafter be given. On the faith of such plausible statements, it is not improbable that Protestants may be called upon to subscribe towards the erection of their new place of worship, and may actually do so, under the impression that they are promoting a project truly catholic, liberal and benevolent in its whole design; and may afterwards think it right to send their children to these sem-

inaries. Now it is against such delusive impressions, that we wish Protestants to be upon their guard. It is certain that pledges of total non-interference with the religious principles and connexions of children committed for education to the care of Papists, however absolute and solemn, are seldom, nay almost never redeemed. Of the truth of this assertion, it has fallen to our lot not only to *hear*, but to *know* of the most flagrant and distressing examples. Indeed it is due to candour, and to the veracity of those who make them, to say, that it is almost impossible they should be really and *bona fide* redeemed. The spirit of the Papacy is a spirit of *proselytism* to the very core. The whole tendency of its rites is to dazzle and to allure. It cannot be expected, or even requested, of the conductors of such seminaries as we have alluded to, that they should hide from the eyes of their pupils the rites and ceremonies of their own worship. Yet it is almost impossible that they should be witnessed, from day to day, for a long time together, without mischief. The instructors, indeed, may so far keep their promise, as never to say a word to their pupils which, if heard even by their parents themselves, could be construed into a direct violation of their engagement. But they can, systematically, pursue a course of treatment peculiarly affectionate and attractive toward those whom they wish to win. They can flatter, cajole, and draw them, in ten thousand nameless and covert ways. They can manage so as to present some of their most peculiar rites and practices under very alluring aspects. They can contrive to give hints, innuendoes, and various practical suggestions, in favour of what they wish to impress, not only without words, but perhaps more powerfully without than with them. Of these artifices, pious, simple-hearted Protestants are not sufficiently aware; but Jesuits, and those who have imbibed Jesuitical maxims and principles, which, without injustice may be said essentially to belong to the general system of Romanism,—understand them perfectly.

We have no desire to hold up to unmerited odium any portion of our fellow-citizens. Romanists have the same perfect right with others to hold and propagate, by all fair means, their theological opinions. And all others have an equal right to understand, appreciate, expose to public view, and resist, by fair means, the progress of those opinions, so far as they think them wrong; and especially when they see, or think they see, any thing insidious or deceptive in the methods employed to propagate them. We take no liberties with our Popish neighbours, which we are

not perfectly willing they should take with us. It is for "the faith once delivered to the saints" that we feel bound to contend. It is for the eternal well-being of immortal souls, that we consider it our duty to plead and provide, as far as in us lies; to keep back no known truth; and to conceal no known danger. In regard to such great and vital interests, we cannot, knowingly, admit of either compromise or accommodation.

ART. VII.—THE ANNUNCIATION OF MESSIAH TO OUR FIRST PARENTS.

*From the German of Hengstenberg.**

IF we take up the predictions of Messiah, as they lie before us in the book of Genesis, and attend to those revelations of the future which, during the period of the history here comprised, were granted in moments of high inspiration to certain individuals, *for themselves*; (John 8: 56.) we shall observe in them a remarkable gradation towards greater definiteness and clearness.

The first promise of Messiah which occurs after the fall, is also the most indefinite. Over against the dreadful threatening, stands the rich and consolatory promise, that the dominion of sin, and the evils consequent upon it, should not be everlasting, but that the posterity of the woman should one day conquer the fearful conqueror. All except the *event* itself is here left undetermined; the kind or manner of the victory is not revealed—whether it is to be gained by means of an entire and highly gifted race of the woman's posterity, or by a single individual.

When Noah and his three sons are left after the destruction of the whole sinful world, the general promise is again more

* *Christologie des Alten Testaments und Commentar ueber die Messianischen Weissagungen der Propheten.* "The doctrine of the Old Testament concerning Christ, including a Commentary upon those passages of the Prophets, which refer to the Messiah. By E. W. Hengstenberg D. D. Ordinary Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin." 8vo. 1829, 1830. Berlin.—Without intending to subscribe to every sentiment of this work, or even of this extract, we are desirous to afford a specimen of interpretation and theology, which may attract attention to this learned and valuable production. It may be doubted whether any man in Germany approaches more nearly to the orthodoxy of the Reformation, than Professor Hengstenberg. We have, for the sake of compression, omitted a few paragraphs of the original.

closely defined, by the declaration that redemption is to come through the offspring of one of them, namely Shem.

Prophecy becomes more definite when the Lord begins to prepare for the appearance of the redemption, by separating from the corrupt mass, first a single man, Abraham, that he may be the depository of his revelations; and then by separating those individuals, whom, of his own free purpose, he would not make partakers of this honour, he defines to which of his descendants this, with all accompanying blessings, shall pass. From the posterity of Shem, God selects, first the family of Abraham, then the family of Isaac, lastly the family of Jacob, and from him causes the redemption to proceed. Yet even these intimations, determinate as they are when compared with those of an earlier date, are very indefinite, if viewed in connexion with those which followed, and with the accomplishment. They declare the benefit, indeed, but not its author: and it remained still uncertain whether salvation should be diffused over all people, by means of a single individual descended from the patriarch, or by an entire nation of the same descent. The precise manner in which this blessing should be communicated, was likewise left in obscurity.

This obscurity is in a manner cleared away by means of the last prediction of the Messiah in the book of Genesis, chap. 49, v. 20. From what had preceded, it was natural to expect that it should be defined which of Jacob's twelve sons should enjoy the felicity of being a source of blessedness to the whole earth. It was not to be supposed that Jacob, who had just before his death transferred to his sons by prophetic inspiration the promises made to his fathers and himself, should pass over the most important portion of these promises. But here the expectation of the Messiah receives from the transfer of the promise to Judah, not only the limit which was looked for, but an unexpected clearness and definiteness. Here, for the first time, the *person* of the Messiah is presented to our view. Here the nature of his kingdom is so far defined, that he is represented as the author of quiet and peace, who shall unite all the nations of the earth under his gentle sceptre. After these preliminary remarks, we proceed to the exposition of particular passages.

The first Promise, or PROTEVANGELIUM. As it was the fall of man which rendered a Messiah necessary, so it was immediately after that event, that the first obscure intimation of the blessing was given. It is contained in the sentence pro-

nounced upon the tempter, Gen. iii. 14, 15. We can have no just insight into the sense of this, until we have inquired who the tempter was.

It is, in the first place, undoubtedly true, that a real serpent was an actor in the temptation, and consequently the opinion must be rejected, that the serpent is introduced, merely as a symbolical representation of the evil principle.* If we adopt this opinion, we must, in order to be consistent, yield to the allegorical interpretation of the whole passage. For unity of interpretation should prevail in a closely connected discourse, and we must not in such a case pursue, first the allegorical or symbolical, and then the strict or literal method of exposition. Against the allegorical interpretation of the whole, many arguments may be urged; as the close connexion with what follows, where we have the history of the same pair who are actors here;—the geographical description of Paradise, which is quite minute;—the fact, that the condition of mankind which in this place is represented as a punishment, is their *actual* condition now;—the absence of any token, whence it might appear that the author was about to give an allegory, and not a history;—the passages of the New Testament in which the account of the fall is treated as properly historical, see 2 Cor. xi. 3. 1 Tim. ii. 13. Rom. v. 12. ;—the perplexity, uncertainty and arbitrariness of the allegorical expositors, when they undertake to represent the *truth* thus adumbrated; which, however, in case the author intended an allegory, should be so plain that it could not be misinterpreted. †

The actual presence of a real serpent further appears, not only from the remark chap. iii. 1. *Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field*,—but likewise from the threatening of punishment, which must necessarily have proximate reference to the animal. And these reasons also go to oppose the supposition of others, that Satan had taken only the outward appearance of a serpent.

While however it is certain that the object which met the eye of Eve was a serpent, it is no less certain that this was not the independent tempter, but rather the mere tool of the evil spirit

* This is defended with much ingenuity by *Cramer*. Nebenarbeiten zur theologischen Literatur St. 2.

† See *Zacharia* bibl. Theol. II. p. 229. *Linderwald*, die Allegorische Erklärung der 3 ersten cap. Mosis, insonderheit des Sündenfalls in ihrem Grunde vorgestellt. 1781.

whom Eve did not know.* For this, the following reasons may be given.

(1) Though the writer intentionally relates the history, just as it was handed down by the first pair, who could judge only by what was visible, and though he intimates by no word the unseen cause of the temptation; yet the whole character of the narrative evinces an intention to conduct the reflecting reader to this very end. For there were solid reasons for restricting the great multitude to the outward appearance, and for explaining nothing of its cause, as the knowledge of this readily admitted of becoming a source of corrupting superstition, such as was widely diffused among other Eastern nations. It is here to be specially remarked, that the serpent speaks, and exhibits in general all the marks of a reasonable creature. Nor need we suppose that this was a matter of any astonishment to Eve. So limited was her knowledge of the nature of animals, the characteristic differences between them and mankind, and the faculties confined on them by God, that the serpent's speaking produced, at most, only a dark impression concerning the co-operation of some higher and invisible power, the existence of which she did not as yet distinctly recognise. But what reflecting reader of later times can avoid the perception of this invisible power, when he is not only convinced that the things spoken cannot be attributed to an ordinary serpent, but sees it to be probable that the author of all evil, of whom he learns something elsewhere, was not inactive in the first introduction of evil upon earth? The attempt has been made by *Le Clerc*, *Eichhorn*, *Doderlein*, *Dathe* and *Less*, after the example of *Abarbanel*, and especially by *Gabler*,† to show that the narrative of Eve's discourse with the serpent, must be explained by means of a well known Orientalism; agreeably to which, external objects and even inanimate things which occasion reflections in us, are personified and represented as speaking. The serpent, say they, by the harmless use of the fruit, had occasioned in the mind of Eve, various thoughts and doubts respecting the prohibition, and the rising doubt and desire, agreeably to the genius of the East, are here clothed in the garb of a conversation with Eve. Even *Hahn* has strangely

* Among recent scholars, this has been admitted by *Rosenmüller* *Comm.* I. p. 109. *Schott*, *Theol. dogm.*; p. 128. ed. 2. *Hahn*, *Dogmatik*, p. 345.

† *Eichhorn's Urgeschichte* II. 1. p. 154 ff.

declared himself, of late, favourable to this supposition, and has endeavoured to establish it as the result of a grammatical and historical exegesis. The hypothesis, however, labours under this difficulty, that it transfers to a historical narrative that which is proper to poetry only. It rests on grounds entirely arbitrary; for, in opposition to all rules of sound interpretation, it takes one part of the account literally, and the other figuratively. It is supported by no analogous case in the writings of the Old Testament; for even in the history of Balaam, there is nothing opposed to the literal exposition, which is advocated even by *Herder*.* Its sole foundation is this, that it is unreasonable to understand literally the dialogue between Eve and the Serpent; a ground which vanishes of itself upon the admitted co-operation of the evil spirit. Against this hypothesis, it has been justly remarked by *Storr*: “Haec opinio a natura rerum priscaequae vetustatis simplicitate sic abhorret, ut tam artificiose affectatum tumorem narrationi vetustæ tribuere nequeamus, nisi indubiis auctoritatibus coacti, quas vero penitus desideramus.”† In addition to this, there is much which points to an invisible seducer, concealed behind that which was visible; as, for instance, the words chap. iii. 1. premised in a remarkable manner to excite attention—*now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field*; also the peculiar character of the curse, in which a higher reference to an unseen tempter, glimmers through the notice of what was visible.

(2) The tradition concerning the fall, as contained in the religious books of Persia, favours the same conclusion. According to the *Zendavesta*, P. I. pp. 84, 85. the first men, *Mesha* and *Meshianeh*, were by God created pure and good, and destined to happiness, under the condition of humility, obedience to the law, and purity of thought, speech and behaviour; but were betrayed, caused to fall from God and made wretched, through the use of fruit, by *Ahriman* “that cruel one, who from the beginning meditated only treachery.” In the *Zendavesta* III. p. 62. *Ahriman* springs from heaven to earth, in the form of a serpent; and another noted evil spirit is called the *Serpent Dew*. P. II. p. 217.‡

(3) Among the Jews also, there is a tradition that *Satan* was actively concerned in the seduction of our first parents.

* Briefe das Studium der Theologie betreffend. Th. 1. p. 26. ff.

† De Protevangelio opuscul. t. II. p. 422.

‡ See *Rhode*, die heilige Sage d. Zendvolkes. p. 392.

“Through the envy of Satan,” we read in Wisd. ii. 24, “came death into the world.” In later Jewish writings, Sammaël, the leader of the fallen spirits, is called נחש הקדמני, *the old serpent*, and sometimes simply נחש; because he tempted Eve under the form of a serpent. See the passages cited by *Eisenmenger*, Entdeck, Judenth. I. p. 822.

(4) It is from the testimony of the New Testament, however, that we arrive at absolute certainty, as to the participation of Satan in the seduction of our first parents. In Rev. xii. 9. the leader of evil spirits is called ὁ δρακῶν ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, (נחש קדמני) ὁ καλουμένος διαβόλος. So likewise chap. xx. 2. It is true that in 2 Cor. xi. 3, Paul omits the invisible cause of the temptation, as is done in the narrative itself, and speaks only of the visible: ὡς ὁ ὄφις ἔβη ἐξήπατησεν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ. But that he was not ignorant of the former, appears from Rom. xvi. 20, ὁ δε Θεὸς τῆς εἰρηνῆς συντριβεί τον σαταναν ὑπο τοὺς ποδας ὑμῶν ἐν ταχεί, where no one can mistake the allusion to Gen. iii. 15. Finally, Christ himself, John viii. 44, calls Satan ἀνθρωποκτονον ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, with reference to his having by sin brought death into the world. That this is truly the reference, we must conclude with most of the ancient interpreters, namely *Origen*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustine* and *Theophylact*, as well as most of the moderns, as for instance *Kuinoel* and *Tholuck*; although the opinion, first advanced by *Cyril* of Alexandria, that the allusion is rather to the murder of Cain, has been acutely maintained by *Nitzsch*,* and has been preferred by *Lücke*. Our reasons are the following. The parallel passages already cited from the Apocalypse and from Jewish writings, show that ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς must be taken in the strictest sense; this reference of ἀνθρωποκτονος is also justified by the passage Wisd. ii. 24, above cited, and by the quotations of *Tholuck* from the book *Sohar Chadash*, where the ungodly are called “the children of the old serpent, who slew Adam and all his posterity.” But above all, Jesus could not expect his words to be referred by his hearers to any thing else than the moral—and indirectly physical—murder, which Satan committed upon the first man; for the participation of Satan in this event was the prevalent belief of the people, while his influence on Cain, of which there is no intimation in the Mosaic account, cannot be considered so universally received, as that Christ

* Abhand. über den Menschenmörder von Anfang in der theol. Zeitsch. v. de Wette, Schleiermacher u. Lücke III. p. 52. ff.

should in such general and indefinite terms refer to it. The appeal is indeed made to 1 John iii. 12, to show that Cain's crime is attributed to Satan; but even if this should be the case, not only is the reference to this event explicit in the text, but its derivation is founded in the preceding part of the passage. And lastly, this is to be referred to the fall of man, because the murder committed by Satan is placed in the closest connexion with his falsehood; and it is the latter, which was influential in the fall.

Before proceeding further to avail ourselves of these results, we must revert to the arguments which have been opposed to the co-operation of Satan in the defection of man. These have been most fully advanced by *Eichhorn* and *Gabler*; whose labours have been used by *Dathe*, *Kuinoel*, *Jahn*, and more recently *Baumgarten-Crusius*.*

Their chief arguments are those which follow; and their want of cogency may at once be seen from the positive proofs already advanced.

(1) "The author calls the serpent, even in reference to the account of the fall, the most subtle of beasts; had he thought of a supernatural cause, he would not have added this particular, as the devil might have used the most stupid animal just as well." We reply, that the writer describes the event, as it appeared to our first parents; since they were ignorant of the invisible cause, they must have formed a high estimate of the serpent's subtlety. This is here designedly expressed by Moses, to lead the penetrating reader to the correct solution of the problem.

(2) "The devil could not speak by means of a serpent, since the serpent is wholly destitute of vocal organs."—We answer with Calvin: "Si incredibile videtur locutas esse Deo jubente bestias, unde homini sermo, nisi quia ejus linguam Deus formavit? Editas sine lingua in aere fuisse voces ad illustrandam Christi gloriam, Evangelium prædicat; minus hoc rationi probabile, quam ex brutorum animalium ore elici sermonem. Quid igitur hic impiorum petulantia insectatione dignum inveniet?" The illusion of speech issuing from the mouth of a serpent, is quite as comprehensible as the operation of the soul on the body, and other things of the kind.

* *Eichhorn*, Urgeschichte Th. III. p. 114. ff. *Gabler*, Urg. Th. II. p. 137. ff. *Dathe* On Pentateuch. *Kuinoel* Mess. Weiss. p. 2. *Jahn* Vaticinia Messiana II. p. 216. 222. & Supp. to Theol. works. *Baumgarten-Crusius* Grundzüge der bibl. Dogm. p. 348.

(3) "How does it comport with the goodness and wisdom of God, to suffer a powerful spirit, to seduce our first parents to defection? Did God indeed foresee the fall, which was the inevitable consequence of this permission, and still permit the diabolical illusion? Who can here vindicate the ways of God?" The force of this argument would at once be removed, if we were to oppose to it no more than the words of *Calvin*: "Utinam se a Deo judicari potius homines, quam sibi in cum iudicium sacrilega temeritate sumerent! Verum hæc earnis arrogantia est, examini suo Deum subicere." For as soon as it appears, upon sufficient evidence, that God has done any certain act, this conclusion is not to be annulled by the consideration that we are unable to justify His mode of action, by our short-sighted reason.*

(4) "The curse falls upon the head of a mere animal."—In the first instance it must necessarily pass upon the serpent, for man as yet knew no other author of the seduction, and the consequence was, that it gave them a horror of sin, by the punishment of the known author of sin. We do not hereby exclude the double sense of the words; the admission of which is justified, as soon as we learn from other sources, that Satan had an agency in the temptation.

(5) "It could not have been the idea of the author, that an evil spirit had any agency in the temptation of our first parents; for no trace of an evil spirit is found in all the Old Testament, previously to the Babylonish captivity. The notion was then borrowed from the Chaldeans, and in imitation of them, he was then made to act the part of tempter to the first human pair."—That the doctrine concerning Satan prevailed *before* the captivity, is evinced, first, by the ancient book of Job, which very few at the present day venture to refer to any period later than the Exile. It is true, *Baumgarten-Crusius* (bibl. Theol. p. 295) following *Herder*, *Eichhorn*, *Ilgen* and *Jahn*, has very recently endeavoured to establish the position that the Satan of the book of Job, is not the Satan of the later Old Testament books; but rather a good and pure angel, who had the office of an accuser, prosecutor or informer. He appeals to the fact that the author even numbers him among the sons of God and the conside-

* The theological discussion of this intricate question, which may well be called the *cruce theologorum*, occupies several additional paragraphs of the original. These are omitted, as containing a hypothesis not relevant to the general subject, and much at variance with the views of most theologians in this country. [*Ed. Bib. Rep.*]

ration that it is unjust to transfer to the person the odiousness of the office. Not to say, however, that the new derivation of the word שטן, upon which it is attempted to rest this hypothesis, does not admit of grammatical justification, (See Gesenius' Lehrgeb. p. 495) the position is altogether untenable. Although the author makes Satan appear before the throne of God, it is by a poetical license. This was no more his serious belief, than it was his serious belief that Jehovah, whose omnipotence and omniscience he so gloriously celebrates, was under the necessity of subjecting a man to trial by means of Satan, in order to ascertain the disinterestedness of his virtue. When it is said that Satan appeared amongst the angels before God, we cannot thence infer, as has been done, that the writer himself numbered him amongst good angels. Moreover, even in this situation he does not deny his own nature, in any particular—jealousy, malice, or envy.* Nor is the doctrine concerning evil spirits wanting in the Pentateuch, as has recently been acknowledged by Schott, epit. theol. dogm. p. 113.

The opinion of those who suppose Azazel (to whom the goat is sent out into the wilderness, Lev. xvi. 8.) to be Satan, is accordant with the connexion.† In imitation of *Deyling*,‡ it has been objected by *Baumgarten-Crusius*,§ that an offering to the evil spirit is altogether repugnant to the universal doctrine of the Mosaic religion, as well as to the import of this expiatory rite. But it is here falsely assumed that one of the goats was offered to Azazel. So far as it was considered a sacrifice, it was, like all others, offered to Jehovah: see verse 10. The *sending forth* was merely a symbolical action. By this act they abjured the kingdom of darkness, and its prince, and, so to speak, sent back to him those sins to which he had tempted, and by which he had endeavoured to gain possession of the nation or of individuals. They symbolically declared the truth, that he who receives expiation from God, is free from the power of the evil one. This interpretation must commend itself as just, to every impartial reader of the entire passage. It is, for instance, supported by the opposition between ליהוה and לעוזאזל, verse 8, and by the tradition of

* See Gesenius. Storr opuscc. ii. p. 426. Staedlin, Beitr. z. Phil. u. Geschicht. der Relig. u. Sittenlehr. ii. p. 151. ff.

† See Spencer leg. rit. l. iii. diss. 8. cap. 1. § 2. Gesenius' Lexicon. Rosenmüller in loc. Winer's Lexicon.

‡ Observationes sacræ. i. p. 51.

§ Grundzuge. p. 294.

the later Jews, among whom Azazel is a name of Sammael. See passages cited by *Spencer, Rosenmüller, Winer, etc. ut supra.*

The passage Deut. xxxii. 17, is more doubtful. The word שְׂדֵיִם which there occurs, is rendered by the LXX. *δαίμονια*, and by the Vulgate, *daemonia*. The opinion that it indicates invisible evil spirits, is supported by a comparison of the Syriac שְׂדֵיִם “evil demon.”

It is undoubtedly true, that Moses touches but seldom upon the doctrine of the kingdom of darkness, and, even when he does so, clothes the subject in an obscurity which is impenetrable, except by the more discerning. For this, however, as we have already observed, he had solid reasons. He pursued a like course with regard to other doctrines, as for instance, that of immortality, of which he gives only brief intimations; yet sufficient for those to whom the truth could be profitable. The derivation of this doctrine among the Hebrews from Chaldea, is opposed, not only by the passages above cited, but by the fact that the Ahriman of the Persians and the Satan of the Jews, are entirely different beings. The Persian Ahriman is the original evil principle, co-eternal with the good, and if not equal in might, so nearly approaching it, as to be able to wage with the other a long and difficult warfare. The Satan of the Hebrews, on the other hand, is wholly subjected to Jehovah, and cannot dare, without divine permission, to injure any one, or tempt any one to sin.

Having thus satisfactorily proved, first, that a real serpent was present in the temptation; and, secondly, that it served as the mere instrument of Satan, the true seducer; we are thence under the necessity of admitting a double sense in the curse of the tempter. This must, in the first instance, fall upon the instrument; it would otherwise have been altogether unintelligible to the first pair, and, for the time, useless. It must, in its principal import, refer to the genuine tempter, for it was he alone who had actually done that which merited the punishment and curse. Upon this principle, let us now attempt the interpretation of the passage: *Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field: upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat, all the days of thy life.*

So far as this sentence applies to the serpent, there are two different opinions with regard to it. Some suppose that a change took place in the nature of the serpent, after the fall;

others, that it continued to have exactly the same nature as before; but that after the fall, that was a punishment, which before the fall was a natural property. The latter opinion is defended with much ingenuity by *Calvin*. “Nihil erit absurdum, si fateamur pristinæ conditioni iterum addici serpentem, cui naturaliter jam subjectus erat, ac si dictum esset: tu ausus es, miserum et putidum animal, in hominem insurgere, quem præfeceram totius mundi dominio! quasi vero tuum esset, quum terræ esses affixus in cœlum penetrare. Ergo unde emergere tentasti, jam te retraho, ut sorte tuo contentus esse discas, nec amplius insolescas in hominis contumeliam.” But we must, nevertheless, declare ourselves to be of the former opinion, because, as *Le Clerc* and *Rosenmüller* have justly remarked, it is far more accordant with the text; and, indeed, no one would ever have thought of any other interpretation, who had not received a bias from doctrinal prepossession. The difficulty which has led to the second interpretation is imaginary. It is consistent with what we might expect, and with the usual methods of Satan, that he should choose a pleasing and attractive instrument of seduction. According to the views of the writer, the fall not only overturned the whole nature of man, but diffused its influence through all the creation, covering it with a curse, Gen. iii. 17; and since before the fall, the whole animal creation bore the image of man’s innocence and happiness, and the law of mutual hostility had not yet pervaded its ranks,* how can we find any difficulty in supposing that the instrument of the temptation endured the consequences of the fall in a peculiar degree?

And thus, in these words, it is made the destination of the serpent, to represent the abominable nature of sin, by that horrid form, which, with all that is evil and odious, was superinduced by the fall; to be, in a manner, also the visible representative as well of the kingdom of darkness, as the head of this kingdom, by whom it was used as an instrument.

But we are here met by the objection; that the curse pronounced on the serpent was unreasonable, as the poor creature

* See ch. 1, 30. It has been well shown by *Krummacher*, to be impossible that the whole animal world should have proceeded from the hand of the Creator in its present condition. *Paragraphen*. p. 63. In opposition, however, to Scripture, imperfection and evil are now attributed to the intractable nature of matter, at the creation: and thus a Dualism is established.

had no knowledge of its being abused by a higher power.* We need not seek a new reply to this, as that which was long since given by Calvin, is satisfactory. “Si cui absurdum videtur pœnam de bruto animali exigi alienæ fraudis, in promptu est solutio: quum esset in hominis gratiam creatus, non temere maledici, ex quo versus est in ejus perniciem. Hac ultione probare Deus voluit, quanti æstimet hominis salutem; quemadmodum si pater gladium, quo filius occisus fuerit, execrationi habeat.” The punishment of the serpent is no more unjust, than the miserable condition into which the whole creation is brought by the fall, Rom. viii. 20; or than the Mosaic ordinance by which a beast, in a certain case, was to be burned with the human transgressor; nor than the offering of animals, as sacrifices for sin.

If we now refer this verse to the spiritual author of the temptation, we have, after setting aside what pertains to the mere instrument, the following idea: The most extreme contempt, disgrace and debasement shall be inflicted on thee. *Calmet* observes on the passage: “Cet ennemi du genre humain rampe en quelle sorte sur le ventre par la confusion et l’opprobre, où il est réduit.” It was the expectation of Satan that he should advance his kingdom and authority by the temptation of man; but the occurrence had a different aspect in the sight of God, who viewed the fall in connexion with the plan of salvation. The eating of dust or ashes, occurs elsewhere, as expressive of the deepest abasement and grief.

VERSE 15. *And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. It shall smite thy head, and thou shalt smite his heel.*†

With application to the serpent, the sense is—Thy offspring shall inflict on that of the woman, wounds which are curable; the seed of the woman shall inflict incurable wounds on thine. A serpent is killed when its head is crushed, while injuries upon other parts of its body are not fatal; on the other hand, there is no part in which a man can be bitten by a snake with greater impunity than the heel.‡

* See *Gabler*, in *Eichhorn’s Urgeschichte*. ii. 1. p. 174.

† We give to the verb ךָש , the signification *to smite, to strike*, as in *Gabler* (ut supr.) II. 1. p. 190. *Jahn*, &c. This rendering has an advantage, as it may be admitted in both clauses, and is likewise applicable to the two passages, Job ix. 17, & Ps. cxxxix. 11. where the word occurs again. According to any other interpretation, different meanings must be given to the word.

‡ It was long since remarked by Calvin that the head and the heel in-

This was the only meaning of the divine sentence, which then, at least, was understood by our first parents. But even with this imperfect understanding, it must have produced, on one hand, a horror of sin, and on the other, very great consolation. They regarded the serpent as the sole author of that misery, which they then felt as a heavy burden. How consoling must it then have been to them to learn, that their conqueror, who seemed to them so dreadful, from their attributing to him the powers which operated through him, should not continually enjoy the victory, but should suffer a defeat from their offspring! Yet the annunciation must certainly have been far more rich in comfort to them or their descendants, when from the discovery of the serpent's natural powers, they were led to distinguish between the visible and the invisible cause of the temptation.

Experience attests the truth of the divine sentence, that there should be enmity between the races of mankind and the serpent. A horror of the serpent is natural to man. "Fit arcano naturæ sensu, ut ab ipsis abhorreat homo, ac quoties nobis horrorem incutit serpentum aspectus, renovatur defectio- nis nostræ memoria." (Calvin.)

As it regards the principal meaning of the sentence, as applied to Satan, most of the earlier Christian expositors understand directly the Messiah, by the seed of the woman which should bruise the head of the serpent's seed.* This is opposed by the consideration that we are thus constrained to understand by the seed of the woman a single individual; which is the more difficult, as it is evident that we must explain the serpent's seed of a plurality, the spiritual children of Satan, the leaders and members of the kingdom of darkness, who are in the New Testament called *οφεις, γεννηματα εχιδωνων, and τεκνα του διαβολου.*

This difficulty may be avoided by understanding the seed of

dedicated a *a majus and minus*—a victory of the human race over the seed of the serpent. "Interea videmus, ut se clementer in homine castigando gerat dominus, in quem serpenti non ultra permittit, quam ut calcaneum attingat, quum illi subjiciat vulnerandum serpentis caput. Nam in nominibus capitis et calcanei distinctio est inter superius et inferius." It is evident that something more is intended than the mutual antipathy between men and serpents, because in that case no special punishment would be threatened to the serpent, which nevertheless appears from the context, to have been the idea of the writer. See *Gabler zu Eichhorn's Urgesch. II. 1. p. 189.*

† So, of late, *De Broix, Ursprung und allmähligē Entwicklung des Messianismus, p. 26. ff.*

the woman, in a general way, as her offspring. Thus interpreted, the words have this meaning: 'Thou hast indeed, now inflicted upon the woman a grievous wound, and thy associates will continue to persecute her offspring. Yet with every desire to injure, thou and thine shall be able to inflict on mankind such wounds only as may be healed; on the other hand, the offspring of the woman shall one day conquer thee, and cause thee to feel all thy impotence.'

This interpretation is found in the Jerusalem Targum, and in that of Jonathan, which explain the seed of the woman to be the Jews, who shall overcome Sammael, at the time of the Messiah. It would seem that this was the understanding of Paul, from his allusion, Rom. xvi. 20, where the promise is made to comprehend Christians in general. It has in later times, been ably defended by *Calvin*.^{*} Among modern writers, it has been adopted by *Herder*,[†] *Storr*, in the treatise above cited, "de Protevangelio," and *Krummacher*, (*Paragaphen*, p. 100,) the last of whom thus defines the sense: "That which is divine, must gain the victory—the fall must be followed by redemption—Eden, once closed, must be opened again."

Agreeably to this interpretation, the passage is deservedly called the PROTEVANGELIUM; which name has been given to it by the Church. It is true, the future victory of the kingdom of light over that of darkness, is here foretold only in general

* "Quare sensus erit, humanum genus, quod opprimere conatus erat Satan, fore tandem superius. Interim tenendus est vincendi modus, quem scriptura describit. Filios hominum captivos sæculis omnibus duxit Satan pro sua libidine et hodie luctuosum illum triumphum continuat. Sed quia fortior emerit e cælo, qui illum subjugaret, hinc fit, ut illi similiter tota Dei ecclesia sub capite suo magnifice insultet."

† "The serpent had injured them; it was to them an emblem of temptation, of evil, and moreover of the curse, of contempt and punishment. The reviving prospect was afforded to mankind that they—that is, the seed of the woman—should become more strong and noble than the serpent and than all evil. They should bruise his head, and his only retaliation should be a wretched attack upon the heel. In short, good should gain ascendancy over evil. Such was the prospect. This is not the place to inquire, how clear or how obscure may have been the views of our first parents upon this subject. It is enough that the most noble champion against evil, the most valiant conqueror of the serpent, who was to descend from Eve, was comprised in this prospect, and fell within it in a remarkable manner: even though at that time the truth was conveyed by a mere sketch or outline of natural imagery, the import of which was first developed in after times." *Herder*, *Briefe das Studium d. Theologie betreff.* ii. 225.

terms, without mention of the *person* of the Redeemer, who should lead the way in this conflict, and from whom proceeds all the strength demanded. Yet more could not be expected in these beginnings of the human race. In the kingdom of grace, as in the kingdom of nature, a gradual progress is observable. The prediction accords in many points with the tradition of other Asiatic nations who had only the darker primitive revelations; while a progressive revelation constantly added to the light of the Hebrews, and filled up with new lines the original sketch.

We shall now briefly examine the arguments which have been advanced for the existence of a primitive evangelical promise in this passage, so far as they affect our exposition. The labour of collecting them from the numerous writers by whom the *Protevangelium* has been impugned, is rendered unnecessary by the work of *Eichhorn* and *Gabler*.*

1. "Why is it that Christ and the Apostles make no use of this passage in the New Testament, when they apply so many Old Testament passages to Jesus? This would have afforded them, in a direct manner, a most important testimony. Why is there not even an allusion to it?" This is easily answered. The reason why the writers of the New Testament do not explicitly refer this prediction to Jesus, is found in the want of explicitness in the prediction itself, which refers only *implicitly* to the person of the Messiah. It was therefore natural that the New Testament writers should prefer the more numerous and determinate passages. It is not true, however, that we find no allusion to these words. See the passages already cited from the Epistle to the Romans; in which even *Rosenmüller* (on Gen. iii. 15.) recognises the allusion. Those citations from the New Testament which we have used to prove that Christ and the Apostles admitted Satan's agency in the seduction, prove satisfactorily that they also here admitted the *Protevangelium*, in our sense of the word. For no one can grant this agency of Satan, without acknowledging also the gospel promise in the text.

2. "The seed of the serpent can scarcely be understood to mean wicked men or angels; for in what sense could the latter be denominated the offspring of the devil? Wicked men are already excluded, since they belong to the posterity of Eve, to which, therefore, they cannot be set in opposition."—To

* *Urgeschichte* Th. ii. p. 292. & ii. 1. p. 197.

this we reply, that nothing is more common in the scriptures, than to transfer the relation between father and son to spiritual relations. In this very book, men of a godly spirit are called sons of God. The disciples of the prophets are denominated their sons; and the above-cited appellations of the wicked, in the New Testament, show that the reference of the term to spiritual connexion with Satan, is not unusual. Also, in the passage which has been quoted from the book Sohar, they are called "the children of the old serpent."

With regard to the second part of the argument, it is by no means sufficient to exclude wicked men from the seed of the serpent, though it is not to be restricted to these, but to comprise all Satan's progeny. As *Storr* has observed, (p. 431.) "Facile videmus etiam serpentis progeniem esse progeniem mulieris, sed indignam hoc nomine ex quo desciverit ad communem sui generis hostem."*

3. "Such a *Protevangelium* would have been altogether unintelligible to our first parents; for they as yet felt no need of a Redeemer, and had indeed no conception of his destined office."—The allegation is contrary to the narrative. That Adam and Eve were seized with a deep sense of guilt, after partaking of the fruit, appears from their shame, the common fruit of sinful desire produced by the fall, and of their accusing consciences. The same thing is apparent in their painful fear of God, with whom they had hitherto maintained affectionate communion. This sense of guilt must have been greatly augmented, when the curse of God upon the earth went into effect, and man was expelled from Paradise. He was more and more reminded of his guilt, by all nature, once subjected to him, but now rising in opposition—by his own body, already become perishable, and from the very moment of the fall, beginning to die; above all, by the tumult within his breast. But, together with this sense of guilt, there is a conviction that redemption is needed; and with the latter, a capacity for receiving the promise of an approaching victory over the kingdom of darkness. This annunciation was useful, not to Adam and Eve alone, but to all their posterity. It is from this and similar instructions communicated to our progenitors, that those reflected intimations of future deliverance and glory have proceeded, which are found among the heathen.

*See Calvin *in loc.*

ART. VIII.—THOUGHTS ON THE MENTAL AND MORAL
CHARACTER OF CHRISTIAN MINISTERS.

THE mental and moral character requisite for the minister of Christ, is more elevated and perfect, than common sentiment demands among any other class of men. The objects of his profession are connected with higher results, than spring directly from any other department of human effort. He is called an ambassador. But whence does he come? From the court of Heaven he comes to a rebel province of the Most High. He proposes terms, for the restoration of this province to an allegiance no less needed by the subject, than demanded by the Sovereign. His message is ultimately to raise spirits who were created "a little lower than the angels" from the depths of moral degradation to *no less* than angelic purity. As the messenger of heaven, we expect to see in him the character of its denizens, if not of its native born subjects. As the ambassador of a foreign court, we expect in him all the accomplishments necessary to his favourable reception wherever he appears. During his residence amongst us, we look for an exhibition of the common qualities most valued by the judicious amongst men, together with the lofty virtues which flourish in full perfection in his Sovereign's court above.

But what are the elements of this almost unearthly character so justly demanded? As an intellectual qualification, the *creative* power of thought is more highly necessary in the Christian ministry than in any other practical department of life. This noblest capacity of intellect does not lie in the ability to think what never before entered the human mind, but in the ability to originate, as occasion may require, the most valuable thoughts upon any important subject of common reasoning. They may, indeed, be such as could easily be borrowed from others, or they may be such as could not readily be found in a common library, but to the individual, they are often new, and in their peculiar relations and dress, quite original. How far they are occasionally "new things under the sun," is of little consequence to our present purpose. The mind possessed of this creative power, resembles another of the same order, as does the skilful artisan his equally skilful neighbour, in the same branch of business. From similar raw materials, they produce wares similar in the general, though, not on that account, less

the original production of each. Such a mind differs from the common cultivated mind, much as the manufactory does from the shop where its products are stored, and dealt out to the customer. What we mean to assert, then, is, that the intellect of a Christian minister should be a manufactory, producing its wares from raw materials to meet any demand, and not a mere store house through which they may pass to the buyer.

But why, since the minister of Christ is not to be a teacher of new truths, does he peculiarly need the mental power in question? Will he not be more faithful as a *messenger* of God, if not tempted by conscious power to substitute human wisdom for divine truth? Why need he be more than a conduit from the fountain of the divine mind to the human receiver? This last question suggests one of the reasons for which we seek. Truth cannot pass freely from the divine mind, through that of the preacher to the hearer, unless the former makes each idea his own, and moulds its form so as to favour its communication in any given circumstances. Borrowed ideas can have no dress to fit them well, except the one in which we find them, but this may be far from the one necessary to our purpose. Our own ideas can be clothed in a great variety of dresses, as occasion may demand. Besides, the preacher, in the midst of opposers, as he always really is, will ordinarily find no adequate stimulus to efficient action, in the feeble impressions made by the conclusions of other minds. His intellectual and moral views must have the depth of self-formed conclusions, or they will often fail in the hour where decided action is most necessary. The arduous struggle for truth will be feebly maintained by those who rely upon human testimony in cases where *it* is not the *kind* of testimony that supports any conclusion.

Again: The interpretation of his message can be entrusted by the preacher to no human mind but his own. Nor will he trust his own unaided powers; but under the promised influences of the Holy Spirit, he must get his most valuable light, in all cases of great difficulty, in the interpretation of Scripture. Suppose he takes up his book of instructions from the court above. He sees great obscurity in many passages, and those too of much apparent consequence. Shall he seek relief in the judgment of others? Let him select a small number of commentators, (for he surely, ought not to follow any man implicitly) whose learning and piety are equally unquestionable, and he will often find it more difficult to decide upon the claims of jarring

opinions, than to form his own, unaided, except by the Spirit of God. The preacher, who relies mainly upon commentaries, is often reduced to the necessity of either passing by important parts of his message, or advancing the opinions of men equally fallible with himself, in the place of divine truth.

A mind that can strike out light in the darkest places, is also necessary, from the fact, that the wisest and best men disagree materially as to the best mode of delivering the message of God. True, the ministers of Christ may secure a respectable standing in the world, by falling into the most common forms of exhibiting truth, but they cannot be at all secure in this way of general success in their ministrations. The best forms for human transactions must often be reduced to their first principles, or they will pass off as mere forms. The complex idea in the minds of thousands in regard to public worship in all its parts, leaves out the first principles of the institution, and may do so for years, unless something more than unvarying forms call attention to the substance of the whole matter. To effect any thing toward the removal of this evil, there is needed independency of thought and observation, applied to the various circumstances in which the preacher may be placed. Others cannot think for him. Their advice will be as various as the circumstances in which God has been pleased to bless their labours, while still more discordant opinions may come from those, whose attachment to human wisdom has prevented their ever preaching the Gospel in those simple modes, which have always proved most effective. What then shall he do? He *must* judge for himself. If baffled in one course he must vary his mode, always taking care to keep within scriptural limits of proceeding. This is what men do in every department of life, or fail to accomplish any thing valuable. Are we told that here is no field for experiment and innovation, since God himself has prescribed the means of grace to be employed? But where is the proof that in the details of the general mode, in which we are required by our standards, to exhibit truth and seek the welfare of souls, the common forms are the most efficient that can be found? Our mode of publicly teaching divine truth is by no means the primitive mode, and may not be in all respects the best one. Much is necessarily left to the judgment of every Pastor, in the details of work as a Shepherd. The state of the human mind, though in many respects ever the same, is perpetually various in its relation to the modes of approaching it with

revealed truth. In almost every department of human science, great improvements in teaching have been recently made, and it seems by no means impossible that similar ones in the mode of teaching religious truth may, to a certain extent, yet be made. The arithmetical works of Colburn have given entirely new facilities of access to a common branch, and although an improvement to the same extent may not be possible in religious teaching, yet much may be accomplished by new modes of analyzing and illustrating moral truth. May we not suppose it possible, that amongst the causes of that mighty influence to be exercised by the scriptures, before the full day of millennial glory, will be some mode of exhibiting truth in a manner so intelligible and forcible, as at once to convince the judgment of every hearer?

Another consideration suggests itself. Impenitent sinners have defensive armour fitted to resist all common attacks. Can they be assailed at no points, when they have failed to provide for defence? Are they invulnerable, even to the "heel" itself? But none except an independent thinker, can ascertain the cases where, and the manner, in which new attacks, supposing them possible, can be made. What would a Bonaparte accomplish, unless he could make a path in places never before trodden by man? The Christian minister is not leading the armies of his king against weak and pusillanimous foes. *They* are not weak, who have held a world in bondage for almost 6000 years. In warring against such foes, weak and irresolute men, daring only to act according to the letter of their orders, as reported by others, can hold no important post. Those teachers who in meek dependence upon heavenly guidance, can form their own opinions, especially upon practical points, will be almost alone in doing great service to the cause of Christ.

A creative mind is highly necessary to the Christian minister, to enable him to tax the known universe for illustrations of divine truth. The effect of truth depends much upon the dress in which it appears. We are often deceived in supposing that its statement in abstract terms is most favourable to its own *peculiar* tendency. We have no terms properly abstract. The question of selection generally lies between those used by speculative men, though really figurative, but not intelligible to the common mind, and those which, though not more figurative, are a part of the common dialect. But where shall we get dresses for truth to suit the ever varying demands of new circumstances? We cannot borrow in the majority of cases, since

we want an article not well prepared in one age to suit another. We must *make* to suit the fashion. It is scarcely necessary to say, that old truths must be so dressed at *all* times as to show their real faces. Masks are never to be employed.

In addition to having a soul filled with truth, nothing perhaps will so well qualify a man to meet error in all its Protean and often unexpected forms, as independency of thought. The proper application of a few plain scriptural truths, will meet all the common forms of error, but how shall it be done? *Hic labor, hoc opus est.* Still we need not despair. The minister of Christ, whose life blood is heavenly truth, and whose mind has a self-furnishing power, need not quail before the legions of Satan, though they brandish a thousand horrid weapons never before seen.

A thorough acquaintance with the inductive mode of seeking truth, is a most important element in the preacher's mental character. If the truth, expressed in the first Aphorism of Lord Bacon's *Novum Organon*, be not so digested as to pervade his whole mental system, he rejects an essential principle in all his inquiries for truth. That man neither knows nor can know of matter or mind, more than is observed or directly revealed by God, is a fact not less important in the intellectual system, than gravity in the material universe. One who does not see a difference between conjectures and observed facts, as palpable as that between light and darkness, may expend the energies of a life in speculations no better than those of the schoolmen. If he cannot open his Bible except to find what some system or creed tells him is there, however excellent the system or creed may be in its place, he is poorly prepared to deliver *the message of God* to men. If he cannot fix upon *ascertained* facts in human nature as real knowledge, and value all conjecture merely as such, he will be master of too little common truth to mould society by his preaching.

The impression is very common, that Lord Bacon permanently and generally disencumbered the human mind of Aristotelian and scholastic chains. But is such an impression correct? Are not the large majority of learners and learned, as really slaves to false principles of investigation, as before his time? The number of shackles is not ordinarily as great, but still the individuals are few, who have ever freely walked abroad in the pure air of mental liberty. There is an apparent propensity in the human mind, generally, to court the very bondage which paralyzed it for so many ages prior to the revival

of learning in Europe. Hence but a few individuals in any age reach more than a pigmy stature, compared with what all might easily attain. The human mind is, in most men, a giant in chains; and, what is still worse, those chains are so like the atmosphere in their equable and uniform pressure, that we scarcely dream of their existence. Not to debate this subject further, we hold it as a fact, that the great bulk of men in the three learned professions, are to this very hour proceeding upon principles of investigation fundamentally wrong. But we are chiefly concerned for religious truth, and feel confident, that before *it* can show its full power to mould the human mind, it must be much further freed from scholastic entanglements, than has, to any great extent, ever been its favoured lot. Were a second Bacon to arise, and accomplish for moral and religious truth, what the Baron of Verulam did in Natural Philosophy, he might become a benefactor to the human race. A Bacon in his Philosophy, combined with a Paul in Christian zeal, might accomplish more for Christianity than a thousand of echoes echoing all that thousands of Fathers have said or written. We mean no disrespect to the great or the good, but while we reverence their learning and their piety, we would not reject their example, in seeking to grow, whether in knowledge or piety, by the actual exercise of our own faculties. Had our most admired predecessors wasted a life in admiring others, they would never have reached our era, even in memory.

Highly cultivated analytical and analogical powers of mind are of unspeakable importance to the teacher of the Christian religion. The same defects in the analysis of ideas, that pervade almost all systems of common instruction, are equally common and injurious in religious teaching. Truth can be delivered to good purpose, only in portions of a certain size, suited always to the capacity of the receiver. Present more than the mind can grasp, and all interest is destroyed in what we do advance. We may, indeed, lodge in the mind verbal notions, but unless they are taken in parts, and the relations of each to others exhibited, no proper impression is produced. The mechanism of a watch would be poorly understood from a single view of the whole, but if each part be shown with its office, and then the combined effect of all, we obtain correct impressions of the machine. Much of all the religious truth advanced, in the common way, is lost from this defect in simplification of analysis. The evil can be corrected, only by a closer attention to ideas and real facts, and less dependence upon any *particular* dress of our

ideas. Facts can usually be made intelligible, while verbal propositions, often mere guesses as they are, must usually be as little comprehended by the hearer as by the speaker. Analysis may, also, be too minute. Like the anatomy of the brain and heart, as exhibited in the dissecting room, the repeated mention of very minute parts, may confuse the mind, and prevent any definite impression of the whole. Those, however, who deal in palpable facts have nature for their guide, and are least liable to err on either extreme. The human mind seems generally adapted to receive impressions from every kind of fact, when fairly described, while the figments of the brain can seldom convey the same impression to more than one mind. Good analogical powers of mind are essential to all who attempt the instruction of others in any department. The Saviour of men, who "spake as never man spake," seldom uttered a truth except in a dress borrowed from an analogical fact. The divinity of his wisdom, may perhaps be as really displayed in his *mode* of teaching truth as in the truth taught. This point seems not always observed. Else, why is our mode of teaching so utterly at variance with his. The language of feeling is still much the same as it was in his days. Formal parables are not so much in vogue, but their equivalent in judicious comparisons, and striking illustration is equally important in all attempts to reach the common mind or affect the hearts of even cultivated persons. Here again, we remark the importance of studying facts. Real truths present numerous analogies amongst themselves, while conjectures seldom do more than separate what the God of truth has joined together.

A degree of moral courage, quite peculiar in its extent, is an essential requisite of ministerial character. We fear this subject is not always appreciated. To show the danger of deception in the case, we need only advert to the fact, that the clerical profession is generally regarded as one, which the Christian student may choose, without possessing any greater degree of fortitude, than is necessary at the bar, or in the practice of medicine. Is it, then, really true, that in a world where the great majority, even in its best portions, are either open or covert enemies of God; in a world where the powers of darkness still hold almost universal sway—can it be true, that in such a world, the servants of God need no higher degree of moral courage, than the servants of men? All admit that the Apostle Paul had abundant employment for this noble quality in its highest perfection. But why? He had a world of heathen idolaters to oppose. Are we,

then, to suppose, that men hate the Cross of Christ less, while they are in the false garb of Christians, than if arrayed in the panoply of her open enemies? They may hate their own idea of the Christian religion less than a Pagan does; but every fact in the case proves beyond doubt, that nominal Christians are as truly enemies to God as are the veriest heathen on earth. Are we told, they respect its forms, and consequently oppose with less violence? Are then its forms all we advocate? Farewell, in that case, a long farewell, to all our hopes of millennial glory. A religion that does not carry heaven-born love, and purity, and peace, to its possessor—a religion that does not draw at every moment upon the life blood of sin, is no religion for this revolted earth. A religion, then, that does not find a real opposer, in every unconverted man, and consequently, that will not secretly or openly array him against its Ministers, is not the religion of Jesus.

The enemies of religion are very frequently proposing a truce; (with what designs we need not say) but all who accept the proposal will fail to understand, at all, their need of moral courage. Flattered and favoured as they may be in this case, they may readily imagine, that the offence of the cross has ceased. But let them declare war against all sin, whether in ecclesiastical or lay dignitaries, whether in bosom friends or open foes, supporters or non-supporters of the Christian ministry—let them always distinguish in all their conduct between him that serveth God, and him that serveth him not, and the case becomes a very different one. The Christian minister will find meaning in the words of the poet, as descriptive of the devotion which he ought to feel, when he says :

“Nor have I ever held my life, but as a pawn
“To wage for thee.”

It is a palpable mistake to suppose that any small degree of moral courage will sustain a faithful preacher of the Gospel, even in this Christian land. To illustrate this: suppose an extensive conspiracy against the United States' government should be discovered as now in full operation. Let it be known that more than half the officers of the nation, more than half her citizens were leagued against her executive and laws. Suppose, too, that true patriots could generally discover, but in such a way as to furnish no open proof, yet almost to a certainty, who were traitors and who faithful men. Would not the lover of his country need more fortitude, than if called to

march against an open foe? Could he as easily face a professed friend, whom he yet suspected as an enemy, as summon resolution to confront a declared aggressor? This is, however, but a partial illustration of the case. Parties in any of this world's concerns, are so much more visibly united, than are the real friends of Christ, that more support for individuals is apparent in almost any circumstances, than in the work of openly serving God.

The necessity imposed upon the Christian minister to follow truth, whether she lead with or against his prejudices from education, his interests from worldly connexions, or his prospects for ease and honour, is of itself an argument of no small weight for our position. Those who sympathize with Locke or Milton, will ask no illustration of this. A love of truth which pervades the whole soul, will soon discover, not only abundance of external foes, but feel deeply, that "a man's worst foes," are "they of his own household." How few individuals have ever dared to investigate their leading sentiments as to opinions not directly supported by revealed truth, thinking it *possible* that others may be nearer right than themselves and their own friends? It requires little moral courage to read books or hear arguments against us, when we are resolved to remain of the same opinion at all events: but to come at all questions of the kind intended, as unsettled questions, and be ready to follow our own best judgment, is quite another thing. The former course may often seem much better, but certainly reflects dishonour upon our best intellectual and moral faculties. It is calling men, *fathers*, and often refusing the guidance of our heavenly Father. If we were designed to walk in leading strings, the majority of men have very obediently fallen in with the arrangement. One reflection is important. Truth is a mighty current setting in from eternity, and flowing onward forever with increasing strength, although often an undercurrent, and seemingly overpowered by others. But it will safely bear onward all who commit their barks to its waves, however frequently the billows of falsehood may threaten their final submersion. They will outride the commotions of time, and soon reach a sea, whose pacific waves know no bounds but those of eternity.

We have glanced at some of the points where peculiar qualifications seem necessary for the Christian minister. Perhaps, we shall be told, that only a few individuals have natural abilities, fitting them for distinction in these high qualifications. In

regard to moral courage and entire devotion to the cause of truth, the answer is obvious. The amount of grace, which warrants the soldiers of Christ in seeking the high office in view, will secure both these traits of character. In other words, those who have such views of the Christian ministry, as to feel their absolute need of these qualifications, will readily find means to attain them. Those who enter the ministry as a worldly profession, will not need them. Their aims being no higher than such as prompt the worldling in any sphere; they seek no higher ground in preparation for their work.

In reference to intellectual attainments of the self-furnishing kind, there is more to encourage all persons in their pursuit, than many imagine. It appears to us, that the human mind has seldom, perhaps never yet, comprehended its own susceptibilities. The intellectual powers depend much for their development upon the greater or less development of the active powers. The high pressure stimulus under which Bonaparte or Alexander acted, might have developed as much fertility of device, might have favoured as much independency of thought and judgment in ten thousand other minds as in their own. Or, to take a case more obviously parallel to that of the Christian minister: might not a similar press of motive make thousands of men, who are now unknown, as truly great as Martin Luther? Suppose, then, an individual of only common talents enters the Gospel ministry at the present moment, there is surely as much to enlist his whole energy in the cause of Christ as ever can press upon a human being. Almost the whole human race is as really going down to death as in the days of the Apostle Paul. Every well directed effort is as visibly crowned with success as at any period of the world. No single man could, in our estimation, have ever hoped to win more souls to Christ, by an unreserved consecration of all his talents to the work of the Lord. Let this vast pressure of motive be felt in all its power, as it is by some individuals. We cannot suppose a case more favourable for the development of the highest powers belonging to the human mind. Those who have felt their own intellectual powers improving by each step of their advance in holiness, can easily conceive, that were any tolerably gifted and cultivated mind progressively freed from sin, till less remained than has polluted the best of our race, he might as far surpass the common mind in true mental attainments as in moral worth. Here it is interesting to remark one of the ways in which moral attainments

favour intellectual advancement. Deficiency in power of attention is one of the main obstacles to our progress in knowledge. This depends upon the occupation of the mind by *other things* than the subject before it. Those *other things* are often uneasinesses of mind or body which result from sinful affections and practices. Suppose then, an individual has moral strength to treat body and mind in all respects as nature, experience and revelation require. The body would lose its power to clog the soul and hinder the free play of its powers. The mind might be concentrated with almost an Angels force upon each subject of thought, and thus produce results above any which the mind can ever reach in less favoured circumstances. There can be little doubt, but the perfect peace of mind which attends an almost overwhelming desire to glorify God, may so far favour this concentration of mind, in the case of men now living, as to bring forward great minds in the place of those most common in their powers. In heaven we may expect these results will be universal; and it, perhaps, remains to be seen how much of heavenly purity and angelic thought may yet fire the bosom of man. It seems perfectly within the reach of all Christian Students, by proper attention to the rules for the promotion of health, and the production of intellectual vigor, when favoured by the love of God filling the whole mind, to rise above any attainments which the world has seen. That such will be a common case, at no distant period, we firmly believe.

Select List of Recent Publications.

BIBLICAL.

Scott's Family Bible, revised and corrected by the Rev. Josiah Pratt, B. D. Vicar of St. Stephens, Coleman street, London. 3 vols. imperial 8vo. London, 1831.

Outlines of Scriptural Geography, with an Atlas, by Joseph E. Worcester. Second edition, revised and corrected. Boston, 1831.

A Key to the Revelation of St. John the Divine, being an analysis of those parts of that wonderful book which relate to the general state of the Christian Church, through all the times since it was written, and to the peculiar signs of those times. By the Rev. Philip Allwood. London.

The Greek Testament, with English Notes. By the Rev. Dr. Burton, Regius Professor of Divinity. In 2 volumes. London.

The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, translated from the Hebrew text of Vanderhooght. London, 1831.

Van der Palm, Ueber die Mosaische Erzählung von der Schöpfung der Welt. Wesel.

Die Fünf Bücher Mosis; verstandiget von S. Paulus. Cassel.

Reply to Professor Stuart's Energetical Essays on several words relating to future punishment. By Walter Balfour. Boston. pp. 238.

THEOLOGICAL, &c.

The whole works of Edward Reynolds, D. D., Lord Bishop of Norwich, now first collected, with a Life of the Author. By Alexander Chalmers, Esq. 6 vols. 8vo. London.

Divarication of the New Testament into Doctrine and History. London, 1831.

[This is a work of the noted follower of Kant, Thomas Wirgman, a mechanic of London, who has for many years fruitlessly endeavoured to engraft the German metaphysics upon the sturdy stock of British common sense. He now applies his system to Theology, "by attempting to prove on the solid basis of Reason, the undeniable fact of the *Divinity of Christ*, from the evidence of the doctrine he promulgated to the world, whose absolute purity and perfect sublimity show at once that it could not be

earth-born, but must have descended from those effulgent regions of never ending bliss—heaven. This desideratum (he adds) once accomplished, *Church Union* follows of course: for where the *doctrine* is universal, the community who adopt it cannot fail to be the same.”—This work may possibly be approved by such as have digested the transcendentalism of Mr. Coleridge.]

Illustrations of the Prædial Power of Faith, in a Series of Discourses on the first part of the Eleventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. By B. T. Binney. London.

Errors regarding Religion and Thoughts on Prayer at the present time. 1 vol. 12mo. Boston. [Containing the rise of Polytheism and Pantheism—Early Corruptions of Christianity—Popery—Mysticism—Heresies after the Reformation—Infidelity—Present State of Errors—Universal Christianity.] By James Douglas, author of Hints on Missions, &c.

The Theological Class Book. Containing a System of Divinity, in the form of Question and Answer, accompanied with Scripture Proofs, designed for the use of Theological Classes, and the higher classes in Sabbath Schools. By the Rev. William Cogswell, author of “The Assistant to Family Religion.” 1 vol. 18mo. pp. 196. Boston.

The Christian Ministry, with an Inquiry into the Causes of its Inefficiency. By Rev. Charles Bridges, B.A., Vicar of Old Newton, Suffolk. 2 vols. 12mo. Boston and New York, 1831.

A Brief Statement of the Doctrine of the Holy Scripture concerning the Second Advent of our blessed Lord. By P. Bathwick, Esq. London.

An Inquiry into the proofs, nature and extent of Inspiration, and into the authority of Scripture. By Samuel Hinds. London.

Biblical Notes and Dissertations, chiefly intended to confirm and illustrate the doctrine of the deity of Christ. By J. J. Gurney. London.

The Errors of Romanism traced to their origin in human nature. By Dr. Whately.

Miscellaneous Writings of Rev. Matthew Henry, Edited by J. B. Williams.

Select Practical Works of Rev. John Howe and William Bates. Collected and arranged with biographical sketches. By James Marsh, President of the University of Vermont. Burlington, 1830.

Benjamin Constant. De la Religion, considérée dans ses sources, ses formes & ses développements. Tomes 5, 8vo. Paris.

Doddridge’s Miscellaneous Works, with an Introductory Essay by Rev. T. Morell. Complete in one vol. royal 8vo. Boston.

Infant Baptism a scriptural ordinance, and Baptism by sprinkling lawful. By William G. Hamilton, A. M. Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Newark, N. J.

Lectures on Universalism. By Joel Parker, Pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, Rochester.

The Works of the Right Rev. John Stark Ravenscroft, D. D. containing his Sermons, Charges, and Controversial Tracts, with a Memoir of his Life. 2 vols. pp. 471 and 573. New York.

A Practical Exposition of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, in the form of lectures, intended to assist the practice of domestic instruction and devotion. By John Bird Summer, Bishop of Chester. London.

Essays, adapted to the understanding of young persons, on the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion, the Immortality of the Soul, &c. By R. Ainslie. London.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AND POLITY.

A Chart of Ecclesiastical History from the Christian Era to the present day. On the plan of the "Stream of Time." London, 1831.

History of the Church, published under the superintendence of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. London, 1830-31. 8vo.

Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, and other works; with his Life by Isaac Walton, and Strype's Interpolations. To which are now first added, the "Christian Letter" to Mr. Hooker, and Dr. Covel's "Just and temperate Defence" in reply to it; accompanied by an Introduction, a Life of Thomas Cartwright, B. D., and numerous notes. By Benjamin Hanbury. London.

The Book of the Priesthood. An Argument in Three Parts. Part I. The Christian Ministry not a Priesthood. Part II. Christ the only, but all-sufficient Priest of the Christian Church. Part III. The Levitical terms employed in the New Testament, which do not apply exclusively to Christ, belong equally to all true Christians. By Thomas Stratten. London, 8vo. 1831.

Observations on the History of the Preparation of the Gospel, and its early propagation, from the dedication of Solomon's Temple, to the end of the first Christian century. By Rev. J. Collinson.

[This work is said to contain "a summary of the leading events relating to the preparation which was made by Providence for the establishment of the New Law, and for its early propagation among the Gentiles. The author's object is to assist those missionaries who are too often sent out with but a very imperfect knowledge of the mode in which Christianity was propagated by the Apostles and their companions."]

An attempt to ascertain the Chronology of the Acts of the Apostles. By Rev. Dr. Burton.

J. K. Korner. Julian der Abtrunnige, oder die traurigen Folgen der Veranstaltung des reinen Christenthums. Schneeberg.

D. Ritter. Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte. 2tes. B.—Bonn.

F. Fiedler. Tabula Ecclesiasticæ Historiæ, Seriem XIX. sæculorum chronistice exhibens. Leipzig.

Memoirs of Augustus Hermann Francke. American Sunday School Union.

 NARRATIVE.

Memoirs of John Frederick Oberlin, Pastor of Waldbach, in the Ban de la Roche; compiled from authentic sources, chiefly French and German. First American Edition, with a Dedication and translations. By the Rev. Luther Halsey, Professor of Theology in the Western Theological Seminary. 1831. Boston.

The Life and Times of the Rev. Richard Baxter, with a critical examination of his writings. By the late Rev. William Orme, author of Memoirs of Owen, Bibliotheca Biblica, and one of the Secretaries of the London Missionary Society. 2 vols. 8vo. Boston, 1831.

Journal of a Tour to Malta, Greece, Asia Minor, Carthage, Algiers, Port Mahon and Spain, in 1828. By Samuel Woodruff, Esq. Agent of the New York Greek Committee. New York, 1831.

The Life of the late Bishop Middleton of Calcutta. By Rev. Charles Webbe Le Bas. London.

Travels in the Holy Land, by Wm. Rae Wilson, with letters from foreign sovereigns to the author, on the Protestant Faith. London.

Memoirs of Howard, the Philanthropist; compiled from his Diary, his confidential Letters, and other authentic documents. By James Baldwin Brown: abridged by a gentleman of Boston, from the London quarto Edition.

Incidents in the Life of Dr. Dwight. New Haven, 1831.

Sketches of Danish Missions. By Rev. S. W. Greenfield, London.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

The Character and Blessedness of the Good Man. A Discourse delivered in the chapel of Nassau Hall, on the sabbath, January 9, 1831. By James Carnahan, D. D. President of the College. pp. 24. Princeton.

Christianity not the religion of the Bible only, or of the Church. A Sermon by Dr. Hawkins, Provost of Oriel College. London.

Sermons, par Mons. Monod, Pasteur de l'Eglise Reformée de Lyons. Spiess. Ausgezählte Predigten. Franckfurt.

Rohr. Christologische Predigten. Weimar.

Importance of a Minister's Reputation: a sermon delivered at the installation of Rev. Dr. Hewitt, in Bridgeport, Conn. December, 1830. By Leonard Woods, D. D. Andover.

Influence of Religion on Liberty. A discourse in commemoration of the landing of the Pilgrims, delivered at Plymouth, December 22, 1830. By B. B. Wisner. Boston.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Christian Lyre. By Joshua Leavitt. New York.

[Six numbers of this little work have been published, and the beautiful pocket volume thus formed, deserves public attention. We cannot but applaud the spirit in which it has been undertaken, as well as the evangelical character of the hymns; and hope that it may prove extensively useful. At the same time we deplore the secular lightness of many of the melodies; and still more the attempted adaptation of spiritual songs to airs which are by association connected with ungodly poetry. There is no science nor art more fertile than Music; and there is therefore no necessity for our being indebted to the ball-room or theatre for our tunes. It is untrue that classical music is necessarily less popular, or less stirring, or less easy, than that which is irregular and unchaste. Witness the better sort of airs in this collection, and many in the works of Messrs. Hastings & Mason. We deplore also the introduction of prosaic effusions, without the elevation of poetry or even the attraction of rhyme, such as "I'll try to prove faithful, p. 119. Notwithstanding these blemishes, however, the manual is worthy of encouragement.]

Juvenile Lyre: or Hymns and Songs, religious, moral and cheerful, set to appropriate music, for the use of primary and common schools. Boston. Edited by Lowell Mason and E. Ives, Jun.: aided by Rev. Wm. C. Woodbridge and Mr. S. F. Smith.

Journal of the Proceedings of a Convention of Literary and Scientific Gentlemen, held in the city of New York, October, 1830.

Letters on Missions. By William Swan, Missionary in Siberia. With an Introductory Preface, by the late William Orme. Boston, 1831.

The Advancement of Society in Knowledge and Religion. By James Douglas. First American from the second Edinburgh Edition. Hartford.

AMERICAN WORKS REPUBLISHED IN LONDON.

Professor Stewart's Hebrew Grammar.

Sermons. By the late Rev. Dr. Payson.

Canon of the Old and New Testaments ascertained. By Rev. Dr. Alexander; with Introductory Remarks, by J. Morrison, D. D.

