

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1852.

No. I.

ARTICLE I.—*Antiquities of the Christian Church.*

1. *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archæologie.* Bde I.—XII. 8vo. Leipzig, 1817–31. Von D. Johann Christian Wilhelm Augusti.
2. *Handbuch der Christlichen Archæologie.* Bde I.—III. Leipzig, 1836–7. Von D. Johann Christian Wilhelm Augusti.
3. *Die Kirchliche Archæologie.* Dargestellt von F. H. Rheinwald. 8vo. S. 569. Berlin, 1830.
4. *Handbuch der christlich-kirchlichen Alterthümer in alphabetischer Ordnung mit steter Beziehung auf das, was davon noch jetzt im christlichen Cultus übrig geblieben ist.* Von M. Carl Christian Friedrich Siegel. Bde I.—IV. Leipzig, 1835–38.
5. *Lehrbuch der christlich-kirchlichen Archæologie.* Verfasst von Dr. Joh. Nep. Locherer. 8vo. S. 194. Frankfort am Main, 1832.
6. *Die christlich-kirchliche Alterthumswissenschaft, theologisch-critisch bearbeitet.* Von Dr. Wilhelm Böhmer. Bde I.—II. 8vo. Breslau, 1836–9.
7. *Lehrbuch der christlich-kirchlichen Archæologie.* Von Heinrich Ernst Ferdinand Guericke. 8vo. S. 345. Leipzig, 1847.

THIS formidable array of authors comprises only those who, in Germany, have within the last thirty years, written on the
VOL. XXIV.—NO. I. 1

partisan zeal for the catholic maxim—"In things essential, *unity*; in things not essential, *liberty*; in all things, *charity*."

With these views, a *Manual of Christian Antiquities* was compiled from the works of Augusti, and other sources, by Rev. J. E. Riddle, a moderate but earnest Churchman of Oxford, and was published in London in 1839. Two years later, a similar manual, now out of print, prepared from a different stand-point, was issued from the press at Andover, and soon reprinted in London. A new edition of this book, under another title, and so revised, altered, and amended as to be almost an independent work, will, it is understood, soon be offered to the public.

ART. II.—*The True Progress of Society.*

THE true method of human advancement is a subject upon which the mind of the civilized world is deeply exercised. Just in proportion as the condition of men has been improved, they have gained a consciousness of their capacities for improvement. They have kindled up to earnest longings and strivings for still further, and even illimitable progress. This is especially true of all countries that have felt the impulse given to popular freedom, intelligence, and thrift, by the Reformation. And as the great masses of the people have succeeded in winning for themselves the priceless blessings of civil liberty and education, and in opening to themselves the avenues to wealth, honour, and power, they have been filled with irrepressible yearnings for something better still; if not always for a definite and attainable, at least for an ideal and impracticable good. These feelings have received a powerful stimulus from the vast improvements actually made during the past half century, in the domain of physical science, and its application to the arts, in labour-saving inventions, in locomotion, in impressing the blind forces of nature into the service of man, and the consequent immense cheapening and diffusion of the comforts and luxuries belonging to civilized life. If man has thus advanced in all the means of physical well-being during this period, he has made scarcely less

progress in his political, intellectual, moral, and religious interests. It cannot be questioned that, on the whole, the liberties and franchises of the people have been increased, while despotism has been on the wane. Popular education and intelligence have made prodigious advances. And with respect to religion, it is enough to advert to the missionary and benevolent agencies which are the growth of the last half century, and which distinguish and adorn Protestant and evangelical Christianity.

It would indeed be strange, if the laudable desire and hope of beneficent progress, thus excited, did not exhibit themselves occasionally in wild and reckless freaks. It is to be expected, that the good which this spirit promotes will be marred by large admixtures of evil: that it will originate and cherish not only beneficent enterprise, but endless visionary and chimerical projects. That such is the actual state of the case, no sober-minded person needs to be convinced. The state of opinion and feeling on this subject, which now infects large bodies of men, and actuates various parties, sections, and cliques in society, and, to some extent in the Church, is analogous to that so generally observed in young people when they first become conscious of their strength, and of their capacity for better things than they have yet attained. There are few who have not witnessed the disastrous workings of this "vile fever of the mind." That discontent with the most favoured lot, and the fairest prospects, that impatience of discipline and steady industry, that passion for raw and suicidal projects, that fickleness which mistakes mere change for improvement, and seeks in novelty a cure for restlessness, are the symptoms of a distemper which sometimes baffles the wisest parents and guardians. Thus, too, the spirit of progress among the masses, most wholesome as it is when rightly regulated, often degenerates into a morbid restlessness and passion for novelty—a merely revolutionary and destructive propensity. It displays the abnormal freaks and aberrations of its youth. It broods endless mad schemes and destructive projects under the fair name of reform. It would often sap the foundations and shatter the frame work of society, for the mere pleasure of reconstructing it. It would destroy that it may create, and put down that it may raise up. It would discard the collected wisdom and experience of the

past, that it may clear the way for its own experiments. It would distrust the most original, intuitive, and permanent beliefs of our race, as shown by all history and observation, and the most fundamental and indubitable truths of revelation as embraced by the whole Church of God, that it may clear the stage for the display of its own transcendental wisdom. It will allow nothing in politics, ethics, or religion to be regarded as a settled and incontrovertible truth. It would unsettle every thing, that it may amend and reform every thing. Beyond the testimony of the senses, and the demonstrations of pure mathematics, we are to reckon nothing certain or fixed. All is to be presumed doubtful until proved by a fresh discussion. We are all afloat. The first principles of the doctrine of Christ, the very inspiration and authority of his word, the first axioms in ethics, are in question. There is nothing settled for us to live by or to die by. The very foundations of all faith are thus fluxing away. And "if the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous do?"

This is no caricature of the attitude in which multitudes place themselves, who claim to be *par excellence*, the progressives of the present age. Others who would shrink from such extremes, are yet fully possessed with that radical spirit which would apply the pick-axe and crow-bar to institutions which are the growth of the wisdom of ages, and to principles on which the excellents of the earth have heretofore founded their hopes, and staked their eternal destiny. And this work of ruin they dignify with the name of progress. There are others who believe that true progress is gained by carefully guarding all the treasures of truth, goodness, well-being, which our race has yet gathered, and by making these the starting point for fresh advances, the fulcrum for more energetic operations, the baseline for new discoveries. That these tendencies or types of opinion, feeling and action, which we have thus briefly indicated now exist, and that they divide the civilized and Christian world, none will deny. One of the gravest of all questions then is, which of these is right? That true progress in all that is good and true is desirable all admit. But what is true progress? Who are the true progressives?

That there are also those who would keep intact, not only all

the good, but all the evil now existing, is not to be disputed. With this class, who are not for stability merely, but for stagnation also, we do not now propose to concern ourselves. It does not constitute active or formidable force, except in connection with that civil or spiritual despotism to which it is ever wedded. In the Protestant portion of our own country it is wholly insignificant. It is utterly lost and unknown under the complete preponderance of progressive tendencies among us. The conflict here is not between the friends of progress on the one hand, and of stagnation on the other, but between the friends of different kinds and methods of progress. The question is, which is true, and which is pseudo-progress? While all alike claim that they are advancing, it is obvious that different classes are going in different, and even contrary directions. Who are going forward, and who backward? And who are diverging to the right and left, and how far? And who are always astir without making headway in any direction, "all move and no go?" Who are the true progressives?

The main question, which we propose first to consider, respects a general principle rather than its applications in detail. It respects the fundamental idea of progress itself. Does such progress as brings real improvement or advantage to men, ground itself on the hypothesis that nothing ought to be regarded as sure and established, until it be subjected to re-investigation and re-construction? Or does it pre-suppose the certainty of most of the principles which have long been regarded as settled and sure by the great mass of the wisest and best of men? And does it proceed upon the presumption that the whole body of such principles are true, so far, at least, that they are to be regarded and treated as true, until their falsity is shown, and so far also, as to throw the burden of proof upon all who call them in question? This is the chief issue with which we concern ourselves. And when this is properly disposed of, all minor questions will adjust themselves accordingly. And this is the real *status quæstionis*, as it is indicated in the various titles which have been employed by common consent to designate the various parties to this conflict. Thus, there is the term *conservative*, applied to the class who would preserve all the treasures of truth and means of well-being which have

already been gained, and make these a capital to be wielded in seeking still larger discoveries and accumulations. Their antagonists on the other hand have been known by various titles, all expressive of a contrary character. Perhaps the most common and characteristic is that of *Radicals*—which implies a fondness for radical innovations, a disposition not merely to lop off diseased branches, but for the sake of getting rid of these, to uproot and destroy the tree itself. They would not only with our Saviour lay the axe at the root of corruption in the human heart, in order to restore the wicked to purity of life; but they would also make immediate *radical* reforms in those systems of faith and doctrine, and practice, or in those ethical, social and civil maxims, which have always been espoused by the excellent of the earth. In order to purge these of some real or imaginary faults, they would uproot them. They must destroy in order to reform, and kill in attempting to cure. They cannot wait for that gradual amelioration which characterizes the divine method of healing. The chronic maladies which always attend human imperfection, which have grown with the growth, and are ingrained into the very fibres of human society, must be instantly eradicated, even if the process involves the demolition of the social fabric itself. They have no idea of curing these distempers by the slow process of building up the general health and constitution, by the gradual infusion of a leaven of good which silently leavens the whole lump; by engrafting right principles upon the stock of existing organizations and systems, which in due time transform them into trees bearing fruit after their own kind. They would at once fell the tree, instead of digging about, manuring, purging and grafting it. The evil must be eradicated at once, and if the tares cannot otherwise be cleaned out, the wheat must be torn up also. Such is the genius of Radicalism. It not only purges away dead and diseased branches. It destroys the whole, root and branch, although a heavenly voice is whispering the while, “destroy it not for there is a blessing in it.”

Hence, another word, which like all language, has had a mysterious birth along with the idea it represents, is *ultraism*. By this is meant, carrying an idea or a reform which in itself and within proper limits is right, beyond all reasonable and scriptu-

ral bounds, so that it becomes false and ruinous. With this species of pseudo-progress, none can doubt that the country and the world have been sufficiently afflicted. Hence, too, it is quite natural that radicals and ultraists should be styled *Destructives*, because in attempting to advance men in truth and goodness, they begin by destroying what of these they already possess. They know how to pull down, but not how to build up. Although they set themselves up as models of progress, yet it is often progress in error, mischief, and ruin.

Against all these, we maintain that stability, at least a good degree of it, is essential to all true progress. This principle holds throughout the universe. At the summit of moral perfection, whether in Creator or creatures, not only necessity and liberty, but the most absolute stability and the most consummate progress coincide. God is at once without variableness or shadow of turning, and yet the author of all good; the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. He yet works all the beneficent changes which come to pass. He educes good from evil, and is creating all things new, making all events conspire to the subjugation of sin and death, and the production of the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Holy angels change not in their principles, or characters, or attachments, yet who among men so swift as they on ministries of love? The spirits of the just made perfect, in like manner, change not their faith or their practice; yet this fact no way hinders, it rather facilitates their endless progress in love, knowledge, bliss, and glory. And what is true of the saints on earth? Is not steadfastness a distinguishing property which the Bible ever ascribes to Christians, and represents as essential to their growth in grace? And if we view the lives of Christian heroes, martyrs, reformers—of those burning and shining lights who have done most to advance religion in their own souls, or among men—have they not been even distinguished for steadfastness and tenacity of principle, of doctrine, of purpose, and of action? And is not their eminent success in advancing truth and righteousness due to this same fixedness of principle, and persistent fidelity to it? Have not all the great benefactors of the race—yea, all great inventors and discoverers, who have advanced mankind in knowledge and true

well-being, been also distinguished for their firm and immovable convictions, their steadfast aim, their indomitable perseverance? Are we not indebted to these qualities for all their glorious achievements? What else could have buoyed them up and cheered them on, through floods of reverses and disappointments, and tempests of scorn and derision, to final triumph? Who so immovable, and yet who, to every good intent, so progressive as Paul, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Edwards, Washington, Wilberforce? Did not the great Apostle sum up his own character in those terse and pregnant passages in which he said: "This one thing I do;" "I have kept the faith;" "I determined to know nothing save Jesus Christ, and him crucified?" And does he not make it even fundamental in Christian character that we be "STEADFAST, IMMOVABLE, always abounding in the work of the Lord?" that we "hold fast that which is good?" that we "be established in the faith, as we have been taught?" Are we not assured that it is characteristic of the good man that his "heart is fixed?" that the "double-minded man is unstable in all his ways?" and that, "unstable as water, he shall not excel?"

This principle, indeed, rules everywhere. A government may be despotic; it may repress all enterprise and improvement among the people. This is a sore evil. It ought to be abated or removed. Yet a stable government, even though bad, is far less destructive of human weal than one that is fitful, capricious, "to nothing fixed but love of change." A legislator who adopts a system of policy, only to abandon and then restore it, then again to annul and reinstate it, thus establishing only perpetual revolution, extinguishes all the springs of enterprise and industry. Few dare attempt, and those who do, attempt in vain, to build up their fortunes on a system of policy which is liable to flux away, like a foundation of quicksand, with the next whim of the legislator. There are few, for example, who would not admit that any sort of tariff, steadily adhered to, would be better for a country than a tariff constantly vacillating from one extreme to the other. Governments must, indeed, vary their legislation to suit the varying exigencies for which they are called to provide. Nay, they must, in some rare exigencies, be themselves revolutionized in

their very structure, to accommodate the altered state and necessities of the people. But all such changes, if they be justifiable, are but applications of one self-consistent principle to diversified circumstances; even as the immutable God hath ordained one regimen for a child, another for a man—one for the church, another for the world. Yet all this makes nothing against the proposition, that the worst of all governments are the unstable and revolutionary. By destroying all security and confidence, they destroy the first conditions and incentives of human effort.

In all the sciences, in every department of human inquiry, it is the certainty of what is known, and the tenacity with which we hold it, that enable us to use it as an instrument for discovering the unknown. The first rudimental efforts of the human mind to increase its knowledge, are based on the supposed truth and certainty of the perceptions of the senses, and of our original and intuitive judgments. It is impossible to conduct education with any success, unless we proceed in some fixed method, upon some established principles, and assume the certainty of what is taught as being true. There can indeed be no reasoning or argument, unless there be some acknowledged and unquestionable truths, some *data* which form the premises from which all conclusions are derived. Stability is the condition of all wholesome progress.

And even in the physical world, the same law obtains, and is capable of being still more vividly illustrated. How beautifully does it appear in all life and growth! A dynamic requires a static force. There can be no progressive motion without a stationary support for it. We cannot take an onward step without a firm foothold. Let him who thinks otherwise take his place on the treadmill. It is the fixed law of gravitation that holds the stars in their courses, and maintains their ceaseless, harmonious circlings in the depths of space. Let it be interrupted, and instead of the music of the spheres, we should have the crash of worlds. Even the bird must spread his wings, and the fish his fins, so as to convert the fluids in which they move into a momentary firmness and solidity, to support their advancing movement. "The most mobile of creatures, the serpent,

makes a rest of its own body, and drawing up its voluminous train from behind this fulcrum, propels itself forward."

While it is thus beyond all doubt, that stability is essential to genuine progress, so it must not be forgotten that progress or improvement of some sort, is essential to all healthy stability. To be stationary, and in every sense moveless, is to become stagnant and degenerate. These two interests of permanence and progression, though in some sense opposite, and even antagonistic, are nevertheless not hostile. When put in due equipoise and fit combination, they mutually aid, regulate, and perfect each other. They produce a resultant motion, or force, which contains each in its highest perfection. It is the union of the centripetal and centrifugal forces that gives to each its due place and bounds, and enables them to keep the worlds in their appointed and harmonious circuits. So in the State. The fixed and circulative elements must be in due proportion and equipoise. Law and liberty, fast and personal property, the landed and the commercial interest, the permanent constitution and the flexible legislation, when properly balanced and combined, reciprocally sustain and invigorate each other. They are the opposite, to some extent antagonistic, yet, when rightly adjusted, mutually completing and sustaining poles of social and worldly well-being. Coleridge, in one of those pregnant sentences in which he so often, despite his more frequent extravaganzas, compresses a world of truth, says, that "the opposite interests of permanence and progression comprise in themselves all other interests of a State." In religion, too, if a steadfast faith in the truth as it is in Jesus is the condition of all salutary progress; if all progress in fact consists in propagating that truth, and leading men to believe, love and obey it; yet it is equally certain, that unless the Church makes constant advances in her understanding, or consciousness of the import, the reach, the limits, the applications of this truth, especially to new and varying circumstances; and unless she makes unceasing efforts to bring men under its saving power, the truth itself will become stagnant and impotent, a dead orthodoxy. Its vital significance and force will die out of the mind when its power is no longer felt in the heart and life, even although the form of

sound words be still tenaciously held. No longer a living power, it cannot have a living import. They who do not "prove all things," all the articles of their faith, and test their beliefs for themselves by the oracles of God, interpreted in view of whatever light the latest researches and discoveries in sacred criticism can shed upon them, will not long be able or disposed to "hold fast that which is good." Not only has truth in the abstract nothing to fear from any new discoveries, which turn out to be real discoveries in any department of knowledge. The truth of God as it has been apprehended, believed, and experienced by the saints of all generations, their hope in life, and triumph in death, cannot be imperilled by any new researches. It will suffer nothing from the most rigid scrutiny under the intensest light. It covets such scrutiny, and such light. They will but disclose confirmations and illustrations of it before unperceived, and display features of divine beauty in it before unnoticed. These are innumerable. Like the Copernican system, Christian doctrine, though evermore one, and so fully tested that it cannot be overthrown, has not yet been so perfectly explored, that it will not display proofs and beauties before undiscovered, on each new survey, whether broad or minute, telescopic or microscopic. Constant attrition does not shatter or wear away the fabric of divine truth; it does but disclose its adamantine firmness, its heavenly brightness. Thus constant advances in the understanding, evidences, illustration and diffusion of Christian truth, do not destroy, they preserve and make conspicuous its unity and identity. Instead of indolent acquiescence, we have a living faith. And Christianity instead of being crowded and stalled into a mere effete form, becomes spirit and life: thus being kept evermore one and the same, and yet "ever new and ever young."

It is very obvious from this general view of the subject, that every man of true progress must be to some good degree a conservative. Every true conservative must in the right sense of the word be a man of progress. In short, our first and general answer to the question, who are the true progressives? is, they are the progressive conservatives.

The further resolution of this question involves more minute and specific inquiries. How far, and in what particulars, must

one be conservative, or progressive? It is obvious that this question must be answered differently, according to the different spheres of human interest and activity to which it may refer. We propose to say something towards answering it, as it stands related to some of the chief interests of man.

Progress is a favourite watchword with all innovators upon received Christian doctrines. When silenced in argument upon the merits of the case, their cry is, We must have progress, in theology, as in all sciences. If man is improving in all other spheres, is religion, his great interest, to remain unimproved? This carries a plausible sound to the ear at least, in this age of unprecedented material progress, when men have made the steam and the lightning their carriers. It is the wooden sword with which heresy tries to parry the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.

It is surely the most momentous, if the stalest of truths, that man's greatest need is religious improvement. It is the greatest need for all, in the Church and out of it. But how is it to be obtained? By denying, or explaining away, or essentially modifying so as to impair or neutralize any of the great doctrines, precepts, or institutes of Christianity? Or is it by bringing ourselves and others through grace, more perfectly to understand, realize, and every way conform to these doctrines and requirements? These questions answer themselves. But, whispers one who whose soul chafes under these doctrines, Is the whole truth of the Bible on these subjects yet understood? Do the received statements of Christian doctrine admit of no amendment, to adapt them to the existing state of science and knowledge? Is Christianity cast in an iron mould? Who are endowed with an infallibility that cannot be questioned, a perfection of knowledge in things pertaining to God, which allows no increase? The answer to this is short. While no Protestant claims to be infallible, or to have yet learned the *omne scibile*, yet all sound and evangelical Protestants claim that we are to hold fast what we do know to be the vital truth of God, and what his people have clung to as the ground of their immortal hopes in all ages and nations. They hold, that to advance in religious knowledge, is not to treat as false or uncertain what are known as surely as any thing can be known,

to be the fundamental verities taught in the Bible. Universal scepticism is not the route to religious knowledge or its increase. The Apostle does not recommend it as the true course to religious insight and discernment, that "when for the time we ought to be teachers, we have need that one teach us which be the first principles of the doctrine of Christ." It is not thus that we "become skilful in the word of righteousness," or have our "senses exercised to discern between good and evil," or "go on unto perfection." Such a course, instead of being progressive, is retrograde towards the darkest ignorance, confusion and infidelity.

There lie patent on the surface of the Scriptures, and have ever been received and professed by all bodies of real, and nearly all nominal Christians, as undoubted divine verities, the doctrine that God is one Being, subsisting in three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that our race is in a state of sin and condemnation; that it is so by nature, and became so by the judgment of God visited upon it for the fall of its first progenitor; that from this state no man is capable of delivering himself; that the Son of God became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, and so was, and continues to be, God and man, two distinct natures in one person for ever; that he suffered and died in the room of sinful men, and purchased eternal redemption for all that believe on him, by becoming a curse for them; that he rose from the dead and ascended to glory, and will at last judge the world; that, having himself removed the curse, he hath procured the Holy Spirit to break the power of sin, and transform his people into the image of God; that this salvation is freely offered, and will surely be given to as many as will receive it by faith; that faith, repentance, and holy living are necessary to salvation; that they whose souls are thus saved shall also receive the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting; that all shall be finally judged by Christ, and that all unbelievers shall be consigned to everlasting punishment. Other doctrines we regard as no less palpably taught in the Bible, and as interlocked with these. But we are now speaking of what is believed and professed in all quarters where we discern the lineaments of a sound Christian piety. Not every babe in

Christ, indeed, at once knows them all. But all mature Christians receive them. They have been solemnly professed by every-known body of Christian believers. They are, and ever have been, the faith of the true catholic and universal Church. They have never been assailed, except on purely rationalistic grounds. Even the objections urged against them on this score, when thoroughly sifted, have been shown to have no basis in true reason. They are the offspring of a depraved heart and mind. They have been advanced over and over again, and as often refuted and repudiated by the Church. There has been scarcely a novelty or supposed improvement in regard to any of these doctrines—surely none of any moment for the last three centuries—which has not quickly been found to be the disinterred skeleton of some thrice-slain heresy, tricked out in the drapery of a new and fashionable philosophy. Every plausible substitute for any of these doctrines has again and again plead for acceptance, or, at least, for allowance within the Christian Church, and as often been tried and condemned, and cast out. This is true of all the heresies which impugn or vitiate the doctrine of the trinity, the incarnation, the fall and corruption of man, vicarious atonement, spiritual regeneration, a judgment to come, the resurrection of the body, and eternal retributions. All these are so fundamental in the Christian scheme, they are so presupposed in all the workings of spiritual life and Christian experience, that their denial has ever been deemed a virtual rejection of Christianity itself.

If, then, the Bible, in the apparent meaning which it conveys to candid and unprejudiced people, and in the unwavering judgment of the Christian Church, after applying every test, and weighing all objections over and over again, contains these doctrines, is it now to be assumed that we cannot know whether they are true? Is it real progress, either in theology or practical religion, to treat these as unsettled and dubious?

Let us look at the consequences of such an assumption. It is a virtual confession that it is impossible to know what are the vital truths which God has revealed in his word, on believing and obeying which he has suspended our eternal destiny. If his own people have not been able to ascertain them in eighteen centuries, then we may well despair of discovering them. If

their agreement, after the most thorough inquiry, as expressed in their confessions, private and public, their prayers, through life and in death, as to what the Bible teaches, does not indicate what the essence of Christianity is, then it is surely past finding out. But, to say that we cannot tell what Christianity is, is to surrender the whole field to infidels and sceptics.

Besides, it palsies or kills all preaching. The substance of the preacher's message, as given by the great Head of the Church, is, "he that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." But how can a preacher denounce eternal damnation upon men for not believing or obeying that, of the truth of which he is uncertain, or which he deems liable to be proved false by the next adventurer in theological science? No man who has a conscience can do it. The result is, that religion is impossible. No one can know what it is, or how to preach and exemplify it.

Moreover, such a view vacates the work of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Ghost, in purifying the heart, illuminates the mind. He regenerates and sanctifies men by the truth. He gives them an unction that they may "know all things." It is in perceiving, feeling, and loving these things, that the Christian life has its being. It consists in knowing or spiritually discerning God and Jesus Christ, and the things which are freely given us of God. As He sanctifies by the truth, and the truth is one, so it follows, that as to all that is vital in Christian experience, the Holy Spirit will work faith in one and the same truth, in all Christians. Otherwise he is not a spirit of truth. The fact that any class of doctrines have always been steadfastly espoused by the people of God, affords the strongest possible presumption that they are taught by that Spirit who is the author of the Bible, and of all evangelical holiness. Were it not so, we can hardly see how he would be more a spirit of truth than a spirit of error. We, of course, in all this sort of remark, speak of the true people of God, and not of those apostate Christian communions from which they are commanded to come out, that they may not be partakers of their plagues.

Withal, the opinion that it cannot be known what Christianity is, and that the Church may yet learn that she has essen-

tially misunderstood its vital doctrines, is incompatible with faith, the first duty which the Bible enjoins, and the spring of all piety. The nature of faith is, that it believes in certain truths upon the testimony of God. But how can such belief exist along with the conviction that they are liable to be proved false, and contrary to this testimony? How can such receive anything not "as the word of men, but as the word of God, which worketh effectually in them that believe?" And how can the gospel come to them, "not in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance?"

Not to specify further, if the view under consideration is correct, it renders various commands of the Bible impracticable. It renders it impossible to attain the full assurance of faith or hope, on any reliable grounds. And how can we avoid being "tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine," or by "divers and strange doctrines," when it is impossible certainly to know the truth of any doctrine? How can we "reject a heretic," or those that come "bringing not this doctrine," or those that cause divisions and offences "contrary to the doctrine we have learned," if we cannot know beyond a peradventure what Christian doctrine is? And how can we "obey the truth," how can "walking in the truth" be made the test and the essence of Christian piety, if it cannot be known what the truth is? In short, the progress achieved in this way, is to turn the Bible into Sybilline leaves, and make Christianity a miserable failure. For if the trumpet utter an *uncertain* sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?

We think it high time then that those who, under whatever pretext, assail the essential doctrines of Christianity, should be regarded as assailants of Christianity itself. They should take their place without the Christian camp. Then the armies of the Lord could meet them in fair and open conflict. They would meet them on the real issue, which is not, what is Christianity in its essential elements? but is Christianity true? But this is just the issue which the infidelity of our day dares not face. It foreknows its own defeat. Therefore it muffles itself in the plausible disguise of seeking to amend our faith, and purge it of human corruptions fastened upon it, in the shape of creeds and dogmas, on the ground that no religious truth can be surely

expressed in language, and that fixed and authoritative statements of doctrine are tyrannical impostures. Thus the Church is tasked with an internal conflict about the first rudiments of Christianity, instead of being left free to advance into fields of Christian knowledge yet partially explored, and to put forth its strength in converting unbelievers and heathens, to a gospel which is unquestioned within its own pale. Would it not be more progressive to learn these first principles of the doctrine of Christ, treating them as settled among ourselves, and go on unto perfection? Or is it a true token of progress in the Church of God, to bring the first principles on which it is built into suspicion, and to be compelled to exhaust its energies in this nineteenth century, in proving against its own members and ministers that they are not cunningly devised fables? Of all perils, the worst are perils among "false brethren."

But may not the Church itself make some improvement in modes of stating, defending, and explaining even fundamental Christian doctrine? There surely can be no better form of stating them than that language of Holy Scripture, or its equivalent, which has always been in use in the Church. That there may be a defence and vindication more perfect, in some respects, than have yet appeared, is doubtless true. These are distinct from the doctrines themselves. No abler defender of the faith than Edwards, has appeared in modern times. Yet few would claim that, amid all his unanswered and unanswerable arguments, he has not failed to present some subjects in their best and strongest light. Moreover, new methods of attack require new methods of defence. Thus there is always a sphere for polemic and didactic theology, and for fresh investigations and advances in it. But even here change and progress are ever hemmed in within certain limits. It is not allowable, under pretext of defending a doctrine, to make a defence or explanation of it which vitiates or subverts it. This is the pretext under which all heresy comes in. It is a poor defence of a *doctrine* to begin by subverting it. *Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis.* Those who overturn the truth on the pretext of vindicating it, are to be counted its most bitter and effective enemies.

"But who shall decide whether they do subvert or vitiate

it?" asks the errorist. "You say that my mode of defending Christian doctrine overthrows it. I retort the charge. I think the same of yours. Who then is umpire? Who shall decide when doctors disagree? Are you infallible?" To this we can only say, that each one is put upon his personal responsibility to God, in the last resort. "Every one of us must give an account of himself to God," for what he condemns and what he approves. For ourselves, we would take the responsibility of saying, that whoever defends the doctrine of the Trinity by making the three persons *mere* dramatic instruments of revelation, denies that doctrine. Whoever defends the doctrine of human depravity and spiritual regeneration, by asserting in man a plenary ability or "power of contrary choice," whereby he is adequate to make himself holy, vitiates, if he does not destroy, the whole doctrine of sin and grace, and seriously corrupts and weakens experimental religion. And we stand ready to abide the awards of the judgment day, in reference to such a judgment. We put these cases simply to illustrate our meaning.

In close relationship to the fallacy we have been exposing, is a fatalistic notion which figures largely in German Pantheism, and which we detect floating, not only in much of our secular, but even in some of our religious and theological literature. It is in substance this:—Whatever is, is good for the age and people among whom it exists. Whatever opinions spring up in a given age are true for that age. Thus truth is, of necessity, variable and progressive. What we call sin, too, is good for the times and persons that are polluted with it. It is a necessary stage of moral development, or of progress towards moral perfection. It is obvious that on this system nothing is true or false, good or evil in itself; that there is no room for a moral sense; that the most atrocious crimes can be easily exculpated; that all opinions which come into vogue are sufficiently vindicated by the fact that they exist; there is no standard above the fluctuating opinions of corrupt and short-sighted man, by which we can try and condemn even the most blasphemous sentiments; that the normal authority of the Scriptures is destroyed, and that the most unlimited licentiousness of opinion and conduct is fully sanctioned. To this category we are obliged to refer much of the popular declamation which makes the impulses of

the popular heart, and the spirit of the age a test or standard of truth and righteousness. It is obvious that, on such a principle, conscience and the Bible are dethroned, nearly all preachers of righteousness have done wrong in denouncing popular sins and errors, and Christ and every other martyr have died in vain. Of like paternity, too, is the "intuitional" theology now growing into vogue. This makes consciousness the source and standard of truth. Hence, truth is as variable as that consciousness in different men, and in the same man at different times. It is clear that this system fulfils the purpose of its authors. It destroys the certainty of truth, and the authority of revelation, and every other standard beyond each man's likes and dislikes.

The near affinity of this type of thinking to the radicalism which makes such havoc with education, and with all the great ordinances of God for human well-being, is apparent. We need not dwell upon it at length, especially as many of the topics involved have been discussed in detail in our pages. But all must see its close connection with the patent methods of education styled "productive," "analytic," and we know not what else, which discard the process of committing to memory the great principles and rules in the several branches of study, in the words which have been elaborated, to express them aright, by the wisdom of ages; which first put the pupil upon a process of investigating and discovering each rudimental truth, as if nothing had already been certainly discovered and established; which, "instead of storing the memory, at the age when that is the predominant faculty, with facts for the after exercise of the judgment, make boy-graduates in arrogance" and crude, superficial knowledge. Neglect of catechetical instruction and Christian nurture is a necessary consequence, not only logical, but actual, of which we have abundant and melancholy evidence. Such progress brings us to the infidel maxim, that we have no right to give a bias to the religious views of our children, for as nothing is certainly known on the subject, they should be left to work out their own religious problems, without any antecedent guidance or predilection. All established creeds, of course, fall under the like condemnation.

Civil government, the family, the tenure of property, those

great ordinances of God for the social regulation of man, without which this fallen world would become a universal Sodom, are not to be endured if they cross the schemes of these reformers, or become the cause or occasion of evils when perverted by fallen man. How often husbands abuse wives, and parents, children! Dissolve, then, all single families. Form whole communities into one household. Divide them into phalanxes and groups. Let the mutual relations and duties of all parties be regulated by taste and inclination. Thus let the evils of the family state be done away. Such is one radical reform proposed. It is not reformation, but destruction. For one misery that it would alleviate, it would gender a thousand now wholly unknown. Every experiment thus far has proved that if a house is not large enough for two, much less is it large enough for a hundred families. Woman, too, is sometimes abused and oppressed. Therefore she must hold "Women's Rights Conventions," to assert for her sex all the prerogatives and duties of man, thus openly defying the explicit commands of God. We have read before of those who take counsel together against the Lord and his Anointed. "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh, the Lord shall have them in derision." Truly it is safe to predict, that if those engaged in this mad enterprise should succeed, they would strip woman of that high and benignant influence which she now wields in the sphere which God has assigned her; they would cast her down from the elevation to which Christianity has raised her; they would debase and render miserable both sexes, and urge back society to heathen and barbaric degradation.

And need we speak of those who are ready to shatter the union of these States to fragments, because it tolerates domestic slavery within its borders? Of others who have repudiated Christianity and the Bible, because the apostles did not treat the holding of slaves as a bar to Christian communion, and an evidence of irreligion? Shall we speak of the larger number who have set up this anti-apostolic test of Christian character, and term of fellowship? who insist that the first duty of slaveholding States is to abolish slavery, although in their present state it should involve the ruin of both races, instead of preparing their slaves for ultimate emancipation, by discharging

the duties to them as rational, accountable, and immortal beings, which the Bible enjoins?

Need we speak of the agrarian principles inculcated, on the plea that every man has a right to a place to live upon, as if this had ever been denied to any but those who expiate their crimes on the scaffold? It is doubtless true, that while man is a depraved being, the holders of property will sometimes abuse their trust, and oppress the poor. Yet the Bible contemplates the perpetual existence of these two classes, and prescribes their respective duties. The remedy for the abuses of property is not in the destruction of it. We can conceive of nothing that would be more fatal to all industry and thrift, that would more completely blight and paralyze society, (the extinction of religion alone excepted,) than insecurity in the tenures of property.

Such remedies are worse than the disease they offer to cure. There is no real remedy for the distempers and woes gendered by sin but the Christian religion—the blood that takes away its guilt, the Spirit that purges away its pollution. These will afford such mitigation of the woes of humanity as is possible on earth, and the complete final exchange of them for the bliss of heaven. They will purify, and sweeten, and bless every human relation. They will clear away all that is unjust, oppressive, and galling, from the relation of ruler and subject, husband and wife, parent and child, the rich and the poor, master and servant, employer and employee. Even in regard to the vexed question of our country, what else or better can we do than to diffuse that godliness which hath the promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come, among masters, and servants, and all the people? This, and this alone, will ensure the rendering unto servants that which is just and equal. This being done, in time only the form of bondage will remain, and even that will disappear whenever religion, justice, and humanity require it. As to those methods of dealing with this subject which proceed on the unscriptural assumption that the holding of slaves is *per se* sinful, we may safely challenge those who adopt them to point us to any fruits they have yet borne, but the clusters of Sodom and the grapes of Gomorrah—sundered churches, the national Union imperilled, increased severity

towards slaves, frantic apprehensions on the part of masters, desperate and often successful efforts to extend the area of slavery; Garrisonian infidelity, "doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, supposing that gain is godliness." These are the triumphs, such is the progress, thus far achieved by this supposed advance beyond the scriptural standard of morality on this subject.

Our readers now will be at no loss to understand how we would answer the question, Who are the true progressives? They are the men who believe, love, and obey, and do their utmost to lead others to believe, love, and obey the truth as it is in Jesus; not merely a misnamed "spirit of truth," which varies with every man's caprice, and discards all fixed, objective doctrines, laws, and standards of belief, but the "doctrine according to godliness," which has guided, sanctified, and consoled Christians of every age and nation. Other foundation can no man lay. This faith of God's elect, and not some denial of it on pretext of amending it, is that tree of life whose leaves are for the healing of the nations. It brings life, peace, blessedness, to the soul of the individual. It purges away the disorders which human depravity breeds in the workings of the beneficent institutions which God has ordained for the preservation, increase, and improvement of our race. It is the salt of the earth, which penetrates every sphere of humanity, and effectually antagonizes against its corruption. That this is so, all history is a swift witness. In brief, the first condition of progress in good, is to "hold fast that which is good." The more rapid the train, the firmer must be the track.

As to that counterfeit progress which deems innovation to be, of course, improvement—which thinks to do God and man service by spreading scepticism in regard to the essentials of Christianity, by abolishing or weakening subordination, government, the family, or the security of property, or by attempting social and civil revolutions for mitigating or removing evils which Christianity alone can mitigate or remove—we think we have shown its true, though, it may be, unconscious tendency. It is a progress simply of descent towards anarchy and infidelity, barbarism and heathenism. We would as soon commit

the custody of man's dearest interests to a "Cyclops with one eye, and that in the back of his head."

In conclusion, we would commend to the consideration of those who are striving to leaven the Christian republicanism of America with an infusion of European Socialism and Red Republicanism, and to retouch the Christianity which planted and moulded our institutions, and has thus far been their glory and defence, with the chameleon hues of German Transcendentalism, the following testimony of a living French writer. Not having the original at hand, we give it as we find it extracted from the preface of M. Chevalier to the thirteenth edition of "De Tocqueville on the Democracy of America." It is the voice of one speaking from the midst of the workings of the very principles which some are labouring with such zeal and industry to import among ourselves:

"It is easy to show how much the *success* of the democratic republic in the United States is *due to the religious feeling of the people*. In Europe most of the disorder in society has its origin in the domestic circle, and not far from the nuptial couch. Frequently the European finds it difficult to submit to the powers of the State, only because tumultuous passions agitate his own dwelling, and that he is there a prey to the uneasiness of the heart or the instability of desires. In the United States the residence of the citizen is the image of order and of peace. North America, according to the unanimous opinion of all who have visited it, is the country where the conjugal tie is most appreciated. This good state of morals in America has its origin in religious faith. Religion would probably be powerless to restrain man in the presence of the temptations with which he is assailed by fortune; but it reigns supreme over the mind of woman, and it is woman who forms public morals. As long as Americans shall preserve the severity of their moral conduct, they will preserve the democratic republic. If their morals become relaxed, if they become vicious, it will be because religion has been deprived of its authority. Instead of a free nation, there will be a degraded mass, governed by the corrupt rich. Republican institutions may exist in name, but the name will become a deception. It will be like the Roman republic, which

existed in name under the Cæsars, but the reality of which had completely disappeared.

“In the United States religion also governs the mind, restrains it in its aberrations, and thus becomes a guaranty of the duration of the republic. Everybody in the United States professes religious dogmas. The small number who are not sincere Christians affect to be so, lest they should be suspected of having no religion. Christianity, therefore, has an external adhesion which is unanimous. The result of this is, that in the moral world *every thing is fixed*, although the political world may appear to be entirely given up to discussion and rash experiments. The human mind, in the United States, has not before it an unlimited space; however bold it may be, it feels that there are insurmountable barriers before which it must stop. Hence it happens that in all classes there is a certain restraint, either voluntary or the result of force.”

2nd Ed. 1830.

ART. III.—*Moral Æsthetics; or the Goodness of God in the
Ornaments of the Universe.*

THE power and wisdom of God appear in so forming the eye and adapting it to the element of light as to make us capable of vision; but his benevolence is manifested in adorning the earth with such scenes of majesty and beauty as minister delight to every beholder. His power and wisdom are seen in so constructing the ear as to render us capable of distinguishing sounds. His benevolence appears in making us alive to the voice of melody and gladness.

The argument, on the illustration of which it is now proposed to enter, has nothing whatever to do with the grosser and more obvious uses of hearing and vision. It is much more limited. We shall regard the sights and sounds of the creation, only as they are beauties and melodies. We shall contemplate them only as so many illustrative tokens of the Divine goodness; and if reference be made to any utility which they may possess beyond that of being a manifestation of God, it is to a spiritual not a material utility.