

THE

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. X.]

APRIL, MDCCCLVII.

[NO. I.

ART. I.—THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

THE Protestant reformation proceeded from the practical development of two propositions, the one of which embodied its formal, the other its material principle. The first is, that the Scriptures are the only rule of Christian faith and practice; and the second, that justification before God is solely through the righteousness of Christ, imputed to the believer, without the works of the law. The former of these principles inaugurates the right of private judgment, and rescues the liberties of the church and people of God from the bondage of a usurping priesthood. The latter enunciates a theology, which, whether designated, from its unanimous reception by the divines of the reformation, by the name of "Reformed;" or from its great exponents called Calvinistic, Augustinian, or Pauline, has always proved itself the alone sure basis of a stable faith; and the only reliable fountain of a pure morality.

Viewed in its practical bearings the reformation was characterized by their cardinal features, springing from these principles. These were, the preaching of a Pauline theology, instead of the Pelagianism of the papacy; the vindication of the morality of the divine law, in contrast with the licentiousness of Rome; and the establishment of a scriptural polity and order in the church, in opposition to the hierarchy of a domineering priesthood. The three elements thus indicated, that is, doctrines, morals, and polity, sustain to each other relations exceedingly intimate and almost inseparable. A pure morality has never long survived that

VOL. X.—NO. I.

1

ART. VI.—IDOLATRY—ITS RISE—NOT MAN'S PRIMITIVE RELIGION—HUME'S ARGUMENT DISPOSED OF.

———"O that men
 (Canst thou believe?) should be so stupid grown,
 While yet the patriarch liv'd, who scap'd the flood,
 As to forsake the living God, and fall
 To worship their own work in wood and stone
 For Gods!"—*Par. Lost*, xii., 116-119.

I. OUR word Idolatry is derived from two Greek words, *ἰδωλον*, an image, and *λατρεῖν*, to serve or worship. The term is used by us, however, in a more extended sense. It comprehends—1. The worship of images, idols, or any thing made by human hands as God; 2. It comprehends also the worship of the heavenly bodies, the sun, moon, and stars, or of men, demons, animals, and angels or saints; and 3. The term is used now to signify any excessive attachment, or veneration, for any thing, that borders on adoration or complete devotion to it. The learned and curious are not agreed as to when nor how idolatry first began. It is confessedly, however, both very old and very widely spread; but we think we can explain its origin, and account for its wide diffusion, without finding any just accusation against the one living and true God. So remote is its origin, however, and so extended is its domain, that infidels say: If there is any true religion, it must be Polytheism, and that idolatry is the primitive religion of mankind. Mr. Hume,* and other writers of his school, have not hesitated to urge it as an objection to the Bible, that it teaches that Theism is the oldest religion of our race; whereas, they say, Polytheism, or the worship of many gods rather than of one only Supreme Creator, is prior in point of time. Mr. Hume exerts all his reasoning powers to prove that Polytheism must have been the primary religion of mankind; but, with all his ability and acuteness, he fails to make out his cause. His arguments, as far as they bear upon the subject, only go to show what we admit, namely: that some eighteen hundred years ago, all of our race, except the Jews, was plunged into gross idolatry; and that Theism, or the worship of one Supreme God, could not have originated in mere human reasoning. It is true, the whole world lies in wickedness, and that eighteen hundred years ago nearly all mankind, and even still a large portion of our race are idolatrous. And it is true that the belief in one God, as a pure spirit, is not the result of men's

* This was not original with Hume. "There is yet one heresy," says Philostratus, "which affirms that heathenism was not introduced through the wickedness of men, nor even invented through the suggestion of the devil, in order to practice vice and sin, but was instituted by God himself. But if it was established by God, why is it condemned by God? For, that from the beginning of the world, a knowledge of God, the Almighty Father, was published, admits of no doubt." Quoted by Theolock on Heathenism, p. 14.

own reasonings, but of revelation from God himself. Now, as Theism is not the result of mere unassisted reasoning, but of a Divine communication from heaven to man, we say, the very existence of such a system of faith and worship is proof that a Divine communication was actually made to man, and that its revelations are true. Suppose it true, as Hume asserts, that it was impossible for men, in the first ages of the world, left to themselves, to have any other religion than Idolatry. Then whence is the Theism of Christianity and of Judaism? According to his own reasoning, it must have had its origin in a revelation from God himself; and if so, then as a Deist he convicts himself, for this is the very thing we contend for. But again, if there be a Creator, is it possible to suppose He would create man, and place him in such circumstances that from the very beginning, he must either have no religion at all, or be an idolater? This is a reflection upon the Divine beneficence and wisdom, that cannot be entertained for a moment. Even Hume himself admits that "there is a consent, almost universal among mankind, in the belief that there is an invisible, intelligent power in the world." This invisible, intelligent power is God, the Creator and Preserver of the world; and it is for Hume to account for this "almost universal consent," and to show how it is that with such a prevailing belief, all men, from the very beginning, should have been, as he supposes, polytheists and idolaters. His arguments are contradictory. His assertion about Polytheism is not true. The first, the primary faith of our race was pure Theism. In the beginning, men were not idolaters; they worshipped the Supreme Being, as one God and only one. If it be admitted there is a God, who is the Creator of the human race, then it cannot be true that his creatures, from the very beginning, and in their first acts, were without any true knowledge of their Creator, and left inevitably to Polytheism or a total want of any religion at all. Historically we know that it was not so. The united testimony of all ancient nations is that their original progenitors possessed a knowledge of one living and true God, who was worshipped by them, and believed to be an All-wise, Infinite Spirit, the Creator of all things. And the farther back we go into the history of ancient nations in Africa, Asia, and America, the purer and more simple is their theology. The Hindoos, Egyptians, and Greeks, though idolaters in practice, seem never wholly to have lost the idea of one Supreme Being, who was over all things, men, angels, and gods. They themselves deny that they are idolaters. And it is a question still in debate among the learned, whether the Egyptians of the oldest dynasties were idolaters at all. Now, the consent of all mankind to the belief in a Supreme Being, and the united testimony of all ancient nations, that their progenitors had some knowledge of and belief in a Supreme Being, who was the Creator of all things, are strong

proofs—1st, that originally mankind were not Polytheists; and 2d, that the Creator did communicate some knowledge of himself to our race. And we submit, in the absence of any proof for any other Creator and of any other communication worthy of our attention, that the Creator of the world is the God known to us as the Jehovah of the Jews, and that the Bible is the revelation which He has communicated to our race. According to Hume himself, Theism, or the worship of one living and true God, is wholly dependent on a divine communication. And historically, it is true that there is not and never has been a pure Theism found among men, but in connection with revelation. Men owe their Theism to the Scriptures. The world is indebted to the Hebrews for a knowledge of the Divine unity and spirituality.

II. The most ancient idolatry seems to have been the worship of the sun, or of the heavenly bodies. Diodorus, and almost all writers since his day, agree that the Egyptians, in some sense, worshipped the sun, moon, and stars, as their principal gods. The same is true of the Phenicians, and ancient Arabs, and of the Assyrians, Chaldeans, and all the tribes of North-Eastern Europe and of Asia. Sir Wm. Jones, in his learned Asiatic Researches, has set this point beyond controversy. And Plato, Aristotle, and Plutarch, tell us that the first inhabitants of Greece esteemed the sun, moon, and stars as gods. Plutarch says it is a great absurdity to deny the things that are generally believed among us—"that there is a Providence, and that the sun and moon are animated, whom, says he, all men worship, and to whom they offer up sacrifice and prayers." Homer saith of the sun, that "he seeth and knoweth all things." Menander declares "that men ought to worship him as the first, or chief of the gods." Macrobinus, a pagan historian, tells us that the heathens of his day addressed the sun in their morning prayers, as the "almighty, all-governing sun, the spirit of the world, the power of the world, the light of the world." The Chinese are believed from a remote antiquity, to have worshipped the sun, moon, and stars. From the time of their first emperor, Fohi, who was probably identical with the Hebrew Noah, their emperors are said to have sacrificed to heaven and earth. And it is well known that the principal deity of the Peruvians and Mexicans was the sun, to whom they erected temples, and offered sacrifices. It is true a class of writers once believed that the aborigines of this continent did not offer human sacrifices, or worship idols, but the proof is now abundant and overwhelming, that at least the most powerful, and the most highly civilized aboriginal nations of the new world, did worship idols and sacrifice human beings to their gods. And recent readings of the monumental history of the Assyrians and Egyptians prove the same things to have been practiced on the Nile and Euphrates. The idolatry which the Scriptures call "the worship of the host

of heaven" certainly did prevail at an early age in Asia, Europe and Africa, and among the aborigines of America. A patient consideration of the subject will, nevertheless, show that man's primitive religion was a pure Theism.

III. The deification of heroes, is another species of idolatry, that soon prevailed in the world. Some suppose that one of the causes that gave rise to idolatry, was affection for lost friends or benefactors. And that a parent, out of love for a favourite child, may have venerated his likeness after his death. And that respect for great benefactors or military leaders caused homage to be rendered to them after death, which, among the enthusiastic, were soon regarded as divine honours. It is well known that some conquerors demanded of their subjects such honours after death. And it was natural that vain and ambitious men, actuated by political motives, should encourage the worship of those who had once been men, and had been taken into the number of the gods. For by encouraging such worship, they established their own authority, and prepared the way for similar honours to be rendered to themselves. And it was easy as soon as men were deified, to apply to them the names and titles that had been attributed to the celestial bodies. The process seems to have been thus: in worshipping the heavenly hosts, who were first regarded as mere *representatives* of the Supreme Being, first the same names and attributes were applied to them as to the Supreme Being, and in process of time, the great mass of the people forgot that they were *representatives*, and worshipped them as true gods. The finest representatives of heathen deities were human figures. The *Hercules Farnese*, *Venus de Medici*, *Apollo Belvidere* are specimens of art unrivalled to this day. But when their sculptors had given human shapes to their deities, then they soon conceived of them as having human passions, and as clothed with human attributes, and hence soon worshipped them as gods that would gratify their sensual appetites. In like manner, by deifying men, the same worship, names, and attributes were first applied to them that were applied to the gods themselves, and this application soon caused them to be regarded as gods—this application of divine attributes led, of course, to great confusion. Thus we are told that Osiris, of the Egyptians, Bel, of the Chaldeans, and Baal, of the Phenicians, signify both a deified man and the sun. And so, also, many of the hero gods of antiquity are the names both of stars and heroes, and both are honoured with divine titles and epithets. And still more, it is the opinion of many of our most learned men, that the names of these gods are but corruptions of the Hebrew names and attributes of the Supreme Being, which were at first applied only to the Supreme Deity, but afterwards came to be applied to deified heroes:—Jehovah, Jove, are examples. And it is worthy of special remembrance also, that Sir

William Jones traces palpably the origin of this idolatry of deified men and the worship of the heavenly bodies to the same source, namely, to the ancient Iran, which he calls "the oldest monarchy in the world;" and Col. Hamilton Smith, in his able and learned work on the "Natural History of the Human Species," has shown most conclusively that the "Typical Stocks" of the human races and of the grains of the fields and of the fruits and animals most used by man, can all be traced back to the interior of Central Asia, or the ancient Persia, and high lands of Thibet *

IV. Now it is certainly no mean proof of the truth of the belief generally entertained among us that the Bible is a Revelation from God, and the source of our knowledge of the one true God, that, *historically*, we can trace the human races back to three progenitors, and that their starting place, or cradle, was in the interior of Central Asia; that to this agree all the traditions of Asia, Europe, Africa, and America; that both *historically* and *traditionally*, also, the same origin is ascribed to the animals, birds, and fruits used by man—and that, *philosophically*, we can trace all human languages, colors, and races pretty clearly and fully up to their *trinal* roots, first appearing and spreading from Central Asia—that is, to the three sons of Noah. Sir William Jones, in his Asiatic Researches, in tracing the origin of hero-worship to the Hindoos in Iran, or ancient Persia, says: "Thus it has been proved by clear evidence and plain reasoning, that a powerful monarchy was established in Iran long before the Assyrian; that it was a Hindoo monarchy; that the language of the first Persian empire was the mother of the Sanscrit, and, consequently, of the Zend and Parsi, as well as of Greek, Latin, and Gothic. * * *

We discover, therefore, in Persia, at the earliest dawn of history, the three distinct races of men, whom we described on a former occasion as possessors of India, Arabia, and Tartary, and that they diverged from thence as from a common centre. * * * And thus the Saxon chronicles, I presume good authority, brings the first inhabitants of Britain from Armenia, and that the Goths, or Scythians, came from Persia; and that both the Irish and old Britons proceeded severally from the borders of the Caspian. We may, therefore, hold this proposition firmly established, that Iran, or Persia, in its largest sense, was the true centre of population, of knowledge, of languages, and of arts, which were expanded in all directions, to all the regions of the world."

There are many facts in support of this origin of hero-worship and of its diffusion. It is certainly worthy of notice, that Dr. Robertson should insist prominently on the resemblance of the

* Lieut. Col. Charles H. Smith's "Natural History of the Human Species;" Dr. Latham's "Man and his Migrations;" Rev. Dr. James Smith's "Defence," 1 vol. sec. 2., in many places; Osburn's Antiquities of Egypt; and also his "Monumental Egypt," *passim*.

aborigines of Germany to the savage tribes of this continent. In his Charles V., he speaks of many striking points of resemblance; and equally striking are the resemblances between the aboriginal inhabitants of Mexico and Peru, and the inhabitants of India. The ancient temples and idols of Mexico, Central America, and of Peru, bear a marked resemblance to those of Hindostan. All who have read the works of our learned and eloquent countryman,* on Mexico and Peru, and who are tolerably familiar with Hindoo history, cannot fail to have been impressed with the analogy. And Sir William Jones says, after a great deal of research and study on the subject, and a long residence in India, that the ceremonies and superstitions of China and Japan have a remarkable affinity with those of Hindostan. Speaking of Hindostan, he says: "We now live among the adorers of those very deities who were worshipped under different names in old Greece and Italy, and among the professors of those philosophical tenets which the Ionic and Attic writers illustrated with all the beauties of their melodious language. On one hand we see the trident of Neptune, the eagle of Jupiter, the satyrs of Bacchus, the bow of Cupid, and the chariot of the sun; on the other we hear the cymbals of Rhea, the songs of the Muses, and the pastoral tales of Apollo Nomius. In more retired scenes, in groves, and in seminaries of learning, we may perceive the Brahmins and the Sarmanes, mentioned by Clemens, disputing in the form of logic, or discoursing on the vanity of human enjoyments, on the immortality of the soul, her emanation from the eternal mind, her debasement, wanderings, and final union with her source. The six philosophic schools, whose principles are explained in the Dersana Sastra, compose all the metaphysics of the old academy; nor is it possible to read the Vedanta, or the many fine compositions in relation to it, without discovering that Pythagoras and Plato derived their sublime theories from the same fountain with the sages of India. I believe it is now admitted, by the best writers, that the worship of Egypt was closely allied to that of India. Col. Smith, in his work already referred to, tells us that British sepoy under General Sir R. Abercombie, in the re-conquest of Egypt, "no sooner entered the ancient temples in the valley of the Nile than they asserted their own divinities were discovered on the walls, and worshipped them accordingly. They even pointed out the Oresvaminam, or Brahmin distinguishing card, as likewise a decoration of the painted divinities." In view, then, of the latest and best investigations that have been made on this whole subject, it is not too much to say that, according to philosophy, tradition, and history, the origin of our race and their dispersion, the rise

* Prescott.

and diffusion of the most ancient kinds of idolatry, the worship of deified men and of the heavenly hosts, is found to have sprung from the same part of the world and to have spread from thence to the four quarters of the globe. Sir William Jones asserts that this conclusion is "supported by indisputable facts."*

V. We can then trace our race to Central Asia, as well as the animals, fowls and fruits most used by us, and there also, we find, the origin of the idolatry and Polytheism of mankind. Historically, traditionally, and philosophically, we are thus taught to turn our eyes in the same general direction for man's origin, and the centre from which he dispersed over the globe. The lines of idolatry and superstition diverge in the same way that our traditions do, as to our races. And thus we are brought back to the point at issue between us and infidels. Is it true, then, as Hume asserts, that the first and only religion of mankind in the early ages was idolatry? Or is it true, that all other religions are derived from the Hindoo mythology, as another infidel writer, Mr. Taylor, of England, asserts? I trust it has already been made

* The first colonists of the valley of the Nile reached Egypt from Asia by the Isthmus of Suez. The first city they founded was Heliopolis, "where they dedicated a Temple to the setting sun, under the impersonation of a man named *Athor*. In this name the builders of Heliopolis identified the sun, their *divus pater*, with ADAM, the father of mankind. In exactly the same spirit of man-worship they also deified the Nile under the impersonation of Noah." Osburn's Monuments of Egypt, 1 vol., 262. And what is *Amun*, but Ham? And *Isis*, but the Hebrew *Isha*, female-man or woman. *Isis* is the feminine of OSIRIS. And the way Osiris got his wife is also significant. At Abydos MENCHZERS split the wooden image of Osiris into two halves, and out of the left side the figure of a woman was carved, which he called *Ishi*, that is, the female Osiris." 1 vol. Osburn, p. 348. There are some very curious facts on this point. For example: Learned men tell us the Hebrew Noah is the same as the Chinese Fohi. And Osburn reads from the monuments of Egypt, that the impersonation of the Nile worshipped as a god among the Egyptians, is known by a name corresponding to the Fohi of the Chinese, and the Noah of the Hebrews. 2 vol., p. 579. and 1 vol., 240. And the Chinese records claim to have discovered this Continent about 1,400 years ago. The history of Mexico, as it was when discovered by the Spaniards, suggests that the religion of the Aztecs was the same as that of the ancient Chinese. Their forms of Government were nearly the same. Many words are the same, and others have a striking resemblance. Mr. Jas. McC. Hanley has furnished us the following examples. Mr. Hanley is a Chinese interpreter:

TRANSLATION.

Chinese.	Indian.	English.
Nang,	Nang-a,	Man.
Soo,	Ti-soo,	Hand.
How,	How-a,	Mouth.
Ee-lung,	Lee-lum,	Deafness.
Choe-Koo,	Koo-cheo,	Hog.
Soo,	Ack-a-soo,	Beard.
Yoet,	Yoet-a,	Moon.
Yeet-ow,	Yee-a,	Sun.

Yi-yam, in the Indian language, is night.

Yi-yam, in the Chinese, is the God of the moon or of night.

Hee-ma, in the Indian language, is day.

Hee-ma, in the Chinese, is the God of the sun or of day.

plain, that these assertions are not true. 1st. They cannot be true, without impeaching the wisdom, goodness, and parental character of God; they cannot be true, if we have any communication from God, at all, teaching us how to worship him. 2d. Historically, we find that all nations, even after they had sunk into idolatry, preserved traditions among them, to the effect, that their original progenitors did not worship idols as they did, but had some knowledge of an invisible, all wise and Supreme Being, whom they worshipped as God. It is true, the knowledge or belief they still preserved of God, was encumbered with a mass of gross superstitions, and that, in the crowd of idols, the true God was not worshipped at all; but still, there prevailed some idea of one Supreme Being, even amongst idolatrous nations. This appears from two facts:

First. Among the ancient idolaters of Greece, Egypt, and Asia, it is difficult, perhaps impossible, always clearly to define in what light they regarded the objects they worshipped. If they regarded the sun, moon and stars, as real divinities, they certainly did not so regard the animals, serpents, vegetables, and blocks of stone and wood, before which they worshipped. It is probable, that the most intelligent among them, only considered all such objects of worship, as mere *representations* of deities, and not as gods. And it is certain, that with them, there were orders and ranks among their gods and goddesses, which implied a supreme or presiding Deity.

Secondly. Among the savage tribes of this continent, as well as among those of the old world, it is certain, there is, and was, an almost "universal consent," as Mr. Hume calls it, in the belief of the existence of a Great Spirit, who is the Creator and Ruler of all things. The aborigines of North and South America, and of the Islands of the sea, and the negroes of Africa, and the Hottentots, as well as the natives of the frozen regions of the north, even if they do not worship the Great Spirit, it is not because they do not believe in His existence, but it is because they think He is too great, and too far removed to care for them. They all profess to hold some kind of belief in an Almighty Being, who is the Creator, and God of all the gods.

Thirdly. It is admitted, that the Greek and Latin poets, believed in a pure Theism. They were corruptors of theology. Their writings contain a great mass of licentiousness and error; but still there runs through them, the idea of one Supreme Being. Cicero, and several of the best heathen authors, have declared their opinions in favour of one Supreme Governor and Maker of the world. The poets of Arabia, and the ancient writers of Persia, India, and China, have also testified to the same belief. Sir William Jones tells, "that the pure adoration of one Creator prevailed in Tartary during the first generations from Yafet, * * *

and that the great Chengiz was a Theist." The ancient Chinese had a knowledge of the Supreme God. Confucius and his followers had a firm belief in one Supreme God. The early Egyptian mythology taught most distinctly, the unity of God, although the method of instruction used by its priests, led the people to the lowest depths of Polytheism. Porphyry* declares unhesitatingly, that "originally, the Egyptians worshipped but one God." And the Greek authors generally concur in this conclusion. Herodotus says, the ancient Egyptians retained the idea of a God who was supreme, self-existent, and from eternity to eternity." Iamblichus† says, "the Egyptians worshipped God, the Master and Creator of the universe, above all the elements, self-existent, immaterial, incorporeal, uncreated, indivisible, unseen, and all-sufficient; who comprehends all things in himself, and imparts all things to all creation." "The idea of this unity was conveyed, by making the sun, the point to which all the parts of the Egyptian polytheism converged, and in which they became one. He was an attribute of all the divinities above him; all those below him in the hierarchy, were emanations from, or parts of himself."‡ And according to William Jones, "the first religion of Iran," which was the oldest country inhabited, and the source and centre of all idolatry, "was that of the one Supreme Being." The oldest, and the noblest religion, of all religions, he affirms, was "a firm belief that one Supreme God made the world by His power, and continually governed it by His providence; a pious fear, love, and adoration of Him; a due reverence for parents, and aged persons; a paternal affection for the whole human species, and a compassionate tenderness, even for the brute creation." This was the religion of Menu, who flourished in India, about A. C. 1000. His religion prevailed in his own country, and thence spread into China, Japan, Thibet, and Ceylon.

VI. We have then plainly arrived at the demonstration, historically, that Mr. Hume's assertion, that the first and only religion of mankind was Polytheism, is not true. But he also maintains, that Theism, or the belief in one Supreme God, is not possible, without some communication from God, himself, to men. Now observe: First. It is not true, that the original religion of our race was Polytheism, or the worship of many gods, and of idols. We have offered proof, taken from the most ancient nations, and from the most reliable sources—sources which, in part, have been brought to light since Mr. Hume's day, showing that the primitive religion of the human race, was the belief in, and worship of, one Supreme God. We have not offered a single

* De Abst., lib. iv., 6.

† De Myste. Egypt.

‡ Osborn's Antiquities, p. 128.

text, or proof from the Bible. We have relied on historical evidence for this point, as if there was no Bible.

Secondly. Then we press the disciples of Mr. Hume, and all his school, to explain on his principles, the origin, and the wide spread idea of a pure Theism. We have found among mankind, at a very early period, the worship of idols, the deification of heroes, and religious homage paid to the heavenly bodies. But we find, aback of all this, and prior to this, and still more widely diffused among mankind, some notion of a Supreme God, and that this notion has never been wholly extinguished. Now, whence this knowledge of one Supreme God! If the primitive religion of Iran, or of mankind, wherever they were in their earliest years, was idolatry, how, then, did the author of the book of *Menur* come to possess any idea of one Supreme, Self-existent Spirit? How did the savages of our own continent, make so important a discovery? Some kind, or degree of belief, in a Supreme Being, we find among legislators, poets, and historians of all nations, rude and savage, as well as civilized—and even among those that were sunk in the grossest idolatry, and surrounded with thousands of deities and idols. Now, according to Hume's own argument, this notion, or knowledge of, and belief in, and worship of, one Supreme God, is not natural to man. He asserts, "it cannot be the result of men's own reasoning." Well, so let it be. Whence comes it, then? We find Theism pure in the Bible, and held by Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans. And we find it more or less pure, overlying, and lying aback of, all idolatry itself. Now, we press the followers of Hume for an answer: Whence is it? He says, it cannot be the result of mere human reasoning; and for once he is right. And but one intelligent answer can be given: A knowledge of the Creator, was communicated by himself, to the progenitor of our races, and has been handed down by tradition, from generation to generation, and carried with them, in their dispersions over all the earth. To us, there is no other satisfactory solution of this difficulty; but this solution leaves our opponent in an inextricable dilemma.

If the Creator has communicated this knowledge of himself to our race, then, Theism, and not Polytheism, is the primeval religion of man, and we are indeed dependent on His revelation, for our knowledge of the way to worship Him, and of what is acceptable in His sight; and thus we have a strong presumption at once, in favour of the Bible, as a message from the living and true God, teaching us what to believe concerning Him, and what duty he requireth of us. And even if we admit all that is claimed reasonably, for the light of Nature, still that light is a revelation. Or, if a part of this knowledge of the Creator, is inwrought with our creation, or flows from the teachings of conscience, still it is a

revelation. It comes to us from the voice of God, speaking to us in His works, by His spirit, and from our own hearts. The explanation, then, we give, is as simple, as it is historically true, and philosophically correct. When God created man, his knowledge of his Creator was perfect. The Creator's laws were written on his heart. The creature was then in communion with the Creator. There was perfect peace between them. Man was in harmony with all the laws of his Maker. When man sinned, then the Creator's laws were erased from his heart—only some traces of them remained. And as time rolled on, these traces grew more and more dim, and consequently, communications from God became more and more necessary, and more frequent. Man's traditions were partly from his consciousness of his primeval state in Eden, and his fall and expulsion, and partly from what God told him. Thus, the history of man towards his Maker proceeded, till wickedness filled the earth, and the flood put an end to the first dynasty of Adamic races. A new era began with Noah's emergency from the ark. He had a store of knowledge, consisting of what he knew of his own history, and of communications from God to himself, and the traditions of his fathers back to Adam. This store of knowledge he communicated to his sons, who are the trinal progenitors of the races of men now on the earth. The knowledge which Noah taught to his sons, comprised the belief in, and worship of, the Jehovah of the Bible, as the one, only, living, and true God. This knowledge prevailed among all his descendants, as we have shown, in the most remote times, and around the very place where his sons' families began their pilgrimage. This knowledge soon began to decline, and, by degrees, became more and more corrupted, until God called Abraham, and revealed himself anew to him. Enoch and Melchizedech, and even the Philistines, and the Egyptians of Abraham's day, had some knowledge of the true God.

And in process of time, even to the descendants of Abraham, who were a people chosen to keep alive pure Theism in the world, and to prepare mankind for the manifestation of God in the flesh, it became necessary to communicate more and more fully, the Divine attributes, and to give a transcript of the Creator's character. This was done at Mount Sinai, and by the Hebrew prophets, till the fulness of time came, when God sent His own Son into the world. God sent His Son into the world, born of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law. For since the world, by its wisdom, knew not God, God has revealed Himself unto us by His Son, who is made unto us, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and complete redemption.