

DUKE
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Treasure Room

~~Eq~~ E.42

2-12-6



125

AIDS TO REFLECTION

IN THE

FORMATION OF A MANLY CHARACTER

ON THE SEVERAL GROUNDS OF

PRUDENCE, MORALITY, AND RELIGION:

ILLUSTRATED BY

SELECT PASSAGES FROM OUR ELDER DIVINES, ESPECIALLY
FROM ARCHBISHOP LEIGHTON.

BY S. T. COLERIDGE.

This makes, that whatsoever here befalls,
You in the region of yourself remain,
Neigh'ring on Heaven: and that no foreign land.

DANIEL.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR TAYLOR AND HESSEY,
93, FLEET-STREET;
AND 13, WATERLOO-PLACE, PAUL-MALL.

1825.

THE HISTORY OF THE

ROYAL SOCIETY OF LONDON

FROM ITS FIRST INSTITUTION

TO THE PRESENT TIME

BY JOHN WALLIS

OF THE SOCIETY OF LONDON, FELLOW OF THE SOCIETY OF GREEK LITERATURE, AND OF THE SOCIETY OF THE HISTORY OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF LONDON



LONDON:

PRINTED BY THOMAS DAVISON, WHITEFRIARS.

11/24/30

Budget of

20

Ingen

12.84

English

T.F.R.
CG93AB
C.1
A29

ADVERTISEMENT.

IN the bodies of several species of Animals there are found certain Parts, of which neither the office, the functions, nor the relations could be ascertained by the Comparative Anatomist, till he had become acquainted with the state of the Animal before birth. Something sufficiently like this (for the purpose of an illustration, at least) applies to the Work here offered to the Public. In the introductory portion there occur several passages, which the Reader will be puzzled to decypher, without some information respecting the original design of the Volume, and the Changes it has undergone during its immature and embryonic state. On this account only, I think myself bound to make it known, that the Work was proposed and begun as a mere Selection from the Writings of Archbishop Leighton, under the usual title of *The Beauties of Archbishop Leighton*, with a few notes and a biographical preface by the Selector. Hence the term, *Editor*, subscribed to the notes, and prefixed alone or conjointly to the Aphorisms, accordingly as the Passage was written entirely by myself, or only modified and (*avowedly*) interpolated. I continued the use of the word on the plea of uniformity: though like most other deviations from propriety of language, it would probably have been a wiser choice to have omitted or exchanged it. The various Reflections, however, that pressed on me while I was considering the motives for selecting this or that passage; the desire of enforcing, and as it were integrating, the truths contained in the Original Author, by adding those which the words suggested or recalled to my own mind; the conversation with men of eminence in the Literary and Religious Circles, occasioned by the Objects which I had in view; and lastly, the increasing disproportion of the Commentary to the Text, and the too marked difference in the frame, character, and colors of the two styles; soon induced me to recognize and adopt a revolution in my plan and object, which had in fact actually taken place without my intention, and almost unawares. It would indeed be more correct to say, that the present Volume owed its

174955

accidental origin to the intention of compiling one of a different description, than to speak of it as the same Work. It is not a change in the child, but a changeling.

Still, however, the selections from Leighton, which will be found in the prudential and moral Sections of this Work, and which I could retain consistently with its present form and matter, will both from the intrinsic excellence and from the characteristic beauty of the passages, suffice to answer two prominent purposes of the original plan; that of placing in a clear light the principle, which pervades all Leighton's Writings—his sublime View, I mean, of Religion and Morality as the means of reforming the human Soul in the Divine Image (*Idea*); and that of exciting an interest in the Works, and an affectionate reverence for the name and memory, of this severely tried and truly primitive Churchman.

S. T. C.

P R E F A C E.

AN Author has three points to settle: to what sort his Work belongs, for what Description of Readers it is intended, and the specific end or object, which it is to answer. There is indeed a preliminary Interrogative respecting the end which the Writer himself has in view, whether the Number of Purchasers, or the Benefit of the Readers. But this may be safely passed by; since where the book itself or the known principles of the writer do not supersede the question, there will seldom be sufficient strength of character for good or for evil, to afford much chance of its being either distinctly put or fairly answered.

I shall proceed therefore to state as briefly as possible the intentions of the present volume in reference to the three first-mentioned, viz. *What?* For *Whom?* and *For* what?

I. WHAT? The answer is contained in the Title-page. It belongs to the class of *didactic* Works. Consequently, those who neither wish instruction for them-

selves, nor assistance in instructing others, have no interest in its contents. *Sis Sus, sis Divus: Sum CALTHA, et non tibi spiro!*

II. FOR WHOM? *Generally*, for as many in all classes as wish for aid in disciplining their minds to habits of reflection—for all who, desirous of building up a manly character in the light of distinct consciousness, are content to study the principles of moral Architecture on the several grounds of prudence, morality and religion. And lastly, for all who feel an interest in the Position, I have undertaken to defend—this, namely, that the CHRISTIAN FAITH (*in which I include every article of belief and doctrine professed by the first Reformers in common*) IS THE PERFECTION OF HUMAN INTELLIGENCE: an interest sufficiently strong to ensure a patient attention to the arguments brought in its support.

But if I am to mention any particular class or description of Readers, that were prominent in my thought during the composition of the volume, my Reply must be: that it was *especially* designed for the studious Young at the close of their education or on their first entrance into the duties of manhood and the rights of self-government. And of these, again, in thought and wish I destined the work (the latter and larger portion, at least) yet more particularly to Students intended for the Ministry; *first*, as in duty bound, to the mem-

bers of our two Universities: *secondly*, (but only in respect of this mental precedency *second*) to all alike of whatever name, who have dedicated their future lives to the cultivation of their Race, as Pastors, Preachers, Missionaries, or Instructors of Youth.

III. FOR WHAT? The Worth of the Author is estimated by the ends, the attainment of which he proposed to himself by the particular work: while the Value of the Work depends on its fitness, as the Means. The Objects of the present volume are the following, arranged in the order of their comparative importance.

1. To direct the Reader's attention to the value of the Science of Words, their use and abuse (see *Note*, p. 6) and the incalculable advantages attached to the habit of using them appropriately, and with a distinct knowlege of their primary, derivative, and metaphorical senses. And in furtherance of this Object I have neglected no occasion of enforcing the maxim, that to expose a sophism and to detect the equivocal or double meaning of a word is, in the great majority of cases, one and the same thing. Horne Tooke entitled his celebrated work, *Επεα πτεροεντα*, *Winged Words: or Language, not only the Vehicle of Thought but the Wheels*. With my convictions and views, for *επεα* I should substitute *λογοι*, i. e. *Words select and determinate*, and for *πτεροεντα ζωντες*, i. e. *living Words*.

The *Wheels* of the intellect I admit them to be; but such as Ezekiel beheld in “the visions of God” as he sate among the Captives by the river of Chebar. “Whithersoever the Spirit was to go, the Wheels went, and thither was their Spirit to go: *for the Spirit of the living creature was in the wheels also.*”

2. To establish the *distinct* characters of Prudence, Morality, and Religion: and to impress the conviction, that though the second requires the first, and the third contains and supposes both the former; yet still Moral Goodness is other and more than Prudence, or the Principle of Expediency; and Religion more and higher than Morality. For this distinction the better Schools even of Pagan Philosophy contended. (*See p. 26, 27*).

3. To substantiate and set forth at large the momentous distinction between REASON and Understanding. Whatever is atchievable by the UNDERSTANDING for the purposes of worldly interest, private or public, has in the present age been pursued with an activity and a success beyond all former experience, and to an extent which equally demands my admiration and excites my wonder. But likewise it is, and long has been, my conviction, that in no age since the first dawning of Science and Philosophy in this Island have the Truths, Interests, and Studies that especially belong

to the REASON, contemplative or practical, sunk into such utter neglect, not to say contempt, as during the last century. It is therefore one main Object of this Volume to establish the position, that whoever transfers to the Understanding the primacy due to the Reason, loses the one and spoils the other.

4. To exhibit a full and consistent Scheme of the Christian Dispensation, and more largely of all the *peculiar* doctrines of the Christian Faith; and to answer all the Objections to the same, that do not originate in a corrupt Will rather than an erring Judgment; and to do this in a manner intelligible for all who, possessing the ordinary advantages of education, do in good earnest desire to form their religious creed in the light of their own convictions, and to have a reason for the faith which they profess. There are indeed Mysteries, in evidence of which no reasons can be *brought*. But it has been my endeavour to show, that the true solution of this problem is, that these Mysteries *are* Reason, Reason in its highest form of Self-affirmation.

Such are the special Objects of these "Aids to Reflection." Concerning the general character of the work, let me be permitted to add the few following sentences. St. Augustine, in one of his Sermons, discoursing on a high point of Theology, tells his auditors

—Sic accipite, ut mereamini intelligere. Fides enim debet præcedere intellectum, ut sit intellectus fidei præmium*. Now without a certain portion of gratuitous and (as it were) *experimentative* faith in the Writer, a Reader will scarcely give that degree of continued attention, without which no *didactic* Work worth reading can be read to any wise or profitable purpose. In *this* sense, therefore, and to *this* extent, *every* Author, who is competent to the office he has undertaken, may without arrogance repeat St. Augustine's words in his own right, and advance a similar claim on similar grounds. But I venture no farther than to imitate the sentiment at a humble distance, by avowing my belief that He, who seeks *instruction* in the following pages, will not fail to find *entertainment* likewise; but that whoever seeks entertainment only will find neither.

READER!—You have been bred in a land abounding with men, able in arts, learning, and knowledges manifold, this man in one, this in another, few in many, none in all. But there is one art, of which every man

* TRANSLATION. So receive this, that you may deserve to understand it. For the faith ought to precede the Understanding, so that the Understanding may be the reward of the faith.

should be master, the art of REFLECTION. If you are not a *thinking* man, to what purpose are you a *man* at all? In like manner, there is one knowledge, which it is every man's interest and duty to acquire, namely, SELF-KNOWLEDGE: or to what end was man alone, of all animals, indued by the Creator with the faculty of *self-consciousness*? Truly said the Pagan moralist, E cœlo descendit, Γνωῖσι Σέαυτον.

But you are likewise born in a CHRISTIAN land: and Revelation has provided for you new subjects for reflection, and new treasures of knowledge, never to be unlocked by him who remains self-ignorant. Self-knowledge is the key to this casket; and by reflection alone can it be obtained. Reflect on your own thoughts, actions, circumstances, and—which will be of especial aid to you in forming a *habit* of reflection,—accustom yourself to reflect on the words you use, hear, or read, their birth, derivation, and history. For if words are not THINGS, they are LIVING POWERS, by which the things of most importance to mankind are actuated, combined, and humanized. Finally, by reflection you may draw from the fleeting facts of your worldly trade, art, or profession, a science permanent as your immortal soul; and make even these subsidiary and preparative to the reception of spiritual truth, “doing as

the dyers do, who having first dipt their silks in colours of less value, then give them the last tincture of crimson in grain."

S. T. COLERIDGE.

CONTENTS.

	Page
INTRODUCTORY APHORISMS	1
PRUDENTIAL APHORISMS	29
REFLECTIONS RESPECTING MORALITY	49
MORAL AND RELIGIOUS APHORISMS	59
ELEMENTS OF RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY, PRELIMINARY TO THE APHORISMS ON SPIRITUAL RELIGION . . .	129
APHORISMS ON SPIRITUAL RELIGION	141
APHORISMS ON THAT WHICH IS INDEED SPIRITUAL RE- LIGION ,	150

87 287 103

Οὕτως πάντα πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἐπάγθωσα, καὶ συνηθροισμένη
ψυχὴ αὐτὴ εἰς αὐτὴν, ραῖσα καὶ μάλα βεβαίως μακαρίζεται.

MARINUS.

Omnis divinæ atque humanæ eruditionis elementa tria, NOSSE, VELLE,
POSSE : quorum *principium* unam MENS, sive SPIRITUS ; cujus *Oculus*
est RATIO ; cui *lumen* præbet DEUS.

Vita di G. B. VICO, p. 50.

The Readers *generally* are intreated to strike out the sentence comprised in lines 4—7 of 'p. 194, containing a mistaken assertion; the result of exhausted attention.

The Editor's personal friends, and others sufficiently prepossessed in his favor to think it worth the trouble, are requested, previously to the perusal of this volume, to make with the pen the following

CORRECTIONS AND AMENDMENTS.

- Page 1—For the three first lines of Aph. I. *substitute*: It is the prerogative of Genius to produce novel impressions from familiar objects: and seldom can philosophic genius be more usefully employed than in thus rescuing, &c.
- 2—Aph. IV. l. 12, *after* fore-thought, *read*, Suppose yourself fronting a glass mirror. Now what the Objects behind you are to their *images* at the same apparent distance before you, such is—omit the words, “in a looking-glass.”
- 10—Aph. XVI. l. 4, *for* ground, *put* rest.
- 13—Aph. XXI. l. 1, *after* PRUDENCE, *insert*, *religious* Prudence, I mean; a prudence in the service of Religion. N. B. *What Prudence is in itself and independent of Religion*, is explained p. 26, in the note to Aph. XXXI.
- 15—For the five first lines of the Comment, *read*, This then, comprising the PRUDENTIALS of religion, comes *first* under consideration. *Next* follow the MORAL Requisites. If in the *first* we have the *shrine* and *frame-work* for that Divine Image, into which the Wordly-human is to be transformed; in the *second*, we are to bring out the *Portrait itself*—the distinct, &c.
- 21—Aph. XXIX. l. 3, omit *not*.
- 46—Aph. XIII. l. 4, *after* therefore, *insert* (says Seneca.)
- 57—L. 1, *after* Religion, *insert* a colon, and “for the *religious* principle is.”
- 67—L. 18, *for* He and his, *read* we and our.

- Page 69—L. 16, transpose from l. 19, 20, and *read*, that in the *material and visible System* it is highly reasonable, &c.
- 74—L. 6, *after* no man, *insert* not, or *for* meaning, *read* except he meant.
- 75—L. 6, *for* senses, *read* Sense.
- 96—Last line but 3, below COMMENT, *insert*, as the heading, “On an intermediate state, or state of *transition* from Morality to Spiritual Religion.”
- 132—Last line but 6, *for* Nature, *read* Prerogative.
- 165—L. 13, *after* and, *insert* why he.
- 170—Last line, *for* forms, *read* makes.
- 176—L. 14, *for* this, *read* that.
- 177—L. 2, *after* Ribbon put a full stop, and *insert*, On this sophism rest the pretended “Demonstrations of a God” grounded on.
L. 3, *after* lastly, *insert* in. And l. 4, *after* Demonstrations, *insert* the Authors.
- 191—L. 13, *after* these, *insert* together—and *after* doctrines, *put* of.
- 228—Last line but five, *for* it, *read* the Light.
- 244—Last line but two, *for* in Principle, *read* Principle in.
- 251—L. 14 of the note, *after* again, *insert* it typifies the Understanding.
- 254—Last line but ten, *after* species, *insert* used as the representative.
- 256—Last line, *after* not in the, *insert* compulsion of.
- 289—L. 9, *for* Principles, *read* Principle.

AIDS
TO
REFLECTION.

INTRODUCTORY APHORISMS.

APHORISM I. EDITOR.

IN philosophy equally as in poetry it is the highest and most useful prerogative of genius to produce the strongest impressions of novelty, while it rescues admitted truths from the neglect caused by the very circumstance of their universal admission. Extremes meet. Truths, of all others the most awful and interesting, are too often considered as *so* true, that they lose all the power of truth, and lie bed-ridden in the dormitory of the soul, side by side with the most despised and exploded errors.

APHORISM II. EDITOR.

There is one sure way of giving freshness and importance to the most *common-place* maxims—that of *reflecting* on them in direct reference to our own state and conduct, to our own past and future being.

APHORISM III.

EDITOR.

To restore a common-place truth to its first *uncommon* lustre, you need only *translate* it into action. But to do this, you must have *reflected* on its truth.

APHORISM IV.

LEIGHTON.

‘ It is the advice of the wise man, ‘ Dwell at home,’
 ‘ or, with yourself; and though there are very few
 ‘ that do this, yet it is surprising that the greatest
 ‘ part of mankind cannot be prevailed upon, at least
 ‘ to visit themselves sometimes; but, according to the
 ‘ saying of the wise Solomon, *The eyes of the fool are*
 ‘ *in the ends of the earth.*’

A reflecting mind, says an ancient writer, is the spring and source of every good thing. (*‘ Omnis boni principium intellectus cogitabundus.’*) It is at once the disgrace and the misery of men, that they live without fore-thought. But what the objects behind you are to the images at the same distance before you in a looking-glass, such is Reflection to Fore-thought. As a man without Fore-thought scarcely deserves the name of a man, so Fore-thought without Reflection is but a metaphorical phrase for the *instinct* of a beast.

ED.

APHORISM V.

EDITOR.

As a fruit-tree is more valuable than any one of its fruits singly, or even than all its fruits of a single season, so the noblest object of reflection is the mind itself, by which we reflect :

And as the blossoms, the green, and the ripe, fruit, of an orange-tree are more beautiful to behold when on the tree and seen as one with it, than the same growth detached and seen successively, after their importation into another country and different clime; so is it with the manifold objects of reflection, when they are considered principally in reference to the reflective power, and as part and parcel of the same. No object, of whatever value our passions may represent it, but becomes *foreign* to us, as soon as it is altogether unconnected with our intellectual, moral, and spiritual life. To be *ours*, it must be referred to the mind either as motive, or consequence, or symptom.

APHORISM VI.

LEIGHTON.

He who teaches men the principles and precepts of spiritual wisdom, before their minds are called off from foreign objects, and turned inward upon themselves, might as well write his instructions, as the sybil wrote her prophecies, on the loose leaves of trees, and commit them to the mercy of the inconstant winds.

APHORISM VII.

EDITOR.

In order to learn, we must *attend*: in order to profit by what we have learnt, we must *think*—i. e. reflect. He only thinks who *reflects*.

APHORISM VIII.

L. & ED.

It is a matter of great difficulty, and requires no ordinary skill and address, to fix the attention of men

(especially of young men*) on the world within them, to induce them to study the processes and superintend the works which they are themselves carrying on in their own minds; in short, to awaken in them both the faculty of thought † and the inclination to exercise it. For alas! the largest part of mankind are nowhere greater strangers than at home.

APHORISM IX.

EDITOR.

Life is the one univereal soul, which by virtue of the enlivening BREATH, and the informing WORD, all organized bodies have in common, each *after its kind*. This, therefore, all animals possess, and man as an animal. But, in addition to this, God transfused into man a higher gift, and specially imbreated:—even a

* So Leighton says: my own experience would rather have suggested the contrary remark.

† *Distinction between Thought and Attention.*—By THOUGHT is here meant the voluntary reproduction in our own minds of those states of consciousness, or (to use a phrase more familiar to the religious reader) of those inward experiences, to which, as to his best and most authentic documents, the teacher of moral or religious truth refers us. In ATTENTION, we keep the mind *passive*: in THOUGHT, we rouse it into activity. In the former, we submit to an impression—we keep the mind steady in order to *receive* the stamp. In the latter, we seek to *imitate* the artist, while we ourselves make a copy or duplicate of his work. We may learn arithmetic, or the elements of geometry, by continued attention alone; but *self-knowledge*, or an insight into the laws and constitution of the human mind and the *grounds* of religion and true morality, in addition to the effort of attention requires the energy of THOUGHT.

living (that is, self-subsisting) soul, a soul having its life in itself. "And man became a living soul." He did not merely *possess* it, he *became* it. It was his proper *being*, his truest *self*, *the man in the man*. None then, not one of human kind, so poor and destitute, but there is provided for him, even in his present state, *a house not built with hands*. Aye, and spite of the philosophy (falsely so called) which mistakes the causes, the conditions, and the occasions of our becoming *conscious* of certain truths and realities for the truths and realities themselves—a house gloriously furnished. Nothing is wanted but the eye, which is the light of this house, the light which is the eye of this soul. This *seeing* light, this *enlightening* eye, is Reflection. It is more, indeed, than is ordinarily meant by that word; but it is what a *Christian* ought to mean by it, and to know too, whence it first came, and still continues to come—of what light even this light is *but* a reflection. This, too, is THOUGHT; and all thought is but unthinking that does not flow out of this, or tend towards it.

APHORISM X.

EDITOR.

Self-superintendence! that any thing should overlook itself! Is not this a paradox, and hard to understand? It is, indeed, difficult, and to the imbruted sensualist a direct contradiction; and yet most truly does the poet exclaim,

— Unless *above* himself he can
Erect himself, how mean a thing is man!

APHORISM XI.

EDITOR.

An hour of solitude passed in sincere and earnest prayer, or the conflict with, and conquest over, a single passion or "subtle *bosom* sin," will teach us more of thought, will more effectually awaken the *faculty*, and form the *habit*, of reflection, than a year's study in the schools without them.

APHORISM XII.

EDITOR.

In a world, whose opinions are drawn from outside shows, many things may be *paradoxical*, (that is, contrary to the common notion) and nevertheless true: nay, *because* they are true. How should it be otherwise, as long as the imagination of the Worldling is wholly occupied by surfaces, while the Christian's thoughts are fixed on the substance, that which *is* and abides, and which, *because* it is the substance*, the outward senses cannot recognize. Tertullian had good reason for his assertion, that the simplest Christian (if indeed a Christian) knows more than the most accomplished irreligious philosopher.

* *Quod stat subtus*, that which stands *beneath*, and (as it were) supports, the appearance. In a language like ours, where so many words are derived from other languages, there are few modes of instruction more useful or more amusing than that of accustoming young people to seek for the etymology, or primary meaning, of the words they use. There are cases, in which more knowledge of more value may be conveyed by the history of a *word*, than by the history of a campaign.

COMMENT.

Let it not, however, be forgotten, that the powers of the understanding and the intellectual graces are precious gifts of God; and that every Christian, according to the opportunities vouchsafed to him, is bound to cultivate the one and to acquire the other. Indeed, he is scarcely a Christian who wilfully neglects so to do. What says the apostle? Add to your faith *knowledge*, and to knowledge *manly energy*, (*ἀρετήν*) for this is the proper rendering, and not *virtue*, at least in the present and ordinary acceptation of the word*.

APHORISM XIII.

EDITOR.

Never yet did there exist a full faith in the Divine Word (by whom *light*, as well as immortality, was brought into the world,) which did not expand the intellect, while it purified the heart: which did not multiply the aims and objects of the understanding, while it fixed and simplified those of the desires and passions†.

* I am not ashamed to confess that I dislike the frequent use of the word *virtue*, instead of *righteousness*, in the pulpit: and that in prayer or preaching before a Christian community, it sounds too much like *Pagan* philosophy. The passage in St. Peter's epistle, is the only scripture authority that can be pretended for its use, and I think it right, therefore, to notice, that it rests either on an oversight of the translators, or on a change in the meaning of the word since their time.

† The effects of a zealous ministry on the intellects and acquirements of the labouring classes are not only attested by

COMMENT.

If acquiescence without insight; if warmth without light; if an immunity from doubt, given and guaranteed by a resolute ignorance; if the habit of *taking for granted* the words of a catechism, remembered or forgotten; if a mere *sensation* of positiveness substituted—I will not say for the *sense* of *certainty*, but—for that calm assurance, the very means and conditions of which it supersedes; if a belief that seeks the darkness, and yet strikes no root, immoveable as the limpet from the rock, and, like the limpet, fixed there by mere force of adhesion;—if these suffice to make men Christians, in what sense could the apostle affirm that believers receive, not indeed worldly wisdom, that comes to nought, but the wisdom of God, *that we might know and comprehend* the things that are freely given to us of God? On what grounds could he denounce the sincerest *fervor* of spirit as *defective*, where it does not likewise bring forth fruits in the UNDERSTANDING?

APHORISM XIV.

EDITOR.

In our present state, it is little less than impossible

Baxter, and the Presbyterian divines, but admitted by Bishop Burnet, who, during his mission in the west of Scotland, was “amazed to find a poor commonality so able to argue,” &c. But we need not go to a sister church for proof or example. The diffusion of light and knowledge through this kingdom, by the exertions of the bishops and clergy, by Episcopalians and Puritans, from Edward VI. to the Restoration, was as wonderful as it is praiseworthy, and may be justly placed among the most remarkable facts of history.

that the affections should be kept constant to an object which gives no employment to the understanding, and yet cannot be made manifest to the senses. The exercise of the reasoning and reflecting powers, increasing insight, and enlarging views, are requisite to keep alive the substantial faith in the heart.

APHORISM XV.

EDITOR.

In the state of perfection, perhaps, all other faculties may be swallowed up in love, or superseded by immediate vision ; but it is on the wings of the CHERUBIM, *i. e.* (according to the interpretation of the ancient Hebrew doctors,) the *intellectual* powers and energies, that we must first be borne up to the “pure empyrean.” It must be seraphs, and not the hearts of imperfect mortals, that can burn unfuelled and self-fed. Give me *understanding*; (is the prayer of the Royal Psalmist) and I shall observe thy law with my *whole* heart.—Thy law is exceeding *broad*—that is, comprehensive, pregnant, containing far more than the apparent import of the words on a first perusal. It is my *meditation* all the day.

COMMENT.

It is worthy of especial observation, that the Scriptures are distinguished from all other writings pretending to inspiration, by the strong and frequent recommendations of knowledge, and a spirit of inquiry. Without reflection, it is evident that neither the one can be acquired nor the other exercised.

APHORISM XVI.

EDITOR.

The word *rational* has been strangely abused of late times. This must not, however, disincline us to the weighty consideration, that thoughtfulness, and a desire to ground all our convictions on grounds of right reason, are inseparable from the character of a Christian.

APHORISM XVII.

EDITOR.

A reflecting mind is not a flower that grows wild, or comes up of its own accord. The difficulty is indeed greater than many, who mistake quick recollection for thought, are disposed to admit; but how much less than it would be, had we not been born and bred in a Christian and Protestant land, the fewest of us are sufficiently aware. Truly may we, and thankfully ought we, to exclaim with the Psalmist: The entrance of thy words *giveth* light; it *giveth* understanding even to the simple.

APHORISM XVIII.

EDITOR.

Examine the journals of our zealous missionaries, I will not say among the Hottentots or Esquimaux, but in the highly *civilized*, though fearfully *uncultivated*, inhabitants of ancient India. How often, and how feelingly, do they describe the difficulty of rendering the simplest chain of thought intelligible to the ordinary natives, the rapid exhaustion of their whole power of attention, and with what distressful effort it is exerted while it lasts! Yet it is among these that

the hideous practices of self-torture chiefly prevail. O if folly were no *easier* than wisdom, it being often so very much more *grievous*, how certainly might these unhappy slaves of superstition be converted to Christianity! But, alas! to swing by hooks passed through the back, or to walk in shoes with nails of iron pointed upwards through the soles—all this is so much less *difficult*, demands so much less exertion of the will than to *reflect*, and by reflection to gain knowledge and tranquillity!

COMMENT.

It is not true, that ignorant persons have no notion of the *advantages* of truth and knowledge. They confess, they see and bear witness to these advantages in the conduct, the immunities, and the superior powers of the possessors. Were they attainable by pilgrimages the most toilsome, or penances the most painful, we should assuredly have as many pilgrims and self-tormentors in the service of true religion, as now exist under the tyranny of papal or Brahman superstition.

APHORISM XIX.

EDITOR.

In countries enlightened by the gospel, however, the most formidable and (it is to be feared) the most frequent impediment to men's turning the mind inward upon themselves, is that they are afraid of what they shall find there. There is an aching hollowness in the bosom, a dark cold speck at the heart, an obscure and boding sense of a somewhat, that must be kept *out of*

sight of the conscience; some secret lodger, whom they can neither resolve to eject or retain *.

COMMENT.

Few are so obdurate, few have sufficient strength of character, to be able to draw forth an evil tendency or immoral practice into distinct *consciousness*, without bringing it in the same moment before an awaking *conscience*. But for this very reason it becomes a duty of conscience to form the mind to a habit of distinct consciousness. An unreflecting Christian walks in twilight among snares and pitfalls! He entreats the

* The following sonnet was extracted by me from Herbert's Temple, in a work long since out of print, for the purity of the language and the fulness of the sense. But I shall be excused, I trust, in repeating it here for higher merits and with higher purposes, as a forcible comment on the words in the text.

Graces vouchsafed in a Christian land.

Lord! with what care hast thou begirt us round!
 Parents first season us. Then schoolmasters
 Deliver us to laws. They send us bound
 To rules of reason. Holy messengers;
 Pulpits and Sundays; sorrow dogging sin;
 Afflictions *sorted*; anguish of all sizes;
 Fine nets and stratagems to catch us in!
 Bibles laid open; millions of surprises;
 Blessings beforehand; ties of gratefulness;
 The sound of glory ringing in our ears:
 Without, our shame; within, our consciences;
 Angels and grace; eternal hopes and fears!
 Yet all these fences, and their whole array,
 One cunning BOSOM SIN blows quite away.

heavenly Father not to lead him into temptation, and yet places himself on the very edge of it, because he will not kindle the torch which his Father had given into his hands, as a means of prevention, and lest he should pray too late.

APHORISM XX.

EDITOR.

Among the various undertakings of men, can there be mentioned one more important, can there be conceived one more sublime, than an intention to form the human mind anew after the DIVINE IMAGE? The very intention, if it be sincere, is a ray of its dawning.

The requisites for the execution of this high intent may be comprised under three heads; the prudential, the moral, and the spiritual:

APHORISM XXI.

EDITOR.

First, PRUDENCE.—What this is, will be best explained by its effects and operations. It consists then in the prevention or abatement of hinderances and distractions; and consequently in avoiding, or removing, all such circumstances as, by diverting the attention of the workman, retard the progress and hazard the safety of the work. It is likewise (we deny not) a part of this unworldly prudence, to place ourselves as much and as often as it is in our power so to do, in circumstances directly favourable to our great design; and to avail ourselves of all the *positive* helps and furtherances which these circumstances afford. But neither dare we, as Christians, forget whose and under what dominion

the things are, quæ nos *circumstant*, i. e. that *stand around* us. We are to remember, that it is the *World* that constitutes our outward circumstances; that in the form of the *World*, which is evermore at variance with the *Divine Form* (or *idea*) they are cast and moulded; and that of the means and measures which prudence requires in the forming anew of the *Divine Image* in the soul, the far greater number suppose the *World* at enmity with our design. We are to avoid its snares, to repel its attacks, to suspect its aids and succours, and even when compelled to receive them as allies within our trenches, yet to commit the outworks alone to their charge, and to keep them at a jealous distance from the citadel. The powers of the world are often *christened*, but seldom christianized. They are but *proselytes of the outer gate*: or, like the Saxons of old, enter the land as auxiliaries, and remain in it as conquerors and lords.

APHORISM XXII.

EDITOR.

The rules of prudence in general, like the laws of the stone tables, are for the most part prohibitive. *Thou shalt not* is their characteristic formula: and it is an especial *part* of *Christian* prudence that it should be so. Nor would it be difficult to bring under this head, all the social obligations that arise out of the relations of the present life, which the sensual understanding (το φρόνημα της Σαρκός, Romans viii. 6.) is of itself able to discover, and the performance of which, under favourable worldly circumstances, the merest

worldly self-interest, without love or faith, is sufficient to enforce; but which Christian prudence enlivens by a higher principle, and renders symbolic and sacramental. (Ephesians v. 32.)

COMMENT.

This then, under the appellation of prudential requisites, comes first under consideration: and may be regarded as the shrine and frame-work for the Divine image, into which the worldly human is to be transformed. We are next to bring out the distinct features of its countenance, as a sojourner among men; its benign aspect turned towards its fellow-pilgrims, the extended arm, and the hand that blesseth and healeth.

APHORISM XXIII.

EDITOR.

The outward service (Θρησκεία*) of ancient religion, the rites, ceremonies and ceremonial vestments of the

* See the epistle of St. James, c. i. v. 26, 27. where, in the authorized version, the Greek word Θρησκεία is falsely rendered *religion*: whether by mistake of the translator, or from the intended sense having become obsolete, I cannot decide. At all events, for the English reader of our times it has the effect of an erroneous translation. It not only obscures the connexion of the passage, and weakens the peculiar force and sublimity of the thought, rendering it comparatively flat and trivial, almost indeed tautological, but has occasioned this particular verse to be perverted into a support of a very dangerous error; and the whole epistle to be considered as a *set-off* against the epistles and declarations of St. Paul, instead of (what in fact it is), a masterly comment and confirmation of the same. I need not

old law, had morality for their substance. They were the *letter*, of which morality was the *spirit*; the enigma, of which morality was the *meaning*. But morality itself is the service and ceremonial (*cultus exterior*, *θηρησκεία*) of the Christian religion. The scheme of grace and truth that *became** through Jesus Christ, the faith that *looks*† *down into* the perfect law of liberty,

inform the religious reader, that James, c. i. v. 27. is the favourite text and most boasted authority of those divines who represent the Redeemer of the world as little more than a moral reformer, and the Christian faith as a code of ethics, differing from the moral system of Moses and the prophets by an additional motive; or rather, by the additional strength and clearness which the historical fact of the resurrection has given to the same motive.

* The Greek word *ἔγένετο*, unites in itself the two senses of *began to exist* and *was made to exist*. It exemplifies the force of the *middle voice*, in distinction from the verb reflex. In answer to a note on John i. 2. in the unitarian version of the New Testament, I think it worth noticing, that the same word is used in the very same sense by Aristophanes in that famous parody on the cosmogonies of the Mythic poets, or the creation of the finite, as delivered, or supposed to be delivered, in the Cabiric or Samothracian mysteries, in the Comedy of the Birds.

————— ἐγένετ' Ὀυραγος ὦ κειανός τε
Καὶ Γῆ.

† James c. i. v. 25. Ὁ δὲ παρακύψας εἰς νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας. The Greek word, *parakupsas*, signifies the incurvation or bending of the body in the act of *looking down into*; as, for instance, in the endeavour to see the reflected image of a star in the water at the bottom of a well. A more happy or forcible word could not have been chosen to express the nature and ultimate object of reflection, and to enforce the necessity of it, in order

has “light for its *garment* :” its very “*robe* is righteousness.”

COMMENT.

Herein the apostle places the pre-eminency, the peculiar and distinguishing excellence, of the Christian religion. The ritual is of the same kind, (*ὁμοίωσιν*) though not of the same order, with the religion itself—not arbitrary or conventional, as types and hieroglyphics are in relation to the things expressed by them; but inseparable, consubstantiated (as it were), and partaking therefore of the same life, permanence, and intrinsic worth with its spirit and principle.

to discover the living fountain and spring-head of the evidence of the Christian faith in the believer himself, and at the same time to point out the seat and region, where alone it is to be found. *Quantum sumus, scimus*. That which we find within ourselves, which is more than ourselves, and yet the ground of whatever is good and permanent therein, is the substance and life of all other knowledge.

N. B. The Familists of the sixteenth century, and similar enthusiasts of later date, overlooked the essential point, that it was a *law*, and a law that involved its own end (*τελος*), a *perfect* law (*τέλειος*) or law that perfects or completes itself; and therefore, its obligations are called, in reference to human statutes, *imperfect* duties, i. e. incoercible from without. They overlooked that it was a law that *portions out* (*Νόμος* from *γέμω* to *allot*, or *make division of*) to each man the sphere and limits, within which it is to be exercised—which as St. Peter notices of certain profound passages in the writings of St. Paul, (2 Pet. c. iii. v. 16.) *οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀσήρικτοι σρεβλῆσιν, ὡς καὶ τὰς λῶπας γραφᾶς, πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν.*

APHORISM XXIV.

EDITOR.

Morality is the body, of which the faith in Christ is the soul—so far indeed its earthly body, as it is adapted to its state of warfare on earth, and the appointed form and instrument of its communion with the present world; yet not “terrestrial,” nor of the world, but a celestial body, and capable of being transfigured from glory to glory, in accordance with the varying circumstances and outward relations of its moving and informing spirit.

APHORISM XXV.

EDITOR.

Woe to the man, who will believe neither power, freedom, nor morality; because he no where finds either entire, or unmixed with sin, thralldom and infirmity. In the natural and intellectual realms, we distinguish what we cannot separate; and in the moral world, we must distinguish *in order to* separate. Yea, in the clear distinction of good from evil the process of separation commences.

COMMENT.

It was customary with religious men in former times, to make a rule of taking every morning some text, or aphorism*, for their occasional meditation

* In accordance with a preceding remark, on the use of etymology in disciplining the youthful mind to thoughtful habits, and as consistent with the title of this work, ‘Aids to Reflection,’ I shall offer no apology for the following and similar notes:

Aphorism, determinate position, from the Greek *ap*, from;

during the day, and thus to fill up the intervals of their attention to business. I do not point it out for imitation, as knowing too well, how apt these self-imposed rules are to degenerate into superstition or hollowness: or I would have recommended the following as the first exercise.

APHORISM XXVI.

EDITOR.

It is a dull and obtuse mind, that must divide in order to distinguish; but it is a still worse, that distinguishes in order to divide. In the former, we may contemplate the source of superstition and *idolatry; in the latter, of schism, heresy †, and a seditious and sectarian spirit ‡.

and horizein, to bound, or limit; whence our horizon.—In order to get the full sense of a word, we should first present to our minds the visual image that forms its primary meaning. Draw lines of different colours round the different counties of England, and then cut out each separately, as in the common play-maps that children take to pieces and put together—so that each district can be contemplated apart from the rest, as a whole in itself. This twofold act of circumscribing, and detaching, when it is exerted by the mind on subjects of reflection and reason, is to *aphorize*, and the result an *aphorism*.

* Τὸ Νόητον διήκασιν εἰς πολλῶν Θείων Ἰδιοτήτας.—*Damasc. de Myst. Egypt*; *i. e.* They divided the intelligible into many and several individualities.

† From ἀφρεσις, a wilful raising into public notice, an uplifting (for display) of any particular opinion differing from the established belief of the church at large, and making it a ground of schism, *i. e.* division, from schizein, to cut off—whence our “scissars” is supposed to have been derived.

‡ I mean these words in their large and philosophic sense in relation to the *spirit*, or originating temper and tendency, and

APHORISM XXVII.

EDITOR.

Exclusive of the abstract sciences, the largest and worthiest portion of our knowledge consists of *aphorisms*: and the greatest and best of men is but an *aphorism*.

APHORISM XXVIII.

EDITOR.

On the prudential influence which the fear or foresight of the *consequences* of his actions, in respect of his own loss or gain, may exert on a newly converted Believer.

PRECAUTIONARY REMARK.—We meddle not with the dispute respecting *conversion*, whether, and in what sense, necessary in all Christians. It is sufficient for our purpose, that a very *large* number of men even in Christian countries *need* to be converted; and that not a few, we trust, have been. The tenet becomes fanatical and dangerous, only when rare and extraordinary exceptions are made to be the general rule;—when what was vouchsafed to the apostle of the Gentiles by especial grace, and for an especial purpose, viz. a conversion * begun and completed in the same moment,

not to any one mode under which, or to any one class, in or by which, it may be displayed. A seditious spirit may (it is possible, though not probable,) exist in the council-chamber of a palace as strongly as in a mob in Palace-Yard; and a sectarian spirit in a cathedral, no less than in a conventicle.

* Whereas Christ's other disciples had a breeding under him, St. Paul was *born* an apostle; not carved out, as the rest, by degrees and in course of time, but a *fusile* apostle, an apostle poured out and cast in a mould. As Adam was a perfect man in an instant, so was St. Paul a perfect Christian. The same

is demanded or expected of all men, as a necessary sign and pledge of their election. Late observations have shown, that under many circumstances the magnetic needle, even after the disturbing influence has been removed, will keep wavering, and require many days before it points aright, and remains steady to the pole. So is it ordinarily with the soul, after it has begun to free itself from the disturbing forces of the flesh and the world, and to convert* itself towards God.

APHORISM XXIX.

EDITOR.

Awakened by the cock-crow (a sermon, a calamity, a sick bed, or a providential escape) the Christian pilgrim sets out in the morning twilight, while yet the truth (the νόμος τέλειος ὁ τῆς ἐλευθερίας) is below the horizon. Certain necessary *consequences* of his past life and his present undertaking will be *seen* by the refraction of its light: more will be apprehended and conjectured. The phantasms, that had ~~not~~ predominated during the hours of darkness, are still busy. No longer present, as Forms, they will yet exist as moulding and formative Motions in the Pilgrim's soul. The Dream of the past night will transfer its shapes to the objects in the distance, while the objects give outwardness and reality to the shapings of the Dream. The fears inspired

spirit was the lightning that melted, and the mould that received and shaped him.—Donne's Sermons—*quoted from memory.*

* From the Latin, *convertere*—*i. e.* by an act of the WILL to *turn towards* the true pole, *at the same time* (for this is the force of the prepositive *con*) that the understanding is convinced and made aware of its existence and direction.

by long habits of selfishness, and self-seeking cunning, though now purifying into that fear which is the *beginning* of wisdom, and ordained to be our guide and safeguard, till the sun of love, the perfect law of liberty, is fully arisen—these fears will set the fancy at work, and haply, for a time, transform the mists of dim and imperfect knowledge into determinate superstitions. But in either case, whether seen clearly or dimly, whether beheld or only imagined, the *consequences* contemplated in their bearings on the individual's inherent* desire of happiness and dread of pain become

* The following extract from Leighton's Theological Lectures, sect. II. cannot be introduced more to the purpose than as a comment on this sentence :

‘ The human mind, however stunned and weakened by the fall, still retains some faint idea of the good it has lost ; a kind of languid sense of its misery and indigence, with affections suitable to these obscure notions. This at least is beyond all doubt and indisputable, that all men wish well to themselves ; nor can the mind divest itself of this propensity, without divesting itself of its being. This is what the schoolmen mean when in their manner of expression they say, that ‘ the will (*mem. voluntas, not arbitrium*) is carried towards happiness not simply as *will*, but as *nature*.’

I venture to remark that this position, if not more *certainly*, would be more *evidently* true, if instead of *beatitudo*, the word *indolentia* (*i. e.* freedom from pain, negative happiness) had been used. But this depends on the exact meaning attached to the term *self*, of which more in another place. One conclusion, however, follows inevitably from the preceding position, viz. that this propensity can never be legitimately made the *principle* of morality, even because it is no part or appurtenance of the moral will ; and because the proper object of the

motives: and (unless all distinction in the words be done away with, and either prudence or virtue be reduced to a superfluous synonyme, a redundancy in all the languages of the civilized world), these motives, and the acts and forbearances directly proceeding from them, fall under the head of PRUDENCE, as belonging to one or other of its three very distinct species. It may be a prudence, that stands in opposition to a higher moral life, and tends to preclude it, and to prevent the soul from ever arriving at the hatred of sin for its own exceeding sinfulness (*Rom. vii. 13*): and this is an EVIL PRUDENCE. Or it may be a *neutral* prudence, not incompatible with spiritual growth: and to this we may, with especial propriety, apply the words of our Lord, "What is not *against* us is for us." It is therefore an innocent, and (being such) a proper, and COMMENDABLE PRUDENCE.

Or it may lead and be subservient to a higher principle than itself. The mind and conscience of the individual may be reconciled to it, in the fore-knowledge of the higher principle, and with a yearning towards it that implies a foretaste of future freedom. The enfeebled convalescent is reconciled to his crutches, and thankfully makes use of them, not only because moral principle is to limit and control this propensity, and to determine in what it *may* be, and in what it *ought* to be, gratified; while it is the business of philosophy to instruct the understanding, and the office of religion to convince the whole man, that otherwise than as a *regulated*, and of course therefore a *subordinate*, end, this propensity, innate and inalienable though it be, can never be realized or fulfilled. τὴν Δείσποιαν
 πᾶντα ἀσπάζεται ἢ Θιράπεινας.

they are necessary for his immediate support, but likewise, because they are the means and conditions of EXERCISE; and by exercise, of establishing, *gradatim paulatim*, that strength, flexibility, and almost spontaneous obedience of the muscles, which the idea and cheering presentiment of health hold out to him. He finds their *value* in their present necessity, and their *worth* as they are the instruments of finally superseding it. This is a faithful, a WISE PRUDENCE, having, indeed, its birth-place in the world, and the *wisdom of this world* for its Father; but naturalized in a better land, and having the Wisdom from above for its Sponsor and Spiritual Parent. To steal a dropt feather from the spicy nest of the Phœnix, (the fond humour, I mean, of the mystic divines and allegorizers of Holy Writ) it is the *son of Terah from Ur of the Chaldees*, who gives a tithe of all to the King of Righteousness, without father, without mother, without descent, (Νόμος αὐτόνομος), and receives a blessing on the remainder.

Lastly, there is a prudence that co-exists with morality, as morality co-exists with the spiritual life: a prudence that is the organ of both, as the understanding is to the reason and the will, or as the lungs are to the heart and brain. This is A HOLY PRUDENCE, the steward faithful and discreet (οἰκονόμος πιστός και φρόνιμος, Luke xii. 42), the ‘eldest servant’ in the family of faith, *born in the house*, and ‘made the ruler over his lord’s household.’

Let not then, I entreat you, my purpose be misunderstood; as if, in *distinguishing* virtue from prudence, I wished to divide the one from the other.

True morality is hostile to that prudence only, which is preclusive of true morality. The teacher, who *subordinates* prudence to virtue, cannot be supposed to *dispense* with it; and he, who teaches the proper connexion of the one with the other, does not depreciate the lower in any sense; while by making it a link of the same chain with the higher, and receiving the same influence, he raises it.

In Greek, Logos (Anglicé, Word), means likewise the Understanding. If the same idiom existed in our own language, only with the substitution of the *practical* for the intellectual, I would say: THE WORD* (*i. e.* Practical Rectitude), has Virtue (or Morality) for its Consonants and Prudence for the Vowels. Though the former can scarcely be pronounced without the latter, yet we ought to acquaint ourselves with their true nature and force. But this we can do only by a distinct knowledge of the latter, that is, what they are of themselves, and sounded separately from the consonants. In like manner, to understand aright what morality is, we must first learn what prudence is, and what acts and obligations are *prudential*; and having removed these to a class of their own, we shall find it comparatively easy to determine what acts and duties belong to morality.

* Logos in Greek, signifies an intelligible *word* as distinguished from *ῥημα*, a flowing or articulate *sound*; and it likewise signifies *the understanding*, in distinction from *Νους* (the pure reason) in one direction, and from *αισθησις* (the sense) in the other.

APHORISM XXX.

EDITOR.

What the duties of MORALITY are, the apostle instructs the believer in full, reducing them under two heads: negative, to keep himself pure from the world; and positive, beneficence with sympathy and loving-kindness, *i. e.* love of his fellow-men (his kind) as himself.

APHORISM XXXI.

EDITOR.

Last and highest, come the *spiritual*, comprising all the truths, acts and duties that have an especial reference to the Timeless, the Permanent, the Eternal: to the sincere love of the True, as truth, of the Good, *as good*: and of God as both in one. It comprehends the whole ascent from uprightness (morality, virtue, inward rectitude) to *godlikeness*, with all the acts, exercises, and disciplines of mind, will, and affection, that are requisite or conducive to the great design of our redemption from the form of the evil one, and of our second creation or birth in the divine image*.

* It is worthy of observation, and may furnish a fruitful subject for future reflection, how nearly this scriptural division coincides with the Platonic, which, *commencing* with the prudential, or the habit of act and purpose proceeding from enlightened self-interest, [*qui animi imperio, corporis servitio, rerum auxilio, in proprium sui commodum et sibi providus utitur, hunc esse prudentem statuimus*], *ascends* to the moral, *i. e.* to the *purifying* and *remedial* virtues; and seeks its *summit* in the imitation of the Divine nature. In this last division, answering to that which we have called the Spiritual, Plato includes all those inward acts and aspirations, waitings, and

APHORISM XXXII.

EDITOR.

It may be an additional aid to reflection, to distinguish the three kinds severally, according to the faculty to which each corresponds, the faculty or part of our human nature which is more particularly its organ. Thus: the prudential corresponds to the sense and the understanding; the moral to the heart and the conscience; the spiritual to the will and the reason, *i. e.* to the finite will reduced to harmony with, and in subordination to, the reason, as a ray from that true light which is both reason and will, universal reason, and will absolute.

watchings, which have a growth in godlikeness for their immediate purpose, and the union of the human soul with the Supreme Good as their ultimate object. Nor was it altogether without grounds that several of the Fathers ventured to believe that Plato had some dim conception of the necessity of a Divine Mediator, whether through some indistinct echo of the patriarchal faith, or some rays of light refracted from the Hebrew prophets through a Phœnician medium (to which he may possibly have referred in his phrase, *Διοπαράδοτος σοφία*, the wisdom delivered from God), or by his own sense of the mysterious contradiction in human nature between the will and the reason, the natural appetences and the no less innate law of conscience (*Romans II. 14, 15*), we shall in vain attempt to determine. It is not impossible that all three may have co-operated in partially unveiling these awful truths to this plank from the wreck of paradise thrown on the shores of idolatrous Greece, to this Divine Philosopher,

Che in quella schiera andó piú presso al segno
Al qual aggiunge, a chi dal cielo e dato.

Petrarch, Del Triunfo della Fama, Cap. III. l. 5, 6.

I have now, I trust, effected the two purposes of this introductory chapter, viz.

1. That of explaining the true nature and evincing the necessity of reflection in the constitution of a Christian character.

2. That of assigning my reasons, why having proposed to select from Archbishop Leighton's Works the most striking prudential, moral, and spiritual maxims, I have separated the prudential from the two following, and interpolated the extracts with mementos of my own.

PRUDENTIAL APHORISMS.

THE NATIONAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL ARCHIVES

PRUDENTIAL APHORISMS.

APHORISM I.

L. & ED.

You will not be offended, nor think I intend to insult you, if once and again, with great earnestness and sincerity, I wish you and myself a sound and serious temper of mind; for, if we may represent things as they really are, very few men are possessed of so valuable a blessing. The far greater part of them are intoxicated either with the pleasures or the cares of this world; they stagger about with a tottering and unstable pace; and, as Solomon expresses it, *The labour of the foolish wearieth every one of them; because he knoweth not how to go to the city*: Eccl. x. 15:—the heavenly city, and the vision of peace, which very few have a just notion of, or are at pains to seek after. Nay, they know not what it is they are seeking. They flutter from one object to another, and live at hazard. They have no certain harbour in view, nor direct their course by any fixed star. But to him that knoweth not the port to which he is bound, no wind can be favourable; neither can he who has not yet determined at what mark he is to shoot, direct his arrow aright.

I assert, then, that there is a proper object to aim at; and if this object be meant by the term happiness, (though I think that not the most appropriate term for a state, the perfection of which consists in the exclusion of all *hap* (*i. e.* chance), and should greatly prefer the Socratic *Eupraxya*, as expressing the union of well-being and well-doing,) I assert that there is such a thing as human happiness. This is indeed implied in the belief of an infinitely wise Author of our being.

APHORISM II.

LEIGHTON.

The whole human race must have been created in misery, and exposed to unavoidable torments, from which they could never have been relieved, had they been formed not only capable of a good, quite unattainable and altogether without their reach, but also with strong and restless desires towards that impossible good. Now, as this is by no means to be admitted, there must necessarily be some full, permanent, and satisfying good, that may be attained by man, and in the possession of which he must be truly happy.

APHORISM III.

LEIGHTON.

What this is, the Bible alone shows clearly and certainly, and points out the way that leads to the attainment of it. This is that which prevailed with St. Augustine to study the Scriptures, and engaged his affection to them. ‘In Cicero, and Plato, and other such writers,’ says he, ‘I meet with many things acutely said, and things that excite a certain warmth

‘ of emotion, but in none of them do I find these words,
 ‘ *Come unto me, all ye that labour, and are heavy*
 ‘ *laden, and I will give you rest*.*’

APHORISM IV.

LEIGHTON.

It is the wisdom of mankind to know God, and their indispensable duty to worship Him. Without this, men of the brightest parts and greatest learning seem to be born with excellent talents only to make themselves miserable; and according to the expression of the wisest of kings, *He that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow*, Eccl. i. 18. We must, therefore, first of all, consider this as a sure and settled point, that religion is the sole foundation of human peace and felicity. This, even the profane scoffers at religion are, in some sort, obliged to own, though much against their will, even while they are pointing their wit against it; for nothing is more commonly to be heard from them, than that the whole doctrine of religion was invented by some wise men, to encourage the practice of justice and virtue through the world. Surely then, religion, whatever else may be said of it, must be a matter of the highest value, since it is found necessary to secure advantages of so very great importance. But, in the mean time, how unhappy is the case of integrity and virtue, if what they want to support them is merely fictitious, and they cannot keep their ground

* Apud Ciceronem et Platonem, aliosque ejusmodi scriptores, multa sunt acute dicta, et leniter calentia, sed in iis omnibus hoc non invenio, *Venite ad me*, &c. [Matt. xii. 28.]

but by means of a monstrous forgery! But far be it from us to entertain such an absurdity! For the first rule of righteousness cannot be otherwise than right, nor is there any thing more nearly allied or more friendly to virtue, than truth.

APHORISM V.

LEIGHTON.

And it is, indeed, very plain, that if it were possible entirely to dissolve all the bonds and ties of religion, yet, that it should be so, would certainly be the interest of none but the worst and most abandoned part of mankind. All the good and wise, if the matter was freely left to their choice, would rather have the world governed by the Supreme and Most Perfect Being, mankind subjected to His just and righteous laws, and all the affairs of men superintended by His watchful providence, than that it should be otherwise. Nor do they believe the doctrines of religion with aversion or any sort of reluctancy, but embrace them with pleasure, and are excessively glad to find them true. So that, if it was possible, to abolish them entirely, and any person, out of mere good-will to them, should attempt to do it, they would look upon the favour as highly prejudicial to their interest, and think his good-will more hurtful than the keenest hatred. Nor would any one, in his wits, choose to live in the world, at large, and without any sort of government, more than he would think it eligible to be put on board a ship without a helm or pilot, and, in this condition, to be tossed amidst rocks and quick-

sands. On the other hand, can any thing give greater consolation, or more substantial joy*, than to be firmly persuaded, not only that there is an infinitely good and wise Being, but also that this Being preserves and continually governs the universe which Himself has framed, and holds the reins of all things in His powerful hand; that He is our father, that we and all our interests are His constant concern; and that, after we have sojourned a short while here below, we shall be again taken into His immediate presence? Or can this wretched life be attended with any sort of satisfaction, if it is divested of this divine faith, and bereaved of such a blessed hope?

APHORISM VI.

EDITOR.

Felicity, *in its proper sense*, is but another word for fortunateness, or happiness; and I can see no advantage in the improper use of words, when proper terms are to be found, but, on the contrary, much mischief. For, by familiarizing the mind to *equivocal* expressions, that is, such as may be taken in two or more different meanings, we introduce confusion of thought, and furnish the sophist with his best and handiest tools. For the juggle of sophistry consists, for the greater part, in using a word in one sense in the premise, and in another sense in the conclusion. We should accustom ourselves to *think*, and *reason*, in precise and steadfast terms; even when custom, or the deficiency, or the corruption of the language will

* Φέυ τι τούτων χάριμα μείζον ἂν λαβοίς.

not permit the same strictness in speaking. The mathematician finds this so necessary to the truths which he is seeking, that his science begins with, and is founded on, the definition of his terms. The botanist, the chemist, the anatomist, &c., feel and submit to this necessity at all costs, even at the risk of exposing their several pursuits to the ridicule of the many, by technical terms, hard to be remembered, and alike quarrelsome to the ear and the tongue. In the business of moral and religious reflection, in the acquisition of clear and distinct conceptions of our duties, and of the relations in which we stand to God, our neighbour, and ourselves, no such difficulties occur. At the utmost we have only to rescue words, already existing and familiar, from the false or vague meanings imposed on them by carelessness, or by the clipping and debasing misuse of the market. And surely happiness, duty, faith, truth, and final blessedness, are matters of deeper and dearer interest for all men, than circles to the geometrician, or the characters of plants to the botanist, or the affinities and combining principle of the elements of bodies to the chemist, or even than the mechanism (fearful and wonderful though it be!) of the perishable Tabernacle of the Soul can be to the anatomist. Among the *aids to reflection*, place the following maxim prominent: let distinctness in expression advance side by side with distinction in thought. For one useless subtlety in our elder divines and moralists, I will produce ten sophisms of equivocation in the writings of our modern preceptors: and for one error

resulting from excess in *distinguishing* the indifferent, I would show ten mischievous delusions from the habit of *confounding* the diverse.

APHORISM VII.

EDITOR.

Whether you are reflecting for yourself, or reasoning with another, make it a rule to ask yourself the precise meaning of the word, on which the point in question appears to turn; and if it may be (*i. e.* by writers of authority *has been*) used in several senses, then ask which of these the word is at present intended to convey. By this mean, and scarcely without it, you will at length acquire a facility in detecting the *quid pro quo*. And believe me, in so doing you will enable yourself to disarm and expose four-fifths of the main arguments of our most renowned irreligious philosophers, ancient and modern. For the *quid pro quo* is at once the rock and quarry, on and with which the strong-holds of disbelief, materialism, and (more pernicious still) epicurean morality, are built.

APHORISM VIII.

LEIGHTON.

If we seriously consider what religion is, we shall find the saying of the wise king Solomon to be unexceptionably true: *Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace.*

Doth religion require any thing of us more than that we live *soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world*? Now what, I pray, can be more pleasant or peaceable than these? Temperance is always at leisure,

luxury always in a hurry: the latter weakens the body and pollutes the soul, the former is the sanctity, purity, and sound state of both. It is one of Epicurus's fixed maxims, 'That life can never be pleasant without virtue.' Vices seize upon men with the violence and rage of furies; but the Christian virtues replenish the breast which they inhabit, with a heavenly peace and abundant joy, and thereby render it like that of an angel. The slaves of pleasure and carnal affections, have within them, even now, an earnest of future torments; so that, in this present life, we may truly apply to them that expression in the Revelations, *They that worship the beast have no rest day nor night.* 'There is perpetual peace with the 'humble,' says the most devout A Kempis; 'but the 'proud and the covetous are never at rest.'

COMMENT.

In the works of moralists, both Christian and Pagan, it is often asserted (indeed there are few common-places of more frequent recurrence) that the happiness even of this life consists solely, or principally, in virtue; that virtue is the only happiness of this life; that virtue is the truest *pleasure*, &c.

I doubt not that the meaning, which the writers intended to convey by these and the like expressions, was true and wise. But I deem it safer to say, nor do I doubt that in diverting men from sensual and dishonest courses it will often be expedient to say, that in all the outward relations of this life, in all our outward conduct and actions, both in what we should

do, and in what we should abstain from, the dictates of virtue are the very same with those of self-interest; that though the incitements of virtue do not proceed *from* the same point, yet they tend *to* the same point with the impulses of a reflecting and consistent selfishness; that the outward object of virtue being the greatest producible sum of happiness of all men, it must needs include the object of an intelligent self-love, which is the greatest possible happiness of one individual; for what is true of all, must be true of each. Hence, you cannot become better, (*i. e.* more virtuous), but you will become happier: and you cannot become worse, (*i. e.* more vicious), without an increase of misery (or at the best a proportional loss of enjoyment) as the consequence. If the thing were not inconsistent with our well-being, and known to be so, it would not have been classed as a *vice*. Thus what in an enfeebled and disordered mind is called prudence, is the voice of nature in a healthful state: as is proved by the known fact, that the prudential duties, (*i. e.* those actions which are commanded by virtue *because* they are prescribed by prudence), the animals fulfil by natural instinct.

The pleasure that accompanies or depends on a healthy and vigorous body will be the consequence and reward of a temperate life and habits of active industry, whether this pleasure were or were not the chief or only determining *motive* thereto. Virtue may, possibly, add to the pleasure a good of another kind, a higher good, perhaps, than the worldly mind is

capable of understanding, a spiritual complacency, of which in your present sensualized state you can form no idea. It may *add*, I say, but it cannot detract from it. Thus the reflected rays of the sun that give light, distinction, and endless multiformity to the mind, give at the same time the pleasurable sensation of *warmth* to the body. If then the time has not yet come for any thing higher, act on the maxim of seeking the most pleasure with the least pain: and, if only you do not seek where you yourself *know* it will not be found, this very pleasure and this freedom from the disquietude of pain, existing in conjunction with their immediate causes and necessary conditions, and with the other almost certain consequences of these causes, (for instance, the advantages of good character, the respect and sympathy of your neighbours, sense of increasing power and influence, &c.) may produce in you a state of being directly and indirectly favourable to the germination and up-spring of a nobler seed. They may prepare and predispose you to the sense and acknowledgment of a principle, differing not merely in degree but in *kind* from the faculties and instincts of the higher and more intelligent species of animals, (the ant, the beaver, the elephant), and which principle is therefore your proper humanity. And on this account and with this view alone may certain modes of pleasurable or *agreeable* sensation, without confusion of terms, be honoured with the title of refined, intellectual, ennobling pleasures.—For Pleasure (and happiness in its proper sense is but the

continuity and sum-total of the pleasure which is allotted or happens to a man, and hence by the Greeks called *εὐτυχία*, *i. e.* good-hap, or more religiously *εὐδαιμόνια*, *i. e.* favourable providence)—Pleasure, I say, consists in the harmony between the specific excitability of a living creature, and the exciting causes correspondent thereto. Considered therefore exclusively in and for itself, the only question is, quantum? not, quale? *How much on the whole?* the contrary, *i. e.* the painful and disagreeable, having been subtracted. The quality is a matter of *taste*: *et de gustibus non est disputandum.* No man can judge for another.

This, I repeat, appears to me a safer language than the sentences quoted above (that virtue alone is happiness; that happiness consists in virtue, &c.) sayings which I find it hard to reconcile with other positions of still more frequent occurrence in the same divines, or with the declaration of St. Paul: "If in this life only we have hope, we are of all men most miserable." Such language the soundest moralists were obliged to employ, before grace and truth were brought into the world by Jesus Christ. And such language may, I doubt not, even now be profitably addressed both to individuals and to classes of men; though in what *proportion* it should be dwelt on, and to what extent it is likely to be efficacious, a review of the different epochs memorable for the turning of many from their evil ways, and a review of the means by which this reformation of life has been principally effected, renders me scrupulous in deciding.

At all events, I should rely far more confidently on the converse, viz. that to be vicious is to be *miserable*. Few men are so utterly reprobate, so imbruted by their vices, as not to have some lucid, or at least quiet and sober, intervals; and in such a moment, *dum desæviunt iræ*, few can stand up unshaken against the appeal to their own experience—what have been the wages of sin? what has the devil done for you? What sort of master have you *found* him? Then let us in befitting *detail*, and by a series of questions that ask no loud, and are secure against any *false*, answer, urge home the proof of the position, that to be vicious is to be wretched: adding the fearful corollary, that if even in the body, which as long as life is in it can never be *wholly* bereaved of pleasurable sensations, vice is found to be misery, what must it not be in the world to come? There, where even the *crime* is no longer possible, much less the gratifications that once attended it—where nothing of vice remains but its guilt and its misery—vice must be misery itself, all and utter misery.—So best, if I err not, may the motives of prudence be held forth, and the impulses of self-love be awakened, in alliance with truth, and free from the danger of confounding things (the Laws of Duty, I mean, and the Maxims of Interest) which it deeply concerns us to keep distinct, inasmuch as this distinction and the faith therein are essential to our moral nature, and this again the ground-work and pre-condition of the spiritual state, in which the Humanity strives after Godliness and, in the name and power, and through

the prevenient and assisting grace, of the Mediator, will not strive in vain.

APHORISM IX.

EDITOR.

The *advantages* of a life passed in conformity with the precepts of virtue and religion, and in how many and various respects they recommend virtue and religion, even on grounds of prudence, form a delightful subject of meditation, and a source of refreshing thought to good and pious men. Nor is it strange if, transported with the view, such persons should sometimes discourse on the charm of forms and colours to men whose eyes are not yet *couched*; or that they occasionally seem to invert the relations of cause and effect, and forget that there are acts and determinations of the will and affections, the *consequences* of which may be plainly foreseen, and yet cannot be made our proper and primary *motives* for such acts and determinations, without destroying or entirely altering the distinct nature and character of the latter. Sophron is well informed that wealth and extensive patronage will be the consequence of his obtaining the love and esteem of Constantia. But if the foreknowledge of this consequence were, and were *found out* to be, Sophron's main and determining motive for seeking this love and esteem; and if Constantia were a woman that merited, or was capable of feeling, either one or the other; would not Sophron find (and deservedly too) aversion and contempt in their stead? Wherein, if not in this,

differs the friendship of worldlings from true friendship? Without kind offices and useful services, wherever the power and opportunity occur, love would be a hollow pretence. Yet what noble mind would not be offended, if he were thought to value the love for the sake of the services, and not rather the services for the sake of the love?

Dissertations on the profitableness of righteousness, that "her ways are ways of pleasantness," we possess many and eloquent, and in our most popular works. Many such passages, and of great beauty, occur in the volumes of Archbishop Leighton; but they are not particularly characteristic of his mind and genius. For these reasons therefore, in addition to the scruples avowed in the preceding pages, I have confined my selection to a few specimens; and shall now conclude what I have thought expedient to observe in my own person, by guarding against any possible misinterpretation of my sentiments by the two following aphorisms:

APHORISM X.

EDITOR.

Though prudence in itself is neither virtue nor spiritual holiness, yet without prudence, or in opposition to it, neither virtue nor holiness can exist.

APHORISM XI.

EDITOR.

Art thou under the tyranny of sin? a slave to vicious habits? at enmity with God, and a skulking fugitive from thy own conscience? O, how idle the

dispute, whether the listening to the dictates of *prudence* from prudential and self-interested motives be virtue or merit, when the *not* listening is guilt, misery, madness, and despair! The best, the most *Christian-like* pity thou canst show, is to take pity on thy own soul. The best and most acceptable service thou canst render, is to do justice and show mercy to *thyself*.

APHORISM XII.

LEIGHTON.

What, you will say, have I beasts within me? Yes, you have beasts, and a vast number of them. And that you may not think I intend to insult you, is anger an inconsiderable beast, when it barks in your heart? What is deceit, when it lies hid in a cunning mind; is it not a fox? Is not the man who is furiously bent upon calumny, a scorpion? Is not the person who is eagerly set on resentment and revenge, a most venomous viper? What do you say of a covetous man; is he not a ravenous wolf? And is not the luxurious man, as the prophet expresses it, a neighing horse? Nay, there is no wild beast but is found within us. And do you consider yourself as lord and prince of the wild beasts, because you command those that are without, though you never think of subduing or setting bounds to those that are within you? What advantage have you by your reason, which enables you to overcome lions, if, after all, you yourself are overcome by anger? To what purpose do you rule over the birds, and catch them with gins, if you yourself, with the inconstancy of a bird, or hurried hither and thither, and sometimes flying high, are ensnared by

pride, sometimes brought down and caught by pleasure? But, as it is shameful for him who rules over nations, to be a slave at home, and for the man who sits at the helm of the state, to be meanly subjected to the beck of a contemptible harlot, or even of an imperious wife; will it not be, in like manner, disgraceful for you, who exercise dominion over the beasts that are without you, to be subject to a great many, and those of the worst sort, that roar and domineer in your distempered mind?

APHORISM XIII.

LEIGHTON.

There is a settled friendship, nay, a near relation and similitude between God and good men; he is even their father; but, in their education, he inures them to hardships. When, therefore, you see them struggling with difficulties, sweating, and employed in up-hill work; while the wicked, on the other hand, are in high spirits, and swim in pleasures; consider, that we are pleased with modesty in our children, and forwardness in our slaves: the former we keep under by severe discipline, while we encourage impudence in the latter. Be persuaded, that God takes the same method. He does not pamper the good man with delicious fare, but tries him; he accustoms him to hardships, and, (which is a wonderful expression in a heathen) PREPARES HIM FOR HIMSELF.

APHORISM XIV.

LEIGHTON.

If what we are told concerning that glorious city, obtain credit with us, we shall cheerfully travel towards

it, nor shall we be at all deterred by the difficulties that may be in the way. But, however, as it is true, and more suitable to the weakness of our minds, which are rather apt to be affected with things present and near, than such as are at a great distance, we ought not to pass over in silence, that the way to the happiness reserved in heaven, which leads through this earth, is not only agreeable because of the blessed prospect it opens, and the glorious end to which it conducts, but also for its own sake, and on account of the innate pleasure to be found in it, far preferable to any other way of life that can be made choice of, or, indeed, imagined. Nay, that we may not, by low expressions, derogate from a matter so grand and so conspicuous, that holiness and true religion which leads directly to the highest felicity, is itself the only happiness, as far as it can be enjoyed on this earth. Whatever naturally tends to the attainment of any other advantage, participates, in some measure, of the nature of that advantage. Now, the way to perfect felicity, if any thing can be so, is a means that, in a very great measure, participates of the nature of its end; nay, it is the beginning of that happiness, it is also to be considered as a part of it, and differs from it, in its completest state, not so much in kind, as in degree.

APHORISM XV.

LEIGHTON.

‘We are always resolving to live, and yet never set about life in good earnest*.’ Archimedes was not

* *Victuros agimus semper, nec vivimus unquam.*

singular in his fate; but a great part of mankind die unexpectedly, while they are poring upon the figures they have described in the sand. O wretched mortals! who, having condemned themselves, as it were, to the mines, seem to make it their chief study to prevent their ever regaining their liberty. Hence, new employments are assumed in the place of old ones; and, as the Roman philosopher truly expresses it, ‘one hope succeeds another, one instance of ambition makes way for another; and we never desire an end of our misery, but only that it may change its outward form*.’ When we cease to be candidates, and to fatigue ourselves in soliciting interest, we begin to give our votes and interest to those who solicit us in their turn. When we are wearied of the trouble of prosecuting crimes at the bar, we commence judges ourselves; and he who is grown old in the management of other men’s affairs for money, is at last employed in improving his own wealth. At the age of fifty, says one, I will retire, and take my ease; or the sixtieth year of my life shall entirely disengage me from public offices and business. Fool! art thou not ashamed to reserve to thyself the last remains and dregs of life? Who will stand surety that thou shalt live so long? And what immense folly is it, so far to forget mortality, as to think of beginning to live at that period of years, to which a few only attain!

* *Spes spem excipit, ambitionem ambitio, et miseriarum non quæritur finis, sed schema tantum mutatur.*

REFLECTIONS RESPECTING MORALITY.

REFLECTIONS RESPECTING MORALITY.

IF Prudence, though practically inseparable from Morality, is not to be confounded with the Moral Principle; still less may Sensibility, *i. e.* a constitutional quickness of Sympathy with Pain and Pleasure, and a keen sense of the gratifications that accompany social intercourse, mutual endearments, and reciprocal preferences, be mistaken, or deemed a Substitute for either. They are not even sure pledges of a GOOD HEART, though among the most common meanings of that many-meaning and too commonly misapplied expression.

So far from being either Morality, or one with the Moral Principle, they ought not even be placed in the same rank with Prudence. For Prudence is at least an offspring of the Understanding; but Sensibility (the Sensibility, I mean, here spoken of), is for the greater part a quality of the nerves, and a result of individual bodily temperament.

Prudence is an *active* Principle, and implies a sacrifice of Self, though only to the same Self *projected*, as it were, to a distance. But the very term Sensibility,

marks its *passive* nature; and in its mere self, apart from Choice and Reflection, it proves little more than the coincidence or contagion of pleasurable or painful Sensations in different persons.

Alas! how many are there in this over-stimulated age, in which the occurrence of excessive and unhealthy sensitiveness is so frequent, as even to have reversed the current meaning of the word, *nervous*,—how many are* there whose sensibility prompts them to remove those evils alone, which by hideous spectacle or clamorous outcry are present to their senses and disturb their selfish enjoyments. Provided the dunghill is not before their parlour window, they are well contented to know that it exists, and perhaps as the hotbed on which their own luxuries are reared. Sensibility is not necessarily Benevolence. Nay, by rendering us tremblingly alive to trifling misfortunes, it frequently prevents it, and induces an effeminate Selfishness instead,

—— pampering the coward heart
With feelings all too delicate for use.

Sweet are the 'Tears, that from a Howard's eye
Drop on the cheek of one, he lifts from earth:
And He, who works me good with unmoved face,
Does it but half. He chills me, while he aids,
My Benefactor, not my Brother Man.
But even this, this *cold* benevolence,
Seems Worth, seems Manhood, when there rise before me

* This paragraph is abridged from the Watchman, No. IV. March 25, 1796; respecting which the inquisitive Reader may consult my "Literary Life." S. T. C.

The sluggard Pity's vision-weaving Tribe,
 Who sigh for Wretchedness yet shun the wretched,
 Nursing in some delicious Solitude
 Their Slothful Loves and dainty Sympathies.

Sibylline Leaves, p. 180.

Lastly, where Virtue is, Sensibility is the ornament and becoming Attire of Virtue. On certain occasions it may almost be said to *become** Virtue. But Sensibility and all the amiable Qualities may likewise become, and too often *have* become, the pandars of Vice and the instruments of Seduction.

So must it needs be with all qualities that have their rise only in *parts* and *fragments* of our nature. A man of warm passions may sacrifice half his estate to rescue a friend from Prison: for he is naturally sympathetic, and the more social *part* of his nature happened to be uppermost. The same man shall afterwards exhibit the same disregard of money in an attempt to seduce that friend's Wife or Daughter.

All the evil achieved by Hobbes and the whole School of Materialists will appear inconsiderable if it be compared with the mischief effected and occasioned by the sentimental Philosophy of STERNE, and his nu-

* There sometimes occurs an apparent *Play* on words, which not only to the Moralizer, but even to the philosophical Etymologist, appears more than a mere Play. Thus in the double sense of the word, *become*. I have known persons so anxious to have their Dress *become* them, so *totus in illo*, as to convert it at length into their proper self, and thus actually to *become* the Dress. Such a one, (safeliest spoken of by the *neuter* Pronoun), I consider as but a suit of *live* Finery. It is indifferent whether we say—It *becomes* He, or, He *becomes* it.

merous Imitators. The vilest appetites and the most remorseless inconstancy towards their objects, acquired the titles of *the Heart, the irresistible Feelings, the too tender Sensibility*: and if the Frosts of Prudence, the icy chains of Human Law thawed and vanished at the genial warmth of Human Nature, who could help it? It was an amiable Weakness!

About this time too the profanation of the word, Love, rose to its height. The French Naturalists, Buffon and others, borrowed it from the sentimental Novellists: the Swedish and English Philosophers took the contagion; and the Muse of Science condescended to seek admission into the Saloons of Fashion and Frivolity, *rouged* like an Harlot, and with the Harlot's wanton leer. I know not how the Annals of Guilt could be better forced into the service of Virtue, than by such a Comment on the present paragraph, as would be afforded by a selection from the sentimental correspondence produced in Courts of Justice within the last thirty years, fairly translated into the true meaning of the words, and the actual Object and Purpose of the infamous Writers. Do you in good earnest aim at Dignity of Character? By all the treasures of a peaceful mind, by all the charms of an open countenance, I conjure you, O youth! turn away from those who live in the Twilight between Vice and Virtue. Are not Reason, Discrimination, Law, and deliberate Choice, the distinguishing Characters of Humanity? Can aught then worthy of a human Being proceed from a Habit of Soul, which would exclude all these and (to borrow a metaphor from Paganism) prefer the den

of Trophonius to the Temple and Oracles of the God of Light? Can any thing *manly*, I say, proceed from those, who for Law and Light would substitute shapeless feelings, sentiments, impulses, which as far as they differ from the vital workings in the brute animals owe the difference to their former connexion with the proper Virtues of Humanity; as Dendrites derive the outlines, that constitute their value above other clay-stones, from the casual neighbourhood and pressure of the Plants, the names of which they assume! Remember, that Love itself in its highest earthly Bearing, as the ground of the marriage union*, becomes Love by an inward FIAT of the Will, by a completing and sealing

* It might be a mean of preventing many unhappy Marriages, if the youth of both sexes had it early impressed on their minds, that Marriage contracted between Christians is a true and perfect Symbol or Mystery; that is, the actualizing Faith being supposed to exist in the Receivers, it is an outward Sign co-essential with that which it signifies, or a living Part of that, the whole of which it represents. Marriage therefore, in the Christian sense (Ephesians v. 22,—33), as symbolical of the union of the Soul with Christ the Mediator, and with God through Christ, is perfectly a *sacramental* ordinance, and not retained by the Reformed Churches as one of THE Sacraments, for two reasons; first, that the Sign is not *distinctive* of the Church of Christ, and the Ordinance not peculiar nor owing its origin to the Gospel Dispensation; secondly, it is not of universal obligation, not a means of Grace enjoined on all Christians. In other and plainer words, Marriage does not contain in itself an open Profession of Christ, and it is not a Sacrament of the *Church*, but only of certain Individual Members of the Church. It is evident, however, that neither of these Reasons affect or di-

Act of Moral Election, and lays claim to permanence only under the form of DUTY.

Again, I would impress it on the reader, that in order to the full understanding of any Whole, it is necessary to have learnt the nature of the component parts, of each severally and, as far as is possible, abstracted from the changes it may have undergone in its combination with the others. On this account I have deferred in order to give effectually the more interesting and far more cheering contemplation of the same Subjects in the reverse order; Prudence, namely, as it flows out of Morality, and Morality as the na-

minish the *religious* nature and dedicative force of the marriage Vow, or detract from the solemnity of the Apostolic Declaration: THIS IS A GREAT MYSTERY.

The interest, which the State has in the appropriation of one Woman to one Man, and the civil obligations therefrom resulting, form an altogether distinct consideration. When I meditate on the words of the Apostle, confirmed and illustrated as they are, by so many harmonies in the Spiritual Structure of our proper Humanity, (in the image of God, male and female created he the Man), and then reflect how little claim so large a number of legal cohabitations have to the name of Christian Marriages—I feel inclined to doubt, whether the plan of celebrating Marriages universally by the civil magistrate, in the first instance, and leaving the *religious* Covenant, and sacramental Pledge to the election of the Parties themselves, adopted during the Republic in England, and in our own times by the French Legislature, was not *in fact*, whatever it might be in intention, *reverential* to Christianity. At all events, it was their own act and choice, if the Parties made bad worse by the profanation of a Gospel Mystery.

tural Overflowing of Religion, always the true though sometimes the hidden Spring and Fountain-head of all true Morality.

I have hitherto considered Prudence and Morality as two Streams from different sources, and traced the former to its supposed confluence with the latter. And if it had been my present purpose and undertaking to have placed Fruits from my own Garden before the Reader, I should in like manner have followed the course of Morality from its Twin Sources, the Affections and the Conscience, till (as the main Feeder into some majestic Lake rich with hidden Springs of its own) it flowed into, and became one with, the Spiritual Life.

But without a too glaring Breach of the promise, that the Banquet for the greater part should consist of Choice Clusters from the Vineyards of Archbishop Leighton, this was not practicable, and now, I trust, with the help of these introductory pages, no longer necessary.

Still, however, it appears to me of the highest use and of vital importance to let it be seen, that Religion or the Spiritual Life is a something in itself, for which mere Morality, were it even far more perfect in its kind than experience authorises us to expect in unaided human Nature, is no *Substitute*, though it cannot but be its Accompaniment. So far, therefore, I have adapted the arrangement of the extracts to this principle, that though I have found it impossible to separate the Moral from the Religious, the morality and moral views of Leighton being every where taken from the point of

Christian Faith, I have yet brought together under one head, and in a separate Chapter, those subjects of Reflection, that *necessarily* suppose or involve the faith in an eternal state, and the probationary nature of our existence under Time and Change.

These whether doctrinal or *ascetic* (*disciplinary, from the Greek ασκηω, to exercise*), whether they respect the obstacles to the attainment of the Eternal, irremoveable by the unrenewed and unaided Will of Man; or the removal of these Obstacles, with its Concurrents and Consequents; or, lastly, the Truths, necessary to a rational belief in the Future, and which alone can interpret the Past, or solve the Riddle of the Present; are *especially* meant in the term Spiritual.

Amplly shall I deem myself remunerated if either by the holy Charm, the good Spell of Leighton's Words, than which few if any since the Apostolic age better deserve the name of *Evangelical*, or by my own notes and interpolations, the reflecting Reader should be enabled to *apprehend*—for we may rightly *apprehend* what no finite mind can fully *comprehend*—and attach a distinct meaning to, the Mysteries into which his Baptism is the initiation; and thus to feel and know, that
CHRISTIAN FAITH IS THE PERFECTION OF HUMAN REASON.

MORAL AND RELIGIOUS APHORISMS.



MORAL AND RELIGIOUS APHORISMS.

APHORISM I.

LEIGHTON.

WHAT the Apostles were in an extraordinary way befitting the first annunciation of a Religion for all Mankind, this all Teachers of Moral Truth, who aim to prepare for its reception by calling the attention of men to the Law in their own hearts, may, without presumption, consider themselves to be under ordinary gifts and circumstances: namely, Ambassadors for the Greatest of Kings, and upon no mean employment, the great Treaty of Peace and Reconcilement betwixt him and Mankind.

APHORISM II.

LEIGHTON.

OF THE FEELINGS NATURAL TO INGENUOUS MINDS
TOWARDS THOSE WHO HAVE FIRST LED THEM TO
REFLECT.

Though Divine Truths are to be received equally from every Minister alike, yet it must be acknowledged that there is something (we know not what to call it) of a more acceptable reception of those who at first were the means of bringing men to God, than of

others ; like the opinion some have of physicians, whom they love.

APHORISM III.

L. & ED.

The worth and value of Knowledge is in proportion to the worth and value of its object. What, then, is the best knowledge?

The exactest knowledge of things, is, to know them in their causes; it is then an excellent thing, and worthy of their endeavours who are most desirous of knowledge, to know the best things in their highest causes; and the happiest way of attaining to this knowledge, is, to possess those things, and to know them in experience.

APHORISM IV.

LEIGHTON.

It is one main point of happiness, that he that is happy doth know and judge himself to be so. This being the peculiar good of a reasonable creature, it is to be enjoyed in a reasonable way. It is not as the dull resting of a stone, or any other natural body in its natural place; but the knowledge and consideration of it is the fruition of it, the very relishing and tasting of its sweetness.

REMARK.

As in a Christian Land we receive the lessons of Morality in connexion with the Doctrines of Revealed Religion, we cannot too early free the mind from prejudices widely spread, in part through the abuse, but far more from ignorance, of the true meaning of

doctrinal Terms, which, however they may have been perverted to the purposes of Fanaticism, are not only scriptural, but of too frequent occurrence in Scripture to be overlooked or passed by in silence. The following extract, therefore, deserves attention, as clearing the doctrine of Salvation, in connexion with the divine Foreknowledge, from all objections on the score of Morality, by the just and impressive view which the Archbishop here gives of those occasional revolutionary moments, that *Turn of the Tide* in the mind and character of certain Individuals, which (taking a religious course, and referred immediately to the Author of all Good) were in his day, more generally than at present, entitled EFFECTUAL CALLING. The theological interpretation and the philosophic validity of this Apostolic Triad, Election, Salvation, and Effectual Calling, (the latter being the intermediate) will be found among the Editor's Comments on the Aphorisms of Spiritual Import. For our present purpose it will be sufficient if only we prove, that the Doctrines are in themselves *innocuous*, and may be both held and taught without any practical ill-consequences, and without detriment to the moral frame.

APHORISM V.

LEIGHTON.

Two Links of the Chain (viz. Election and Salvation) are up in heaven in God's own hand; but this middle one (i. e. Effectual Calling) is let down to earth, into the hearts of his children, and they laying hold on it have sure hold on the other two: for no

power can sever them. If, therefore, they can read the characters of God's image in their own souls, those are the counter-part of the golden characters of His love, in which their names are written in the book of life. Their believing writes their names under the promises of the revealed book of life (the Scriptures) and thus ascertains them, that the same names are in the secret book of life which God hath by himself from eternity. So that finding the stream of grace in their hearts, though they see not the fountain whence it flows, nor the ocean into which it returns, yet they know that it hath its source in their eternal election, and shall empty itself into the ocean of their eternal salvation.

If *election, effectual calling* and *salvation* be inseparably linked together, then, by any one of them a man may lay hold upon all the rest, and may know that his hold is sure; and this is the way wherein we may attain, and ought to seek, the comfortable assurance of the love of God. Therefore *make your calling sure*, and by that, your *election*; for that being done, this follows of itself. We are not to pry immediately into the decree, but to read it in the performance. Though the mariner sees not the *pole-star*, yet the needle of the compass which points to it, tells him which way he sails: thus the heart that is touched with the loadstone of divine love, trembling with godly fear, and yet still looking towards God by fixed believing, interprets the fear by the love *in* the fear, and tells the soul that its course is heavenward, towards

the haven of eternal rest. He that loves, may be sure he was loved first; and he that chooses God for his delight and portion, may conclude confidently, that God hath chosen him to be one of those that shall enjoy him, and be happy in him for ever; for that our love and electing of him is but the return and repercussion of the beams of his love shining upon us.

Although from present unsanctification, a man cannot infer that he is not *elect*; for the decree may, for part of a man's life, run (as it were) underground; yet this is sure, that that estate leads to death, and unless it be broken, will prove the black line of reprobation. A man hath no portion amongst the children of God, nor can read one word of comfort in all the promises that belong to them, while he remains unholy.

REMARK.

In addition to the preceding, I select the following paragraphs as having no where seen the term, Spirit, the Gifts of the Spirit, and the like, so effectually vindicated from the sneers of the Sciolist on one hand, and protected from the perversions of the Fanatic on the other. In these paragraphs the Archbishop at once shatters and precipitates the only draw-bridge between the fanatical and the orthodox doctrine of Grace, and the Gifts of the Spirit. In Scripture the term, Spirit, as a power or property seated in the human soul, never stands singly, but is always *specified* by a genitive case following; this being an Hebraism instead of the adjective which the Writer would have

used if he had *thought*, as well as *written*, in Greek. It is “the Spirit of Meekness” (a meek Spirit), or “the Spirit of Chastity,” and the like. The moral Result, the specific Form and Character in which the Spirit *manifests* its presence, is the only sure pledge and token of its presence: which is to be, and which safely may be, inferred from its practical effects, but of which an *immediate* knowledge or consciousness is impossible; and every Pretence to such knowledge is either hypocrisy or fanatical delusion.

APHORISM VI.

LEIGHTON.

If any pretend that they have the Spirit, and so turn away from the straight rule of the holy Scriptures, they have a spirit indeed, but it is a fanatical spirit, the spirit of delusion and giddiness: but the Spirit of God, that leads his children in the way of truth, and is for that purpose sent them from heaven to guide them thither, squares their thoughts and ways to that rule whereof it is author, and that word which was inspired by it, and sanctifies them to obedience. *He that saith I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.* (1 John ii. 4.)

Now this Spirit which sanctifieth, and sanctifieth to obedience, is within us the evidence of our election, and the earnest of our salvation. And whoso are not sanctified and led by this Spirit, the Apostle tells us what is their condition: *If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.* The stones which are

appointed for that glorious temple above, are hewn, and polished, and prepared for it here; as the stones were wrought and prepared in the mountains, for building the temple at *Jerusalem*.

COMMENT.

There are many serious and sincere Christians who have not attained to a fullness of knowledge and insight, but are well and judiciously employed in preparing for it. Even these may study the master-works of our elder Divines with safety and advantage, if they will accustom themselves to translate the theological terms into their *moral* equivalents; saying to themselves—This may not be *all* that is meant, but this *is* meant, and it is that portion of the meaning, which belongs to *me* in the present stage of my progress. For example: render the words, sanctification of the Spirit, or the sanctifying influences of the Spirit, by, Purity in Life and Action from a pure Principle.

He need only reflect on his own experience to be convinced, that the Man makes the *motive*, and not the motive the Man. What is a strong motive to one man, is no motive at all to another. If, then, the man determines the motive, what determines the Man—to a good and worthy act, we will say, or a virtuous Course of Conduct? The intelligent Will, or the self-determining Power? True, *in part* it is; and therefore the Will is pre-eminently the *spiritual* Constituent in our Being. But will any reflecting man admit, that his own Will is the only and sufficient determinant of

all he *is*, and all he does? Is nothing to be attributed to the harmony of the system to which he belongs, and to the pre-established Fitness of the Objects and Agents, known and unknown, that surround him, as acting *on* the will, though, doubtless, *with* it likewise? a process, which the co-instantaneous yet reciprocal action of the Air and the vital Energy of the Lungs in Breathing may help to render intelligible.

Again: in the World we see every where evidences of a Unity, which the component Parts are so far from explaining, that they necessarily pre-suppose it as the cause and condition of their existing *as* those parts: or even of their existing at all. This antecedent Unity, or Cause and Principle of each Union, it has since the time of Bacon and Kepler been customary to call a Law. This Crocus, for instance: or any other Flower, the Reader may have in sight or choose to bring before his fancy. That the root, stem, leaves, petals, &c. cohere to one plant, is owing to an antecedent Power or Principle in the Seed, which existed before a single particle of the matters that constitute the *size* and visibility of the Crocus, had been attracted from the surrounding Soil, Air, and Moisture. Shall we turn to the Seed? Here too the same necessity meets us. An antecedent Unity (I speak not of the parent plant, but of an agency antecedent in the order of operance, yet remaining present as the conservative and reproductive Power) must here too be supposed. Analyse the Seed with the finest tools, and let the Solar Microscope come in aid of your

senses, what do you find? Means and instruments, a wondrous Fairy-tale of Nature, Magazines of Food, Stores of various sorts, Pipes, Spiracles, Defences—a House of many Chambers, and the Owner and Inhabitant invisible! Reflect further on the countless Millions of Seeds of the same Name, each more than numerically differenced from every other: and further yet, reflect on the requisite harmony of all surrounding Things, each of which necessitates the same process of thought, and the coherence of all of which to a System, a World, demands its own adequate Antecedent Unity, which must therefore of necessity be present *to* all and *in* all, yet in no wise excluding or suspending the individual Law or Principle of Union in each. Now will Reason, will Common Sense, endure the assumption, that it is highly reasonable to believe a Universal Power, as the cause and pre-condition of the harmony of all particular Wholes, each of which involves the working Principle of its own Union, in the material and visible System—that it is reasonable, I say, to believe this respecting the Aggregate of *Objects*, which without a *Subject* (i. e. a sentient and intelligent Existence) would be purposeless; and yet unreasonable and even superstitious or enthusiastic to entertain a similar Belief in relation to the System of intelligent and self-conscious Beings, to the moral and personal World? But if in *this* too, in the great Community of *Persons*, it is rational to infer a One universal Presence, a One present to all and in all, is it not most irrational to suppose that a finite Will can exclude it?

Whenever, therefore, the Man is determined (i. e. impelled and directed) to act in harmony of inter-communication, must not something be attributed to this all-present power as acting *in* the Will? and by what fitter names can we call this than THE LAW, as empowering; THE WORD, as informing; and THE SPIRIT, as actuating?

What has been here said amounts (I am aware) only to a negative Conception; but this is all that is required for a Mind at that period of its growth which we are now supposing, and as long as Religion is contemplated under the form of Morality. A *positive* Insight belongs to a more advanced stage: for spiritual truths can only spiritually be discerned. This we know from Revelation, and (the existence of spiritual truths being granted) Philosophy is compelled to draw the same conclusion. But though merely negative, it is sufficient to render the union of Religion and Morality *conceivable*; sufficient to satisfy an unprejudiced Inquirer, that the spiritual Doctrines of the Christian Religion are not at war with the reasoning Faculty, and that if they do not run on the same Line (or Radius) with the Understanding, yet neither do they cut or cross it. It is sufficient, in short, to prove, that some distinct and consistent meaning may be attached to the assertion of the learned and philosophic Apostle, that “the Spirit beareth witness with our spirit”—i. e. with *the Will*, as the Supernatural in Man and the Principle of our Personalty—of that, I mean, by which

we are responsible Agents; *Persons*, and not merely living *Things**.

It will suffice to satisfy a reflecting mind, that even at the porch and threshold of Revealed Truth there is a great and worthy sense in which we may believe the Apostle's assurance, that not only doth "the Spirit aid our infirmities;" that is, *act on* the Will by a predisposing influence *from without*, as it were, though in a spiritual manner, and without suspending or destroying its freedom (the possibility of which is proved to us in the influences of Education, of providential Occurrences, and, above all, of Example) but that in regenerate souls it may act *in* the will; that uniting and becoming one † with our will or spirit it may "make intercession for us;" nay, in this intimate

* Whatever is comprized in the Chain and Mechanism of Cause and Effect, of course *necessitated*, and having its necessity in some other thing, antecedent or concurrent—this is said to be *Natural*; and the Aggregate and System of all such things is NATURE. It is, therefore, a contradiction in terms to include in this the Free-will, of which the verbal definition is—that which *originates* an act or state of Being. In this sense therefore, which is the sense of St. Paul, and indeed of the New Testament throughout, Spiritual and Supernatural are synonymous.

† Some distant and faint *similitude* of this, that merely as a similitude may be innocently used to quiet the Fancy, provided it be not imposed on the understanding as an analogous fact or as identical in kind, is presented to us in the power of the Magnet to awaken and strengthen the magnetic power in a bar of Iron, and (in the instance of the compound Magnet) acting *in* and with the latter.

union taking upon itself the form of our infirmities, may intercede for us “with groanings that cannot be uttered.” Nor is there any danger of Fanaticism or Enthusiasm as the consequence of such a belief, if only the attention be carefully and earnestly drawn to the concluding words of the sentence (Romans, viii. v. 26.); if only the due force and the *full* import be given to the term *unutterable* or *incommunicable*, in St. Paul’s use of it. In this, the strictest and most proper use of the term, it signifies, that the subject, of which it is predicated, is something which I *cannot*, which from the nature of the thing it is impossible that I should, communicate to any human mind (even of a person under the same conditions with myself) so as to make it *in itself* the object of his direct and immediate consciousness. It cannot be the object of *my own* direct and immediate Consciousness; but must be *inferred*. Inferred it may be *from* its workings: it cannot be perceived *in* them. And, thanks to God! in all points in which the knowledge is of high and necessary concern to our moral and religious welfare, from the *Effects* it may safely be inferred by us, from the *Workings* it may be assuredly known; and the Scriptures furnish the clear and unfailing Rules for directing the inquiry, and for drawing the conclusion.

If any reflecting mind be surprised that the aids of the Divine Spirit should be deeper than our Consciousness can reach, it must arise from the not having attended sufficiently to the nature and necessary limits of human Consciousness. For the same impossibility

exists as to the first acts and movements of our own will—the farthest back our recollection can follow the traces, never leads us to the first foot-mark—the lowest depth that the light of our Consciousness can visit even with a doubtful Glimmering, is still at an unknown distance from the Ground: and so, indeed, must it be with all Truths, and all modes of Being that can neither be counted, coloured, or delineated. Before and After, when applied to such Subjects, are but allegories, which the Sense or Imagination supply to the Understanding. The Position of the Aristoteleans, *Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu*, on which Mr. Locke's Essay is grounded, is irrefragable: Locke erred only in taking half the truth for a whole Truth. Conception is consequent on Perception. What we cannot *imagine*, we cannot, in the proper sense of the word, conceive.

I have already given one definition of Nature. Another, and differing from the former in words only, is this: Whatever is representable in the forms of Time and Space, is Nature. But whatever is comprehended in Time and Space, is included in the Mechanism of Cause and Effect. And conversely, whatever, by whatever means, has its principle in itself, so far as to *originate* its actions, cannot be contemplated in any of the forms of Space and Time—it must, therefore, be considered as *Spirit* or *Spiritual* by a mind in that stage of its Developement which is here supposed, and which we have agreed to understand under the name of Morality, or the Moral State: for

in this stage we are concerned only with the forming of *negative* conceptions, *negative* convictions; and by *spiritual* I do not pretend to determine *what* the Will *is*, but what it is *not*—namely, that it is not Nature. And as no man who admits a Will at all, (for we may safely presume, that no man meaning to speak figuratively, would call the shifting Current of a stream the WILL* of the River), will suppose it *below* Nature, we may safely add, that it is super-natural; and this without the least pretence to any positive Notion or Insight.

Now Morality accompanied with Convictions like these, I have ventured to call *Religious* Morality. Of the importance I attach to the state of mind implied in these convictions, for its own sake, and as the natural preparation for a yet higher state and a more substantive knowledge, proof more than sufficient, perhaps, has been given in the length and minuteness of this introductory Discussion, and in the foreseen risk which I run of exposing the volume at large to the censure which every work, or rather which every writer, must be prepared to undergo, who, treating of subjects that cannot be seen, touched, or in any other way made matters of outward sense, is yet anxious both to attach and to convey a distinct mean-

* “The River windeth at his own sweet Will.”

Wordsworth's exquisite Sonnet on Westminster-bridge at Sun-rise.

But who does not see that here the poetic charm arises from the known and felt *impropriety* of the expression, in the technical sense of the word *impropriety*, among Grammarians?

ing to the words he makes use of—the censure of being dry, abstract, and (of all qualities most scaring and opprobrious to the ears of the present generation) *metaphysical*: though how it is possible that a work not *physical*, that is, employed on Objects known or believed on the evidence of senses, should be other than *metaphysical*, that is, treating on Subjects, the evidence of which is not derived from the Senses, is a problem which Critics of this order find it convenient to leave unsolved.

The Editor and Annotator of the present Volume, will, indeed, have reason to think himself fortunate, if this be all the Charge! How many smart quotations, which (duly cemented by personal allusions to the Author's supposed Pursuits, Attachments, and Infirmities), would of themselves make up "A Review" of the Volume, might be supplied from the works of Butler, Swift and Warburton. For instance: 'It
' may not be amiss to inform the Public, that the
' Compiler of the Aids to Reflection, and Commenter
' on a Scotch Bishop's platonico-calvinistic commentary
' on St. Peter, belongs to the Sect of the *Æolists*,
' whose fruitful imaginations lead them into certain
' notions, which although in appearance *very unac-*
' *countable*, are not without their *mysteries and their*
' *meanings*; furnishing plenty of Matter for such,
' whose *converting Imaginations dispose them to reduce*
' *all things into TYPES*; who can make SHADOWS, no
' thanks to the Sun; and then mould them into SUB-
' STANCES, no thanks to Philosophy; whose peculiar

‘ *Talent lies in fixing* TROPES and ALLEGORIES to the
 ‘ LETTER, and refining what is LITERAL into FIGURE
 ‘ and MYSTERY.’—*Tale of the Tub*, Sect. xi.

And would it were my lot to meet with a Critic, who, in the might of his own Convictions, and with arms of equal Point and Efficiency from his own Forge, would come forth as my Assailant; or who, as a friend to my purpose, would set forth the Objections to the matter and pervading Spirit of these Aphorisms, and the accompanying Elucidations. Were it my task to form the mind of a young man of Talent, desirous to establish his opinions and belief on solid principles, and in the light of distinct understanding, I would commence his theological studies, or, at least, that most important part of them respecting the aids which Religion promises in our attempts to realize the ideas of Morality, by bringing together all the passages scattered throughout the Writings of Swift and Butler, that bear on Enthusiasm, Spiritual Operations, and pretences to the Gifts of the Spirit, with the whole train of New Lights, Raptures, Experiences, and the like. For all that the richest Wit, in intimate union with profound Sense and steady Observation, can supply on these Topics, is to be found in the works of these Satirists; though unhappily alloyed with much that can only tend to pollute the Imagination.

Without stopping to estimate the degree of caricature in the Portraits sketched by these bold Masters, and without attempting to determine in how many of the Enthusiasts, brought forward by them in proof

of the influence of false Doctrines, a constitutional Insanity, that would probably have shown itself in some other form, would be the truer Solution, I would direct my Pupil's attention to one feature common to the whole Group—the pretence, namely, of possessing, or a Belief and Expectation grounded on other men's assurances of their possessing, an immediate Consciousness, a sensible Experience, of the Spirit in and during its operation on the soul. It is not enough that you grant them a consciousness of the Gifts and Graces infused, or an assurance of the Spiritual Origin of the same, grounded on their correspondence to the Scripture *Promises*, and their conformity with the *Idéa* of the divine Giver. No! They all alike, it will be found, lay claim (or at least look forward) to an inward perception of the Spirit itself and of its operating.

Whatever must be misrepresented in order to be ridiculed, is in fact *not* ridiculed; but the thing substituted for it. It is a Satire on something else, coupled with a Lie on the part of the Satirist, who knowing, or having the means of knowing the truth, chose to call one thing by the name of another. The Pretensions to the Supernatural, *pilloried* by Butler, sent to Bedlam by Swift, and (on their re-appearance in public) *gibbeted* by Warburton, and *anatomized* by Bishop Lavington, one and all have *this* for their essential character, that the Spirit is made the immediate Object of Sense or Sensation. Whether the Spiritual Presence and Agency are supposed cognizable by an indescribable Feeling or in unimaginable Vision

by some specific visual energy ; whether seen, or heard, or touched, smelt, and tasted—for in those vast Storehouses of fanatical assertion, the volumes of Ecclesiastical History and religious Auto-biography, Instances are not wanting even of the three latter extravagancies—this variety in the mode may render the several pretensions more or less offensive to the *Taste*; but with the same Absurdity for the *Reason*, this being derived from a contradiction in terms common and radical to them all alike, the assumption of a something essentially supersensual, that is nevertheless the object of Sense, *i. e.* not supersensual.

Well then !—for let me be allowed still to suppose the Reader present to me, and that I am addressing him in the character of Companion and Guide—the positions recommended for your examination not only do not involve, but exclude, this inconsistency. And for aught that hitherto appears, we may see with complacency the Arrows of Satire feathered with Wit, weighted with Sense, and discharged by a strong Arm, fly home to their mark. Our Conceptions of a possible Spiritual Communion, though they are but negative, and only preparatory to a faith in its actual existence, stand neither in the Level or the Direction of the Shafts.

If it be objected, that Swift and Warburton did not choose openly to set up the interpretations of later and more rational Divines against the decisions of their own Church, and from *prudential* considerations did not attack the doctrine *in toto*: that is *their* concern (I would answer), and it is more charitable to think

otherwise. But we are in the silent school of Reflection, in the secret confessional of Thought. Should we ‘*lie* for God,’ and that to our own Thoughts? They indeed, who dare do the one, will soon be able to do the other. So did the Comforters of Job: and to the Divines, who resemble Job’s Comforters, we will leave both attempts.

But (it may be said), a possible Conception is not necessarily a true one; nor even a probable one, where the Facts can be otherwise explained. In the name of the supposed Pupil I would reply—That is the very question I am preparing myself to examine; and am now seeking the Vantage-ground where I may best command the Facts. In my own person, I would ask the Objector, whether he counted the Declarations of Scripture among the Facts to be explained. But both for myself and my Pupil, and in behalf of all rational Enquiry, I would demand that the Decision should not be such, in itself or in its effects, as would prevent our becoming acquainted with the most important of these Facts; nay, such as would, for the mind of the Decider, preclude their very existence. *Unless ye believe, says the Prophet, ye cannot understand.* Suppose (what is at least possible) that the facts should be consequent on the belief, it is clear that without the belief the materials, on which the understanding is to exert itself, would be wanting.

The reflections that naturally arise out of this last remark, are those that best suit the stage at which we last halted, and from which we now recommence our

progress—the state of a *Moral Man*, who has already welcomed certain truths of Religion, and is inquiring after other and more special Doctrines: still however as a Moralist, desirous indeed to receive them into combination with Morality, but to receive them as its Aid, not as its Substitute. Now, to such a man I say; Before you reject the Opinions and Doctrines asserted and enforced in the following Extract from our eloquent Author, and before you give way to the Emotions of Distaste or Ridicule, which the Prejudices of the Circle in which you move, or your own familiarity with the mad perversions of the doctrine by Fanatics in all ages, have connected with the very words, Spirit, Grace, Gifts, Operations, &c. re-examine the arguments advanced in the first pages of this Introductory Comment, and the simple and sober View of the Doctrine, contemplated in the first instance as a mere Idea of the Reason, flowing naturally from the admission of an infinite omnipresent Mind as the Ground of the Universe. Reflect again and again, and be sure that you *understand* the Doctrine before you determine on rejecting it. That no false judgements, no extravagant conceits, no practical ill-consequences need arise out of the Belief of the Spirit, and its possible communion with the Spiritual Principle in Man, or *can* arise out of the *right* Belief, or are compatible with the Doctrine truly and scripturally explained, Leighton, and almost every single Period in the Passage here transcribed from him, will suffice to convince you.

On the other hand, reflect on the consequences of

rejecting it. For surely it is not the act of a reflecting mind, nor the part of a Man of Sense to disown and cast out one Tenet, and yet persevere in admitting and clinging to another that has neither sense nor purpose, that does not *suppose* and rest on the truth and reality of the former! If you have resolved that all belief of a divine Comforter present to our inmost Being and aiding our infirmities, is fond and fanatical—if the Scriptures promising and asserting such communion are to be explained away into the action of circumstances, and the necessary movements of the vast machine, in one of the circulating chains of which the human Will is a petty Link—in what better light can Prayer appear to you, than the groans of a wounded Lion in his solitary Den, or the howl of a Dog with his eyes on the Moon? At the best, you can regard it only as a transient bewilderment of the Social Instinct, as a social Habit misapplied! Unless indeed you should adopt the theory which I remember to have read in the writings of the late Dr. Jebb, and for some supposed beneficial re-action of Praying on the Prayer's own Mind, should practise it as a species of *Animal-Magnetism* to be brought about by a wilful eclipse of the Reason, and a temporary *make-believe* on the part of the Self-magnetizer!

At all events, do not pre-judge a Doctrine, the utter rejection of which must oppose a formidable obstacle to your acceptance of Christianity itself, when the Books, from which alone we can learn what Christianity is and teaches, are so strangely written, that in a series of

the most concerning points, including (historical facts excepted) all the *peculiar* Tenets of the Religion, the plain and obvious meaning of the words, that in which they were understood by Learned and Simple for at least sixteen Centuries, during the far larger part of which the language was a living language, is no sufficient guide to their actual sense or to the Writer's own Meaning! And this too, where the literal and received Sense involves nothing impossible, or immoral, or contrary to reason. With such a persuasion, Deism would be a more consistent Creed. But, alas! even this will fail you. The utter rejection of all present and living communion with the Universal Spirit impoverishes Deism itself, and renders it as cheerless as Atheism, from which indeed it would differ only by an obscure impersonation of what the Atheist receives unpersonified under the name of Fate or Nature.

APHORISM VII.

L. & ED.

The proper and natural Effect, and in the absence of all disturbing or intercepting forces, the certain and sensible accompaniment of Peace (or Reconcilement) with God, is our own inward Peace, a calm and quiet temper of mind. And where there is a consciousness of earnestly desiring, and of having sincerely striven after the former, the latter may be considered as a *Sense* of its presence. In this case, I say, and for a soul watchful, and under the discipline of the Gospel, the Peace with a man's self may be the medium or organ through which the assurance of his Peace with God is conveyed.

We will not therefore condemn this mode of speaking, though we dare not greatly recommend it. Be it, that there is, truly and in sobriety of speech, enough of just Analogy in the subjects meant, to make this use of the words, if less than proper, yet something more than metaphorical; still we must be cautious not to transfer to the Object the defects or the deficiency of the Organ, which must needs partake of the imperfections of the imperfect Beings to whom it belongs. Not without the co-assurance of other senses and of the same sense in other men, dare we affirm that what our Eye beholds, is verily there to be beheld. Much less may we conclude negatively, and from the inadequacy or suspension or affections of the Sight infer the non-existence, or departure, or changes of the Thing itself. The Camelion darkens in the shade of him that bends over it to ascertain its colours. In like manner, but with yet greater caution, ought we to think respecting a tranquil habit of the inward life, considered as a spiritual *Sense*, as the medial Organ in and by which our Peace with God, and the lively Working of his Grace on our Spirit, are perceived by us. This Peace which we have with God in Christ, is inviolable; but because the sense and persuasion of it may be interrupted, the soul that is truly at peace with God may for a time be disquieted in itself, through weakness of faith, or the strength of temptation, or the darkness of desertion, losing sight of that grace, that love and light of God's countenance, on which its tranquillity and joy depend. *Thou didst hide thy face*, saith David, *and*

I was troubled. But when these eclipses are over, the soul is revived with new consolation, as the face of the earth is renewed and made to smile with the return of the sun in the spring; and this ought always to uphold Christians in the saddest times, viz. that the grace and love of God towards them depend not on their sense, nor upon any thing in them, but is still in itself, incapable of the smallest alteration.

A holy heart that gladly entertains grace, shall find that it and peace cannot dwell asunder; while an ungodly man may sleep to death in the lethargy of carnal presumption and impenitency; but a true, lively, solid peace he cannot have. *There is no peace to the wicked, saith my God, Isa. lvii. 21.*

APHORISM VIII.

LEIGHTON.

WORLDLY HOPES.

Worldly hopes are not living, but lying hopes; they die often before us, and we live to bury them, and see our own folly and infelicity in trusting to them; but at the utmost, they die with us when we die, and can accompany us no further. But the lively Hope, which is the Christian's Portion, answers expectation to the full, and much beyond it, and deceives no way but in that happy way of far exceeding it.

A *living hope*, living in death itself! The world dares say no more for its device, than *Dum spiro spero*; but the children of God can add, by virtue of this living hope, *Dum exspiro spero*.

APHORISM IX.

LEIGHTON.

THE WORLDLING'S FEAR.

It is a fearful thing when a man and all his hopes die together. Thus saith Solomon of the wicked, Prov. xi. 7., When he dieth, then die his hopes; (many of them *before*, but at the utmost *then**, all of them;) but *the righteous hath hope in his death*, Prov. xiv. 32.

APHORISM X.

L. & ED.

WORLDLY MIRTH.

As he that taketh away a garment in cold weather, and as vinegar upon nitre, so is he that singeth songs to a heavy heart, Prov. xxv. 20. Worldly mirth is so far from curing spiritual grief, that even worldly grief, where it is great and takes deep root, is not allayed but increased by it. A man who is full of inward heaviness, the more he is encompassed about with mirth, it exasperates and enrages his grief the more; like ineffectual weak physic, which removes not the humour, but stirs it and makes it more unquiet. But spiritual joy is seasonable for all estates: in prosperity, it is pertinent to crown and sanctify all other enjoyments, with this which so far surpasses them; and in distress, it is the only *Nepenthe*, the cordial of fainting

* One of the numerous proofs against those who with a strange inconsistency hold the Old Testament to have been inspired throughout, and yet deny that the doctrine of a future state is taught therein.

spirits: so, Psal. iv. 7, *He hath put joy into my heart.* This mirth makes way for itself, which other mirth cannot do. These songs are sweetest in the night of distress.

There is something exquisitely beautiful and touching in the first of these similes: and the second, though less pleasing to the imagination, has the charm of propriety, and expresses the transition with equal force and liveliness. A Grief of recent birth is a sick Infant that must have its medicine administered in its Milk, and sad Thoughts are the sorrowful Heart's natural food. This is a Complaint that is not to be cured by opposites, which for the most part only reverse the symptoms while they exasperate the Disease—or like a Rock in the Mid Channel of a River swoln by a sudden rain-flush from the mountain, which only detains the excess of Waters from their proper Outlet, and make them foam, roar, and eddy. The Soul in her desolation hugs the sorrow close to her, as her sole remaining garment: and this must be drawn off so gradually, and the garment to be put in its stead so gradually slipt on and feel so like the former, that the Sufferer shall be sensible of the change only by the refreshment. The true Spirit of Consolation is well content to detain the tear in the eye, and finds a surer pledge of its success in the smile of Resignation that dawns through that, than in the liveliest shows of a forced and alien exhilaration.

APHORISM XI.

EDITOR.

Plotinus thanked God, that his Soul was not tied to an immortal Body.

APHORISM XII.

L. & ED.

What a full Confession do we make of our dissatisfaction with the Objects of our bodily senses, that in our attempts to express what we conceive the Best of Beings, and the Greatest of Felicities to be, we describe by the exact Contraries of all, that we experience here—the one as *Infinite*, *Incomprehensible*, *Immutable*, &c. the other as *incorruptible*, *undefiled*, and that passeth *not* away. At all events, this Coincidence, say rather, Identity of Attributes is sufficient to apprise us, that to be inheritors of Bliss we must become the children of God.

This Remark of Leighton's is ingenious and startling. Another, and more fruitful, perhaps more solid, inference from the fact would be, that there is something in the human mind which makes it know (as soon as it is sufficiently awakened to reflect on its own thoughts and notices), that in all finite Quantity there is an Infinite, in all measures of Time an Eternal; that the latter are the basis, the substance, the true and abiding *reality* of the former; and that as we truly *are*, only as far as God is with us, so neither can we truly *possess* (*i. e.* enjoy) our Being or any other real Good, but by living in the sense of his holy presence.

A Life of Wickedness is a Life of Lies: and an

Evil Being, or the Being of Evil, the last and darkest mystery.

APHORISM XIII.

LEIGHTON.

THE WISEST USE OF THE IMAGINATION.

It is not altogether unprofitable; yea, it is great wisdom in Christians to be arming themselves against such temptations as may befall them hereafter, though they have not as yet met with them; to labour to overcome them before-hand, to suppose the hardest things that may be incident to them, and to put on the strongest resolutions they can attain unto. Yet all that is but an imaginary effort; and therefore there is no assurance that the victory is any more than imaginary too, till it come to action, and then, they that have spoken and thought very confidently, may prove but (as one said of the Athenians) *fortes in tabula*, patient and courageous in picture or fancy; and, notwithstanding all their arms, and dexterity in handling them by way of exercise, may be foully defeated when they are to fight in earnest.

APHORISM XIV.

EDITOR.

THE LANGUAGE OF SCRIPTURE.

The Word of God speaks to Men, and therefore it speaks the language of the Children of Men. This just and pregnant Thought was suggested to Leighton by Gen. xxii. 12. The same Text has led the Editor to unfold and expand the Remark.—On moral subjects, the Scriptures speak in the language of the Affections

which they excite in us; on sensible objects, neither metaphysically, as they are known by superior intelligences; nor theoretically, as they would be seen by us were we placed in the Sun; but as they are represented by our human senses in our present relative position. Lastly, from no vain, or worse than vain, Ambition of seeming “to walk on the Sea” of Mystery in my way to Truth, but in the hope of removing a difficulty that presses heavily on the minds of many who in Heart and Desire are believers, and which long pressed on my own mind, I venture to add: that on *spiritual* things, and allusively to the mysterious union or conspiracy of the Divine with the Human in the Spirits of the Just, spoken of in Romans, vii. 27., the Word of God attributes the language of the Spirit sanctified to the Holy One, the Sanctifier.

Now the Spirit in Man (that is, the Will) knows its own State in and by its Acts alone: even as in geometrical reasoning the Mind knows its constructive *faculty* in the *act* of constructing, and contemplates the act in the *product* (*i. e.* the mental figure or diagram) which is inseparable from the act and co-instantaneous.

Let the Reader join these two positions: first, that the Divine Spirit acting *in* the Human Will is described as *one with* the Will so filled and actuated: secondly, that our actions are the means, by which alone the Will becomes assured of its own state: and he will understand, though he may not perhaps adopt

my suggestion, that the Verse, in which God *speaking of himself*, says to Abraham, *Now I know* that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy Son, thy only Son, from me—may be more than merely *figurative*. An *accommodation* I grant; but in the *thing expressed*, and not altogether in the Expressions. In arguing with Infidels, or with the weak in faith, it is a part of religious Prudence, no less than of religious Morality, to avoid whatever looks *like* an evasion. To retain the literal sense, wherever the harmony of Scripture permits, and reason does not forbid, is ever the honestest, and, nine times in ten, the more rational and pregnant interpretation.

Of the Figures of Speech in the sacred Volume, that are only Figures of Speech, the one of most frequent occurrence is that which describes an effect by the name of its most usual and best known cause: the passages, for instance, in which Grief, Fury, Repentance, &c., are attributed to the Deity. But these are far enough from justifying the (I had almost said, dishonest) fashion of metaphorical Glosses, in as well as out of the Church; and which our fashionable Divines have carried to such an extent, as, in the doctrinal part of their Creed, to leave little else but Metaphors. But the Reader who wishes to find this latter subject, and that of the Aphorism, treated more at large, is referred to Southey's *Omniana*, Vol. II. p. 7—12. and to the Note in p. 62—67. of the Editor's second Lay-Sermon.

APHORISM XV.

L. & ED.

THE CHRISTIAN NO STOIC.

Seek not altogether to dry up the stream of Sorrow, but to bound it, and keep it within its banks. Religion doth not destroy the life of nature, but adds to it a life more excellent; yea, it doth not only permit, but requires some feeling of afflictions. Instead of patience, there is in some men an affected pride of spirit suitable only to the doctrine of the *Stoics* as it is usually taken. They strive not to feel at all the afflictions that are on them; but where there is no feeling at all, there can be no patience.

Of the sects of ancient philosophy the Stoic is, doubtless, the nearest to Christianity. Yet even to this Christianity is fundamentally opposite. For the Stoic attaches the highest honour (or rather, attaches honour *solely*) to the person that acts virtuously in spite of his feelings, or who has raised himself above the conflict by their extinction; while Christianity instructs us to place small reliance on a Virtue that does not *begin* by bringing the Feelings to a conformity with the Commands of the Conscience. Its especial aim, its characteristic operation, is to moralize the affections. The Feelings, that oppose a right act, must be wrong Feelings. The *act*, indeed, whatever the Agent's *feelings* might be, Christianity would command: and under certain circumstances would both command and commend it—commend it, as a health-

ful symptom in a sick Patient ; and command it, as one of the ways and means of changing the Feelings, or displacing them by calling up the opposite.

APHORISM XVI.

LEIGHTON.

As excessive eating or drinking both makes the body sickly and lazy, fit for nothing but sleep, and besots the mind, as it clogs up with crudities the way through which the spirits should pass*, bemiring them, and making them move heavily, as a coach in a deep way; thus doth all immoderate use of the world and its delights wrong the soul in its spiritual condition, makes it sickly and feeble, full of spiritual distempers and inactivity, benumbs the graces of the Spirit, and fills the soul with sleepy vapours, makes it grow secure and heavy in spiritual exercises, and obstructs the way and motion of the Spirit of God, in the soul. Therefore, if you would be spiritual, healthful, and vigorous, and enjoy much of the consolations of Heaven, be sparing and sober in those of the earth, and what you abate of the one, shall be certainly made up in the other.

* Technical phrases of an obsolete System will yet retain their places, nay, acquire universal currency, and become sterling in the language, when they at once represent the feelings, and give an apparent solution of them by visual images easily managed by the Fancy. Such are many terms and phrases from the *Humoral* Physiology long exploded, yet are far more popular than any description would be from the Theory that has taken its place.

APHORISM XVII.

L. & ED.

INCONSISTENCY.

It is a most unseemly and unpleasant thing, to see a man's life full of ups and downs, one step like a Christian, and another like a worldling; it cannot choose but both pain himself and mar the edification of others.

The same sentiment, only with a special application to the maxims and measures of our Cabinet and Statesmen, had been finely expressed by a sage Poet of the preceding Generation, in lines which no Generation will find inapplicable or superannuated.

God and the World we worship both together,
 Draw not our Laws to Him, but His to ours;
 Untrue to both, so prosperous in neither,
 The imperfect Will brings forth but barren Flowers!
 Unwise as all distracted Interests be,
 Strangers to God, Fools in Humanity:
 Too good for great things, and too great for good,
 While still "I dare not" waits upon "I wou'd."

APHORISM XVII. CONTINUED. LEIGHTON.

THE ORDINARY MOTIVE TO INCONSISTENCY.

What though the polite man count thy fashion a little odd and too precise, it is because he knows nothing above that model of goodness which he hath set himself, and therefore approves of nothing beyond it: he knows not God, and therefore doth not discern and esteem what is most like Him. When courtiers come down into the country, the common home-bred people

possibly think their habit strange; but they care not for that, it is the fashion at court. What need, then, that Christians should be so tender-foreheaded, as to be put out of countenance because the world looks on holiness as a singularity? It is the only fashion in the highest court, yea, of the King of Kings himself.

APHORISM XVIII.

LEIGHTON.

SUPERFICIAL RECONCILIATIONS, AND THE SELF-DECEIT
IN FORGIVING.

When, after variances, men are brought to an agreement, they are much subject to this, rather to cover their remaining malices with superficial verbal forgiveness, than to dislodge them, and free the heart of them. This is a poor self-deceit. As the philosopher said to him, who being ashamed that he was espied by him in a tavern in the outer room, withdrew himself to the inner, he called after him, ‘ That is not the way out; the more you go that way, you will be the further in!’ So when hatreds are upon admonition not thrown out, but retire inward to hide themselves, they grow deeper and stronger than before; and those constrained semblances of reconcilment are but a false healing, do but skin the wound over, and therefore it usually breaks forth worse again.

APHORISM XIX.

LEIGHTON.

OF THE WORTH AND THE DUTIES OF THE PREACHER.

The stream of custom and our profession bring us to the Preaching of the Word, and we sit out our hour

under the sound; but how few consider and prize it as the great ordinance of God for the salvation of souls, the beginner and the sustainer of the Divine life of grace within us! And certainly, until we have these thoughts of it, and seek to feel it thus ourselves, although we hear it most frequently, and let slip no occasion, yea, hear it with attention and some present delight, yet still we miss the right use of it, and turn it from its true end, while we take it not as *that ingrafted word which is able to save our souls*, James i. 21.

Thus ought they who preach to speak the word; to endeavour their utmost to accommodate it to this end, that sinners may be converted, begotten again, and believers nourished and strengthened in their spiritual life; to regard no lower end, but aim steadily at that mark. Their hearts and tongues ought to be set on fire with holy zeal for God and love to souls, kindled by the Holy Ghost, that came down on the apostles in the shape of fiery tongues.

And those that hear, should remember this as the end of their hearing, that they may receive spiritual life and strength by the word. For though it seems a poor despicable business, that a frail sinful man like yourselves should speak a few words in your hearing, yet, look upon it as the way wherein God communicates happiness to those who believe, and works that believing unto happiness, alters the whole frame of the soul, and makes a new creation, as it begets it again to the inheritance of glory. Consider it thus, which is its true notion; and then, what can be so precious?

APHORISM XX.

LEIGHTON.

The difference is great in our natural life, in some persons especially; that they who in infancy were so feeble, and wrapped up as others in swaddling clothes, yet, afterwards come to excel in wisdom and in the knowledge of sciences, or to be commanders of great armies, or to be kings: but the distance is far greater and more admirable, betwixt the small beginnings of grace, and our after perfection, that fulness of knowledge that we look for, and that crown of immortality which all they are born to, who are born of God.

But as in the faces or actions of some children, characters and presages of their after-greatness have appeared (as a singular beauty in Moses's face, as they write of him, and as Cyrus was made king among the shepherds' children with whom he was brought up, &c.) so also, certainly, in these children of God, there be some characters and evidences that they are born for Heaven by their new birth. That holiness and meekness, that patience and faith which shine in the actions and sufferings of the saints, are characters of their Father's image, and show their high original, and foretel their glory to come; such a glory as doth not only surpass the world's thoughts, but the thoughts of the children of God themselves. 1 John iii. 2.

COMMENT.

This Aphorism would, it may seem, have been placed more fitly in the Chapter following. In placing it here, I have been determined by the following Con-

victions: 1. Every State, and consequently that which we have described as the State of Religious Morality, which is not progressive, is dead or retrograde. 2. As a pledge of this progression, or, at least, as the form in which the propulsive tendency shows itself, there are certain Hopes, Aspirations, Yearnings, that, with more or less of consciousness, rise and stir in the Heart of true Morality as naturally as the Sap in the full-formed Stem of a Rose flows towards the Bud, within which the Flower is maturing. 3. No one, whose own experience authorizes him to confirm the truth of this statement, can have been conversant with the Volumes of Religious Biography, can have perused (for instance) the Lives of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Wishart, Sir Thomas More, Bernard Gilpin, Bishop Bedel, or of Egede, Swartz, and the Missionaries of the Frozen World, without an occasional conviction, that these men lived under extraordinary influences, that in each instance and in all ages of the Christian æra bear the same characters, and both in the accompaniments and the results evidently refer to a common origin. And what can this be? is the Question that must needs force itself on the mind in the first moment of reflection on a phenomenon so interesting and apparently so anomalous. The answer is as necessarily contained in one or the other of two assumptions. These influences are either the Product of Delusion (*Insania Amabilis*, and the Re-action of disordered Nerves), or they argue the existence of a

Relation to some real Agency, distinct from what is experienced or acknowledged by the world at large, for which as not merely *natural* on the one hand, yet not assumed to be *miraculous** on the other, we have no apter name than *spiritual*. Now if neither analogy justifies nor the moral feelings permit the former assumption; and we decide therefore in favour of the Reality of a State other and higher than the mere Moral Man, whose Religion † consists in Morality, has attained under these convictions; can the existence of a *transitional* state appear other than probable? or that these very Convictions, when accompanied by correspondent dispositions and stirrings of the Heart, are among the Marks and Indications of such a state? And thinking it not unlikely that among the Readers of this Volume, there may be found some Individuals, whose inward State, though disquieted by Doubts and oftener still perhaps by blank Misgivings, may, nevertheless, betoken the commencement of a Transition

* In check of fanatical pretensions, it is expedient to confine the term *miraculous*, to cases where the *Senses* are appealed to, in proof of something that transcends, or can be a part of the Experience derived from the Senses.

† For let it not be forgotten, that Morality, as distinguished from Prudence, implying (it matters not under what name, whether of Honour, or Duty, or Conscience, still, I say, implying), and being grounded in, an awe of the Invisible and a Confidence therein beyond (nay occasionally in apparent contradiction to) the inductions of outward Experience, is essentially religious.

from a not irreligious Morality to a Spiritual Religion, with a view to their interests I placed this Aphorism under the present Head.

APHORISM XXI.

LEIGHTON.

The most approved teachers of wisdom, in a human way, have required of their scholars, that to the end their minds might be capable of it, they should be purified from vice and wickedness. And it was Socrates's custom, when any one asked him a question, seeking to be informed by him, before he would answer them, he asked them concerning their own qualities and course of life.

APHORISM XXII.

L. & ED.

KNOWLEDGE NOT THE ULTIMATE END OF RELIGIOUS PURSUITS.

The Hearing and Reading of the Word, under which I comprize theological studies generally, are alike defective when pursued *without* increase of Knowledge, and when pursued chiefly *for* increase of Knowledge. To seek no more than a present delight, that evanisheth with the sound of the words that die in the air, is not to desire the word as meat, but as music, as God tells the prophet Ezekiel of his people, Ezek. xxxiii. 32. *And lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well upon an instrument; for they hear thy words, and they do them not.* To desire the word for the increase of knowledge, although this is necessary and commend-

able, and, being rightly qualified, is a part of spiritual accretion, yet, take it as going no further, it is not the true end of the word. Nor is the venting of that knowledge in speech and frequent discourse of the word and the divine truths that are in it; which, where it is governed with Christian prudence, is not to be despised, but commended; yet, certainly, the highest knowledge, and the most frequent and skilful speaking of the word, severed from the growth here mentioned, misses the true end of the word. If any one's head or tongue should grow apace, and all the rest stand at a stay, it would certainly make him a monster; and they are no other, who are knowing and discoursing Christians, and grow daily in that respect, but not at all in holiness of heart and life, which is the proper growth of the children of God. Apposite to their case is Epicuretus's comparison of the sheep; they return not what they eat in grass, but in wool.

APHORISM XXIII.

LEIGHTON.

THE SUM OF CHURCH HISTORY.

In times of peace, the Church may dilate more, and build as it were into breadth, but in times of trouble, it arises more in height; it is then built upwards: as in cities where men are straitened, they build usually higher than in the country.

APHORISM XXIV.

L. & ED.

WORTHY TO BE FRAMED AND HUNG UP IN THE LIBRARY
OF EVERY THEOLOGICAL STUDENT.

Where there is a great deal of smoke, and no clear flame, it argues much moisture in the matter, yet it witnesseth certainly that there is fire there; and therefore dubious questioning is a much better evidence, than that senseless deadness which most take for believing. Men that know nothing in sciences, have no doubts. He never truly believed, who was not made first sensible and convinced of unbelief.

Never be afraid to doubt, if only you have the disposition to believe, and doubt in order that you may end in believing the Truth. I will venture to add in my own name and from my own conviction the following :

APHORISM XXV.

EDITOR.

He, who begins by loving Christianity better than Truth, will proceed by loving his own Sect or Church better than Christianity, and end in loving himself better than all.

APHORISM XXVI.

L. & ED.

THE ABSENCE OF DISPUTES, AND A GENERAL AVERSION
TO RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSIES, NO PROOF OF TRUE
UNANIMITY.

The boasted Peaceableness about questions of Faith too often proceeds from a superficial Temper, and not

seldom from a supercilious Disdain of whatever has no marketable use or value, and from indifference to Religion itself. Toleration is an Herb of spontaneous growth in the Soil of Indifference; but the Weed has none of the Virtues of the Medicinal Plant, reared by Humility in the Garden of Zeal. Those, who regard Religions as matters of Taste, may consistently include all religious differences in the old Adage, *De gustibus non est disputandum*. And many there be among these of Gallio's temper, who *care for none of these things*, and who account all questions in religion, as he did, but matter of words and names. And by this all religions may agree together. But that were not a natural union produced by the active heat of the spirit, but a confusion rather, arising from the want of it; not a knitting together, but a freezing together, as cold congregates all bodies, how heterogeneous soever, sticks, stones, and water; but heat makes first a separation of different things, and then unites those that are of the same nature.

Much of our common union of minds, I fear, proceeds from no other than the aforementioned causes, want of knowledge, and want of affection to religion. You that boast you live conformably to the appointments of the Church, and that no one hears of your noise, we may thank the ignorance of your minds for that kind of quietness.

The preceding Extract is particularly entitled to our serious reflections, as in a tenfold degree more applicable to the present times than to the age in which it was

written. We all know, that Lovers are apt to take offence and wrangle on occasions that perhaps are but trifles, and which assuredly would appear such to those who regard Love itself as Folly. These Quarrels may, indeed, be no proof of Wisdom; but still, in the imperfect state of our Nature the entire absence of the same, and this too on far more serious provocations, would excite a strong suspicion of a comparative indifference in the Parties who can love so coolly where they profess to love so well. I shall believe our present religious Tolerancy to proceed from the abundance of our charity and good sense, when I see proofs that we are equally cool and forbearing as Litigants and political Partizans.

APHORISM XXVII.

LEIGHTON.

THE INFLUENCE OF WORLDLY VIEWS (OR WHAT ARE CALLED A MAN'S PROSPECTS IN LIFE), THE BANE OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

It is a base, poor thing for a man to seek himself: far below that royal dignity that is here put upon Christians, and that priesthood joined with it. Under the Law, those who were squint-eyed were incapable of the priesthood: truly, this squinting toward our own interest, the looking aside to that, in God's affairs especially, so deforms the face of the soul, that it makes it altogether unworthy the honour of this spiritual priesthood. Oh! this is a large task, an infinite task. The several creatures bear their part in this; the sun

says somewhat, and moon and stars, yea, the lowest have some share in it; the very plants and herbs of the field speak of God; and yet, the very highest and best, yea all of them together, the whole concert of Heaven and earth, cannot show forth all His praise to the full. No, it is but a part, the smallest part of that glory, which they can reach.

APHORISM XXVIII.

LEIGHTON.

DESPISE NONE: DESPAIR OF NONE.

The Jews would not willingly tread upon the smallest piece of paper in their way, but took it up; for possibly, said they, the name of God may be on it. Though there was a little superstition in this, yet truly there is nothing but good religion in it, if we apply it to men. Trample not on any; there may be some work of grace there, that thou knowest not of. The name of God may be written upon that soul thou treadest on; it may be a soul that Christ thought so much of, as to give His precious blood for it; therefore despise it not.

APHORISM XXIX.

LEIGHTON.

MEN OF LEAST MERIT MOST APT TO BE CONTEMPTUOUS,
BECAUSE MOST IGNORANT AND MOST OVERWEENING
OF THEMSELVES.

Too many take the ready course to deceive themselves; for they look with both eyes on the failings and defects of others, and scarcely give their good qualities

half an eye, while, on the contrary, in themselves, they study to the full their own advantages, and their weaknesses and defects, (as one says), they skip over, as children do their hard words in their lesson, that are troublesome to read; and making this uneven parallel, what wonder if the result be a gross mistake of themselves!

APHORISM XXX.

LEIGHTON.

VANITY MAY STRUT IN RAGS, AND HUMILITY BE AR-
RAYED IN PURPLE AND FINE LINEN.

It is not impossible that there may be in some an affected pride in the meanness of apparel, and in others, under either neat or rich attire, a very humble unaffected mind: using it upon some of the aforementioned engagements, or such like, and yet, the heart not at all upon it. *Magnus qui fictilibus utitur tanquam argento, nec ille minor qui argento tanquam fictilibus*, says Seneca: Great is he who enjoys his earthenware as if it were plate, and not less great is the man to whom all his plate is no more than earthenware.

APHORISM XXXI.

L. & ED.

OF THE DETRACTION AMONG RELIGIOUS PROFESSORS.

They who have attained to a self-pleasing pitch of civility or formal religion, have usually that point of presumption with it, that they make their own size the model and rule to examine all by. What is below it, they condemn indeed as profane; but what is be-

yond it, they account needless and affected preciseness: and therefore are as ready as others to let fly invectives or bitter taunts against it, which are the keen and poisoned shafts of the tongue, and a persecution that shall be called to a strict account.

The slanders, perchance, may not be altogether forged or untrue: they may be the implements, not the inventions, of Malice. But they do not on this account escape the guilt of Detraction. Rather, it is characteristic of the evil spirit in question, to work by the advantage of real faults; but these stretched and aggravated to the utmost. IT IS NOT EXPRESSIBLE HOW DEEP A WOUND A TONGUE SHARPENED TO THIS WORK WILL GIVE, WITH NO NOISE AND A VERY LITTLE WORD. This is the true *white* gunpowder, which the dreaming Projectors of silent Mischiefs and insensible Poisons sought for in the Laboratories of Art and Nature, in a World of Good; but which was to be found, in its most destructive form, in "the World of Evil, the Tongue."

APHORISM XXXII.

LEIGHTON.

THE REMEDY.

All true remedy must begin at the heart; otherwise it will be but a mountebank cure, a false imagined conquest. The weights and wheels are *there*, and the clock strikes according to their motion. Even he that speaks contrary to what is within him, guilefully contrary to his inward conviction and knowledge, yet speaks conformably to what is within him in the temper

and frame of his heart, which is double, *a heart and a heart*, as the Psalmist hath it, Psal. xii. 2.

APHORISM XXXIII.

L. & ED.

It is an argument of a candid ingenuous mind, to delight in the good name and commendation of others; to pass by their defects, and take notice of their virtues; and to speak and hear of those willingly, and not endure either to speak or hear of the other; for in this indeed you may be little less guilty than the evil speaker, in taking pleasure in it, though you speak it not. He that willingly drinks in tales and calumnies, will, from the delight he hath in evil hearing, slide insensibly into the humour of evil speaking. It is strange how most persons dispense with themselves in this point, and that in scarcely any societies shall we find a hatred of this ill, but rather some tokens of taking pleasure in it; and until a Christian sets himself to an inward watchfulness over his heart, not suffering in it any thought that is uncharitable, or vain self-esteem, upon the sight of others' frailties, he will still be subject to somewhat of this, in the tongue or ear at least. So, then, as for the evil of guile in the tongue, a sincere heart, *truth in the inward parts*, powerfully redresses it; therefore it is expressed, Psal. xv. 2, *That speaketh the truth from his heart*; thence it flows. Seek much after this, to speak nothing with God, nor men, but what is the sense of a single unfeigned heart. O sweet truth! excellent but rare sincerity! he that *loves that truth within*, and who is

himself at once THE TRUTH and THE LIFE, He alone can work it there! Seek it of him.

It is characteristic of the Roman Dignity and Sobriety, that, in the Latin, *to favour the tongue* (*favere linguæ*) means, *to be silent*. We say, Hold your tongue! as if it were an injunction, that could not be carried into effect but by manual force, or the pincers of the Forefinger and Thumb! And verily—I blush to say it—it is not Women and Frenchmen only that would rather have their tongues bitten than bitted, and feel their souls in a strait-waistcoat, when they are obliged to remain silent.

APHORISM XXXIV.

LEIGHTON.

ON THE PASSION FOR NEW AND STRIKING THOUGHTS.

In conversation seek not so much either to vent thy knowledge, or to increase it, as to know more spiritually and effectually what thou dost know. And in this way those mean despised truths, that every one thinks he is sufficiently seen in, will have a new sweetness and use in them, which thou didst not so well perceive before (for these flowers cannot be sucked dry), and in this humble sincere way thou shalt *grow in grace and in knowledge* too.

APHORISM XXXV.

L. & ED.

THE RADICAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE GOOD MAN
AND THE VICIOUS MAN.

The godly man hates the evil he possibly by temptation hath been drawn to do, and loves the good he is

frustrated of, and, having intended, hath not attained to do. The sinner, who hath his denomination from sin as his course, hates the good which sometimes he is forced to do, and loves that sin which many times he does not, either wanting occasion and means, so that he cannot do it, or through the check of an enlightened conscience possibly dares not do; and though so bound up from the act, as a dog in a chain, yet the habit, the natural inclination and desire in him, is still the same, the strength of his affection is carried to sin. So in the weakest *sincere* Christian, there is that predominant sincerity and desire of holy walking, according to which he is called a *righteous person*, the Lord is pleased to give him that name, and account him so, being upright in heart, though often failing.

Leighton adds, “There is a Righteousness of a “higher strain.” I do not ask the Reader’s full assent to this position: I do not suppose him as yet prepared to yield it. But thus much he will readily admit, that here, *if* any where, we are to seek the fine Line which, like stripes of Light in Light, distinguishes, not divides, the summit of religious Morality from Spiritual Religion.

“A Righteousness (Leighton continues), that is not *in* him, but *upon* him. He is *clothed* with it.” This, Reader! is the controverted Doctrine, so warmly asserted and so bitterly decried under the name of “IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS.” Our learned Archbishop, you see, adopts it; and it is on this account principally, that by many of our leading Churchmen his Orthodoxy

has been more than questioned, and his name put in the List of prescribed Divines, as a Calvinist. That Leighton attached a definite sense to the words above quoted, it would be uncandid to doubt; and the general Spirit of his Writings leads me to presume that it was compatible with the eternal distinction between *Things* and *Persons*, and therefore opposed to *modern Calvinism*. But what it was, I have not (I own) been able to discover. The sense, however, in which I think he *might* have received this doctrine, and in which I avow myself a believer in it, I shall have an opportunity of showing in another place. My present Object is to open out the Road by the removal of prejudices, so far at least as to throw some disturbing *Doubts* on the secure *Taking-for-granted*, that the peculiar Tenets of the Christian Faith asserted in the Articles and Homilies of our National Church are in contradiction to the Common Sense of Mankind. And with this view, (and not in the arrogant expectation or wish, that a mere *ipse dixit* should be received for argument) I here avow my conviction, that the doctrine of IMPUTED Righteousness, rightly and scripturally interpreted, is so far from being either *irrational* or *immoral*, that Reason itself prescribes the idea in order to give a *meaning* and an ultimate Object to Morality; and that the Moral Law in the Conscience demands its reception in order to give reality and substantive existence to the idea presented by the Reason.

APHORISM XXXVI.

LEIGHTON.

Your blessedness is not,—no, believe it, it is not where most of you seek it, in things below you. How can that be? It must be a higher good to make you happy.

COMMENT.

Every rank of Creatures, as it ascends in the scale of Creation, leaves Death behind it or under it. The Metal at its height of Being seems a mute Prophecy of the coming Vegetation, into a mimic semblance of which it crystallizes. The Blossom and Flower, the Acme of Vegetable Life, divides into correspondent Organs with reciprocal functions, and by instinctive motions and approximations seems impatient of that fixture, by which it is differenced in kind from the flower-shaped Psyche, that flutters with free wing above it. And wonderfully in the insect realm doth the Irritability, the proper seat of Instinct, while yet the nascent Sensibility is subordinated thereto—most wonderfully, I say, doth the muscular Life in the Insect, and the musculo-arterial in the Bird, imitate and typically rehearse the adaptive Understanding, yea, and the moral affections and charities, of Man. Let us carry ourselves back, in spirit, to the mysterious Week, the teeming Work-days of the Creator: as they rose in vision before the eye of the inspired Historian of “the Generations of the Heaven and the Earth, in the days that the Lord God made the Earth and the Heavens.” And who that hath watched their ways with an un-

derstanding heart, could contemplate the filial and loyal Bee; the home-building, wedded, and divorceless Swallow; and above all the manifoldly intelligent * Ant tribes, with their Commonwealths and Confederacies, their Warriors and Miners, the Husbandfolk, that fold in their tiny flocks on the honeyed Leaf, and the Virgin Sisters with the holy Instincts of Maternal Love, detached and in selfless purity—and not say to himself, Behold the Shadow of approaching Humanity, the Sun rising from behind, in the kindling Morn of Creation! Thus all lower Natures find their highest Good in semblances and seekings of that which is higher and better. All things strive to ascend, and ascend in their striving. And shall man alone stoop? Shall his pursuits and desires, the *reflections* of his inward life, be like the reflected Image of a Tree on the edge of a Pool, that grows downward, and seeks a mock heaven in the unstable element beneath it, in neighbourhood with the slim water-weeds and oozy bottom-grass that are yet better than itself and more noble, in as far as Substances that appear as Shadows are preferable to Shadows mistaken for Substance! No! it must be a higher good to make you happy. While you labour for any thing below your proper Humanity, you seek a happy Life in the region of Death. Well saith the moral Poet—

Unless above himself he can
Erect himself, how mean a thing is man!

* See Huber on Bees, and on Ants.

APHORISM XXXVII.

LEIGHTON.

There is an imitation of men that is impious and wicked, which consists in taking the copy of their sins. Again, there is an imitation which though not so grossly evil, yet, is poor and servile, being in mean things, yea, sometimes descending to imitate the very imperfections of others, as fancying some comeliness in them; as some of Basil's scholars, who imitated his slow speaking, which he had a little in the extreme, and could not help. But this is always laudable, and worthy of the best minds, to be *imitators of that which is good*, wheresoever they find it; for that stays not in any man's person, as the ultimate pattern, but rises to the highest grace, being man's nearest likeness to God, His image and resemblance, bearing His stamp and superscription, and belonging peculiarly to Him, in what hand soever it be found, as carrying the mark of no other owner than Him.

APHORISM XXXVIII.

LEIGHTON.

Those who think themselves high-spirited, and will bear least, as they speak, are often, even by that, forced to bow most, or to burst under it; while humility and meekness escape many a burden, and many a blow, always keeping peace within, and often without too.

APHORISM XXXIX.

LEIGHTON.

Our condition is universally exposed to fears and troubles, and no man is so stupid but he studies and projects for some fence against them, some bulwark to

break the incursion of evils, and so to bring his mind to some ease, ridding it of the fear of them. Thus, men seek safety in the greatness, or multitude, or supposed faithfulness of friends; they seek by any means to be strongly underset this way, to have many, and powerful, and trust-worthy friends. But wiser men, perceiving the unsafety and vanity of these and all external things, have cast about for some higher course. They see a necessity of withdrawing a man from externals, which do nothing but mock and deceive those most who trust most to them; but they cannot tell whither to direct him. The best of them bring him *into himself*, and think to quiet him so, but the truth is, he finds as little to support him there; there is nothing truly strong enough within him, to hold out against the many sorrows and fears which still from without do assault him. So then, though it is well done, to call off a man from outward things, as moving sands, that he build not on them, yet, this is not enough; for his own spirit is as unsettled a piece as is in all the world, and must have some higher strength than its own, to fortify and fix it. This is the way that is here taught, *Fear not their fear, but sanctify the Lord your God in your hearts*; and if you can attain this latter, the former will follow of itself.

APHORISM XL.

LEIGHTON.

WORLDLY TROUBLES IDOLS.

The too ardent Love or self-willed Desire of Power, or Wealth, or Credit in the World, is (an Apostle has assured us) Idolatry. Now among the words or syno-

nimes for Idols, in the Hebrew Language, there is one that in its primary sense signifies *Troubles* (Tegirim), other two that signify *Terrors* (Miphletzeth and Emim). And so it is certainly. All our Idols prove so to us. They fill us with nothing but anguish and Troubles, with cares and fears, that are good for nothing but to be fit punishments of the Folly, out of which they arise.

APHORISM XLI.

L. & ED.

ON THE RIGHT TREATMENT OF INFIDELS.

A regardless contempt of infidel writings is usually the fittest answer; *Spreta vilescerent*. But where the holy profession of Christians is likely to receive either the main or the indirect blow, and a word of defence may do any thing to ward it off, there we ought not to spare to do it.

Christian prudence goes a great way in the regulating of this. Some are not capable of receiving rational answers, especially in Divine things; they were not only lost upon them, but religion dishonoured by the contest.

Of this sort are the vulgar Railers at Religion, the foul-mouthed Beliers of the Christian Faith and History. Impudently false and slanderous Assertions can be met only by Assertions of their impudent and slanderous falsehood: and Christians will not, must not condescend to this. How can mere Railing be answered by them who are forbidden to return a railing answer? Whether or on what provocations such offenders may be punished or coerced on the score of Incivility, and

Ill-neighbourhood, and for the abatement of a Nuisance, as in the case of other Scolds and Endangerers of the public Peace, must be trusted to the Discretion of the civil Magistrate. Even then, there is danger of giving them importance, and flattering their vanity, by attracting attention to their works, if the punishment be slight; and if severe, of spreading far and wide their reputation as Martyrs, as the smell of a dead dog at a distance is said to change into that of Musk. Experience hitherto seems to favour the plan of treating these Bêtes puantes and *Enfans de Diable*, as their four-footed Brethren, the *Skink* and Squash, are treated* by the American Woodmen, who turn their backs upon the fetid Intruder, and make appear not to see him, even at the cost of suffering him to regale on the favourite viand of these animals, the brains of a stray goose or crested Thraso of the Dunghill. At all events, it is degrading to the majesty, and injurious to the character of Religion, to make its safety the plea for their punishment, or at all to connect the name of Christianity with the castigation of Indecencies that

* About the end of the same year (says Kalm), another of these Animals (*Mephitis Americana*) crept into our cellar; but did not exhale the smallest scent, *because it was not disturbed. A foolish old Woman, however, who perceived it at night, by the shining, and thought, I suppose, that it would set the world on fire, killed it: and at that moment its stench began to spread.*

We recommend this anecdote to the consideration of sundry old Women, on this side of the Atlantic, who, though they do not wear the appropriate garment, are worthy to sit in their committee-room, like Bickerstaff in the *Tatler*, under the canopy of their Grandam's Hoop-petticoat.

properly belong to the Beadle, and the perpetrators of which would have equally deserved his Lash, though the Religion of their fellow-citizens, thus assailed by them, had been that of Fo or of Jaggernaut.

On the other hand, we are to answer every one that *inquires a reason*, or an account; which supposes something receptive of it. We ought to judge ourselves engaged to give it, be it an enemy, if he will hear; if it gain him not, it may in part convince and cool him; much more, should it be one who ingenuously inquires for satisfaction, and possibly inclines to receive the truth, but has been prejudiced by false misrepresentations of it.

APHORISM XLII.

LEIGHTON.

PASSION NO FRIEND TO TRUTH.

Truth needs not the service of passion; yea, nothing so disserves it, as passion when set to serve it. The *Spirit of truth* is withal the *Spirit of meekness*. The Dove that rested on that great Champion of truth, who is The Truth itself, is from Him derived to the lovers of truth, and they ought to seek the participation of it. Imprudence makes some kind of Christians lose much of their labour, in speaking for religion, and drive those further off, whom they would draw into it.

The confidence that attends a Christian's belief makes the believer not fear men, to whom he answers, but still he fears his God, for whom he answers, and whose interest is chief in those things he speaks of. The soul that hath the deepest sense of spiritual things,

and the truest knowledge of God, is most afraid to miscarry in speaking of Him, most tender and wary how to acquit itself when engaged to speak of and for God*.

APHORISM XLIII.

LEIGHTON.

ON THE CONSCIENCE.

It is a fruitless verbal Debate, whether Conscience be a Faculty or a Habit. When all is examined, Conscience will be found to be no other than *the mind of a man, under the notion of a particular reference to himself* and his own actions.

COMMENT.

What Conscience is, and that it is the ground and antecedent of human (or *self-*) consciousness, and not any modification of the latter, I have shown at large in a Work announced for the Press, and described in the Chapter following. I have selected the preceding Extract as an Exercise for Reflection; and *because* I think

* To the same purpose are the two following sentences from Hilary:

Etiam quæ *pro* Religione dicimus, cum grandi metu et disciplinâ dicere debemus.—Hilarius de Trinit. Lib. 7.

Non relictus est hominum eloquiis de Dei rebus alius quam Dei sermo.—Idem.

The latter, however, must be taken with certain *Qualifications* and *Exceptions*: as when any two or more Texts are in apparent contradiction, and it is required to state a Truth that comprehends and reconciles both, and which, of course, cannot be expressed in the words of either. Ex. gr. the filial subordination (*My Father is greater than I*), in the equal Deity (*My Father and I are one*).

that in too closely following Thomas a Kempis, the Archbishop has strayed from his own judgment. The Definition, for instance, seems to say all, and in fact says nothing; for if I asked, How do you define the *human mind*? the answer must at least *contain*, if not consist of, the words, “a mind capable of *Conscience*.” For Conscience is no synonyme of Consciousness, nor any mere expression of the same as modified by the particular Object. On the contrary, a Consciousness properly human (*i. e. Self-consciousness*), with the sense of moral responsibility, presupposes the Conscience, as its antecedent Condition and Ground. Lastly, the sentence, “It is a fruitless verbal Debate,” is an assertion of the same complexion with the contemptuous Sneers at Verbal Criticism by the Contemporaries of Bentley. In Questions of Philosophy or Divinity, that have occupied the Learned and been the subjects of many successive Controversies, for one instance of mere Logomachy I could bring ten instances of *Logodædaly*, or verbal Legerdemain, which have perilously confirmed Prejudices, and withstood the advancement of Truth, in consequence of the neglect of *verbal debate*, *i. e.* strict discussion of Terms. In whatever sense, however, the term Conscience may be used, the following Aphorism is equally true and important. It is worth noticing, likewise, that Leighton himself in a following page (vol. ii. p. 97), tells us, that A good Conscience is the *Root* of a good Conversation: and then quotes from St. Paul a text, Titus i. 15, in which the Mind and the Conscience are expressly distinguished.

APHORISM XLIV.

LEIGHTON.

THE LIGHT OF KNOWLEDGE A NECESSARY ACCOMPANIMENT OF A GOOD CONSCIENCE.

If you would have a good conscience, you must by all means have so much light, so much knowledge of the will of God, as may regulate you, and show you your way, may teach you how to do, and speak, and think, as in His presence.

APHORISM XLV.

LEIGHTON.

YET THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE RULE, THOUGH ACCOMPANIED BY AN ENDEAVOUR TO ACCOMMODATE OUR CONDUCT TO THIS RULE, WILL NOT OF ITSELF FORM A GOOD CONSCIENCE.

To set the outward actions right, though with an honest intention, and not so to regard and find out the inward disorder of the heart, whence that in the actions flows, is but to be still putting the index of a clock right with your finger, while it is foul, or out of order within, which is a continual business, and does no good. Oh! but a purified conscience, a soul renewed and refined in its temper and affections, will make things go right without, in all the duties and acts of our callings.

APHORISM XLVI.

EDITOR.

THE DEPTH OF THE CONSCIENCE.

How deeply seated the Conscience is in the human Soul, is seen in the effect which sudden Calamities pro-

duce on guilty men, even when unaided by any determinate notion or fears of punishment after death. The wretched Criminal, as one rudely awakened from a long sleep, bewildered with the new light, and half recollecting, half striving to recollect, a fearful something, he knows not what, but which he will recognize as soon as he hears the name, already interprets the calamities into *judgments*, Executions of a Sentence passed by an *invisible* Judge; as if the vast Pyre of the Last Judgment were already kindled in an unknown Distance, and some Flashes of it, darting forth at intervals beyond the rest, were flying and lighting upon the face of his Soul. The calamity may consist in loss of Fortune, or Character, or Reputation; but you hear no *regrets* from him. Remorse extinguishes all Regret; and Remorse is the *implicit* Creed of the Guilty.

APHORISM XLVII.

L. & ED.

God hath suited every creature He hath made with a convenient good to which it tends, and in the obtaining of which it rests and is satisfied. Natural bodies have all their own natural place, whither, if not hindered, they move incessantly till they be in it; and they declare, by resting there, that they are (as I may say) where they would be. Sensitive creatures are carried to seek a sensitive good, as agreeable to their rank in being, and, attaining that, aim no further. Now, in this is the excellency of Man, that he is made capable of a communion with his Maker, and, because capable of it, is unsatisfied without it: the soul, being

cut out (so to speak) to that largeness, cannot be filled with less. Though he is fallen from his right to that good, and from all right desire of it, yet, not from a capacity of it, no, nor from a necessity of it, for the answering and filling of his capacity.

Though the heart once gone from God turns continually further away from Him, and moves not towards Him till it be renewed, yet, even in that wandering, it retains that natural relation to God, as its centre, that it hath no true rest elsewhere, nor can by any means find it. It is made for Him, and is therefore still restless till it meet with Him.

It is true, the natural man takes much pains to quiet his heart by other things, and digests many vexations with hopes of contentment in the end and accomplishment of some design he hath; but still the heart mis-gives. Many times he attains not the thing he seeks; but if he do, yet he never attains the satisfaction he seeks and expects in it, but only learns from that to desire something further, and still hunts on after a fancy, drives his own shadow before him, and never overtakes it; and if he did, yet it is but a shadow. And so, in running from God, besides the sad end, he carries an interwoven punishment with his sin, the natural disquiet and vexation of his spirit, fluttering to and fro, and *finding no rest for the sole of his foot*; the *waters* of inconstancy and vanity *covering the whole face of the earth*.

These things are too gross and heavy. The soul, the immortal soul, descended from heaven, must either

be more happy, or remain miserable. The Highest, the Increated Spirit, is the proper good, *the Father of spirits*, that pure and full good which raises the soul above itself; whereas all other things draw it down below itself. So, then, it is never well with the soul, but when it is near unto God, yea, in its union with Him, married to Him: mismatching itself elsewhere, it hath never any thing but shame and sorrow. *All that forsake Thee shall be ashamed*, says the Prophet, Jer. xvii. 13; and the Psalmist, *They that are far off from thee shall perish*. Psal. lxxiii. 27. And this is indeed our natural miserable condition, and it is often expressed this way, by estrangedness and distance from God.

The same sentiments are to be found in the works of Pagan Philosophers and Moralists. Well then may they be made a Subject of Reflection in our days. And well may the pious Deist, if such a character now exists, reflect that Christianity alone both teaches the way, and provides the means, of fulfilling the obscure promises of this great Instinct for all men, which the Philosophy of boldest Pretensions confined to the sacred Few.

APHORISM XLVIII.

LEIGHTON.

A CONTRACTED SPHERE, OR WHAT IS CALLED RETIRING FROM THE BUSINESS OF THE WORLD, NO SECURITY FROM THE SPIRIT OF THE WORLD.

The heart may be engaged in a little business as much, if thou watch it not, as in many and great affairs.

A man may drown in a little brook or pool, as well as in a great river, if he be down and plunge himself into it; and put his head under water. Some care thou must have, that thou mayest not care. Those things that are thorns indeed, thou must make a hedge of them, to keep out those temptations that accompany sloth, and extreme want that waits on it; but let them be the hedge: suffer them not to grow within the garden.

APHORISM XLIX.

LEIGHTON.

ON CHURCH-GOING, AS A PART OF RELIGIOUS MORALITY, WHEN NOT IN REFERENCE TO A SPIRITUAL RELIGION.

It is a strange folly in multitudes of us, to set ourselves no mark, to propound no end in the hearing of the Gospel. The merchant sails not merely that he may sail, but for traffic, and traffics that he may be rich. The husbandman plows not merely to keep himself busy, with no further end, but plows that he may sow, and sows that he may reap with advantage. And shall we do the most excellent and fruitful work fruitlessly,—hear only to hear, and look no further? This is indeed a great vanity, and a great misery, to lose that labour, and gain nothing by it, which, duly used, would be of all others most advantageous and gainful: and yet all meetings are full of this!

APHORISM L.

LEIGHTON.

ON THE HOPES AND SELF-SATISFACTION OF A RELIGIOUS MORALIST, INDEPENDENT OF A SPIRITUAL FAITH—
ON WHAT ARE THEY GROUNDED?

There have been great disputes one way or another, about the merit of good works; but I truly think they who have laboriously engaged in them have been very idly, though very eagerly, employed about nothing, since the more sober of the schoolmen themselves acknowledge there can be no such thing as meriting from the blessed God, in the human, or, to speak more accurately, in any created nature whatsoever: nay so far from any possibility of merit, there can be no room for reward any otherwise than of the sovereign pleasure and gracious kindness of God; and the more ancient writers, when they use the word merit, mean nothing by it but a certain *correlate* to that reward which God both promises and bestows of mere grace and benignity. Otherwise, in order to constitute what is properly called merit, many things must concur, which no man in his senses will presume to attribute to human works, though ever so excellent; particularly, that the thing done must not previously be matter of debt, and that it be entire, or our own act, unassisted by foreign aid; it must also be perfectly good, and it must bear an adequate proportion to the reward claimed in consequence of it. If all these things do not concur, the act cannot possibly amount to merit. Whereas I think

no one will venture to assert, that any one of these can take place in any human action whatever. But why should I enlarge here, when one single circumstance overthrows all those titles: the most righteous of mankind would not be able to stand, if his works were weighed in the balance of strict justice; how much less then could they deserve that immense glory which is now in question! Nor is this to be denied only concerning the unbeliever and the sinner, but concerning the righteous and pious believer, who is not only free from all the guilt of his former impenitence and rebellion, but endowed with the gift of the Spirit. "For the time *is come* that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if *it first begin* at us, what shall the end *be* of them that obey not the Gospel of God? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" 1 Peter iv. 17, 18. The Apostle's interrogation expresses the most vehement negation, and signifies that no mortal, in whatever degree he is placed, if he be called to the strict examination of Divine Justice, without daily and repeated forgiveness could be able to keep his standing, and much less could he arise to that glorious height. 'That merit,' says Bernard, 'on which my hope relies, consists in these three things; the love of adoption, the truth of the promise, and the power of its performance.' This is the threefold cord which cannot be broken.

COMMENT.

Often have I heard it said by advocates for the So-

cinian Scheme—True! we are all sinners; but even in the Old Testament God has promised Forgiveness on Repentance. One of the Fathers (I forget which) supplies the Retort—True! God has promised Pardon on Penitence: but has he promised Penitence on Sin?—He that repenteth shall be forgiven: but where is it said, He that sinneth shall repent? But Repentance, perhaps, the Repentance required in Scripture, *the Passing into a new mind*, into a new and contrary Principle of Action, this METANOIA *, is in the Sinner's own power? at his own Liking? He has but to open his eyes to the sin, and the Tears are close at hand to wash it away!—Verily, the exploded Tenet of *Transubstantiation* is scarcely at greater variance with the common Sense and Experience of Mankind, or borders more closely on a contradiction in terms, than this volunteer *Transmentation*, this Self-change, as the easy † means of Self-salvation! But the Reflections of our evangelical Author on this subject will appropriately commence the Aphorisms relating to Spiritual Religion.

* ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑ, the New Testament word, which we render by Repentance, compounded of μετα, *trans*, and νους, *mens*, the Spirit, or practical Reason.

† May I without offence be permitted to record the very appropriate title, with which a stern Humorist *lettered* a collection of Unitarian Tracts?—"Salvation made easy; or, Every Man his own Redeemer."

ELEMENTS

OF

RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY,

PRELIMINARY TO THE

APHORISMS ON SPIRITUAL RELIGION.

PHILIP saith unto him: Lord *show* us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, He that hath seen me hath seen the Father: and how sayest thou then, *Show* us the Father? Believest thou not, that I am in the Father and the Father in me? And I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, even the *Spirit* of Truth: whom the world *cannot* receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him. But ye know him (for he dwelleth *with* you and *shall* be *in* you). And in that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me and I in you. John xiv. 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 20.

PRELIMINARY.

IF there be aught *Spiritual* in Man, the Will must be such.

If there be a Will, there must be a Spirituality in Man.

I suppose both positions granted. The Reader admits the reality of the power, agency, or mode of Being expressed in the term, Spirit; and the actual existence of a Will. He sees clearly, that the idea of the former is necessary to the conceivability of the latter; and that, vice versâ, in asserting the *fact* of the latter he presumes and instances the truth of the former—just as in our common and received Systems of Natural Philosophy, the Being of imponderable Matter is assumed to render the Lode-stone intelligible, and the Fact of the Lode-stone adduced to prove the reality of imponderable Matter.

In short, I suppose the Reader, whom I now invite to the third and last Division of the work, already disposed to reject for himself and his human Brethren the insidious title of “Nature’s noblest *Animal*,” or

to retort it as the unconscious Irony of the Epicurean Poet on the animalizing tendency of his own philosophy. I suppose him convinced, that there is more in man than can be rationally referred to the life of Nature and the mechanism of Organization; that he has a Will not included in this mechanism; and that the Will is in an especial and pre-eminent sense the spiritual part of our Humanity.

Unless then we have some distinct notion of the Will, and some acquaintance with the prevalent errors respecting the same, an insight into the nature of Spiritual Religion is scarcely possible; and our reflections on the particular truths and evidences of a Spiritual State will remain obscure, perplexed, and unsafe. To place my Reader on this requisite Vantage-ground, is the purpose of the following Exposition.

We have begun, as in geometry, with defining our Terms; and we proceed, like the Geometricians, with stating our POSTULATES; the difference being, that the Postulates of Geometry *no man can deny*, those of Moral Science are such as *no good man will deny*. For it is *not* in our power to disclaim our Nature, as *sentient* Beings; but it *is* in our power to disclaim our Nature as *Moral* Beings. It is possible (barely possible, I admit) that a man may have remained ignorant or unconscious of the Moral Law within him: and a man need only persist in disobeying the Law of Conscience to *make* it possible for himself to deny its existence, or to reject and repel it as a phantom of Superstition. Were it otherwise, the Creed would stand

in the same relation to Morality as the Multiplication Table.

This then is the distinction of Moral Philosophy—*not* that I begin with one or more *Assumptions*: for this is common to *all* science; but—that I assume a something, the proof of which no man can *give* to another, yet every man may *find* for himself. If any man assert, that he *can* not find it, I am *bound* to disbelieve him! I cannot do otherwise without unsettling the very foundations of my own moral Nature. For I either find it as an *essential* of the Humanity *common* to Him and Me: or I have not *found* it at all, except as an Hypochondriast finds *Glass Legs*. If, on the other hand, he *will* not find it, he excommunicates himself. He forfeits his *personal* Rights, and becomes a *Thing*: *i. e.* one who may rightfully be *employed*, or *used*, as a* means to an end, against his will, and without regard to his interest.

All the significant objections of the Materialist and Necessitarian are contained in the term, Morality, all the Objections of the Infidel in the term, Religion!

* On this principle alone is it possible to justify *capital*, or *ignominious* Punishments (or indeed any punishment not having the reformation of the Criminal, as *one* of its objects). Such Punishments, like those inflicted on Suicides, must be regarded as *posthumous*: the wilful extinction of the moral and personal Life being, for the purposes of punitive Justice, equivalent to a wilful destruction of the natural Life. If the speech of Judge Burnet to the Horse-stealer (You are not hanged for stealing a Horse; but, that Horses may not be stolen) can be vindicated at all, it must be on *this* principle; and not on the all-unsettling scheme of *Expedience*, which is the anarchy of Morals.

The very terms, I say, imply a something *granted*, which the Objection supposes *not* granted. The term *presumes* what the Objection denies, and in denying *presumes* the contrary. For it is most important to observe, that the Reasoners on *both* sides commence by taking something for granted, our Assent to which they ask or demand: i. e. both set off with an Assumption in the form of a Postulate. But the Epicurean assumes what according to himself he neither is nor can be under any *obligation* to assume, and demands what he *can* have no *right* to demand: for *he* denies the reality of *all* moral Obligation, the existence of *any* Right. If he use the *words*, Right and Obligation, he does it deceptively, and means only Compulsion and Power. To overthrow the Faith in aught higher or other than Nature and physical Necessity, is the very purpose of his argument. He desires you only to *take for granted*, that *all* reality is *included* in Nature, and he may then safely defy you to ward off his conclusion—that *nothing* is *excluded*!

But as he cannot morally demand, neither can he rationally expect, your Assent to this premise: for he cannot be ignorant, that the best and greatest of Men have devoted their lives to the enforcement of the contrary; that the vast majority of the human Race in all ages and in all nations have believed in the contrary; and that there is not a Language on Earth, in which he could argue, for ten minutes, in support of his scheme without sliding into words and phrases, that imply the contrary. It has been said, that the Arabic

has a thousand names for a Lion; but this would be a trifle compared with the number of superfluous words and useless Synonimes that would be found in an Index Expurgatorius of any European Dictionary constructed on the principles of a consistent and strictly consequential Materialism!

The *Christian* likewise grounds *his* philosophy on assertions; but with the best of all *reasons* for making them—viz. that he *ought* so to do. He asserts what he can neither prove, nor account for, nor himself comprehend; but with the strongest of *inducements*, that of understanding thereby whatever else it most concerns him to understand aright. And yet his Assertions have nothing in them of Theory or Hypothesis; but are in immediate reference to three ultimate *Facts*; namely, the Reality of the LAW OF CONSCIENCE; the existence of a RESPONSIBLE WILL, as the subject of that law; and lastly, the existence of EVIL—of Evil essentially such, not by accident of outward circumstances, not derived from its physical consequences, or from any cause, out of itself. The first is a Fact of Consciousness; the second a Fact of Reason necessarily concluded from the first; and the third a Fact of History interpreted by both.

Omnia exeunt in mysterium, says a Schoolman: *i. e.* *There is nothing, the absolute ground of which is not a Mystery.* The contrary were indeed a contradiction in terms: for how can that, which is to explain all things, be susceptible of an explanation? It would be to suppose the same thing first and second at the same time.

If I rested here, I should merely have placed my

Creed in direct opposition to that of the Necessitarians, who assume (for observe *both* Parties begin in an *Assumption*, and cannot do otherwise) that motives act on the Will, as bodies act on bodies; and that whether mind and matter are essentially the same or essentially different, they are both alike under one and the same law of compulsory Causation. But this is far from exhausting my intention. I mean at the same time to oppose the Disciples of SHAFTESBURY and those who, substituting one Faith for another, have been well called the pious Deists of the last Century, in order to distinguish them from the Infidels of the present age, who *persuade* themselves, (for the thing itself is not possible) that they reject all Faith. I declare my dissent from these too, because they imposed upon themselves an *Idea* for a Reality: a most sublime Idea indeed, and so necessary to human Nature, that without it no Virtue is conceivable; but still an Idea! In contradiction to their splendid but delusory Tenets, I profess a deep conviction that Man was and is a *fallen* Creature, not by accidents of bodily constitution, or any other cause, which *human* Wisdom in a course of ages might be supposed capable of removing; but diseased in his *Will*, in that Will which is the true and only strict synonyme of the word, I, or the intelligent Self. Thus at each of these two opposite Roads (the Philosophy of Hobbes and that of Shaftesbury), I have placed a directing Post, informing my Fellow-travellers, that on neither of these Roads can they see the Truths to which I would direct their attention.

But the place of starting was at the meeting of *four*

Roads, and one only was the right road. I proceed therefore to preclude the opinion of those likewise, who indeed agree with me as to the moral Responsibility of Man in opposition to Hobbes and the Anti-Moralists, and that He was a fallen Creature, essentially diseased, in opposition to Shaftesbury and the Misinterpreters of Plato; but who differ from me in exaggerating the diseased *weakness* of the Will into an absolute privation of all Freedom, thereby making moral responsibility, not a mystery *above* comprehension, but a direct contradiction, of which we do distinctly comprehend the absurdity. Among the consequences of this Doctrine, is that direful one of swallowing up all the Attributes of the supreme Being in the one Attribute of infinite Power, and thence deducing that Things are good and wise because they were created, and not created through Wisdom and Goodness. Thence too the awful Attribute of *Justice* is explained away into a mere right of absolute *Property*; the sacred distinction between Things and Persons is erased; and the selection of Persons for Virtue and Vice in this Life, and for eternal Happiness or Misery in the next, is represented as the result of a mere *Will*, acting in the blindness and solitude of its own Infinity. The Title of a Work written by the great and pious Boyle is "Of the Awe, which the human Mind owes to the supreme Reason." This, in the language of these gloomy Doctors, must be translated into—"the horror, which a Being capable of eternal Pleasure or Pain is compelled to feel at the idea of an infinite Power,

about to inflict the latter on an immense majority of human Souls, without any power on their part either to prevent it or the actions which are (not indeed its causes but) its assigned *signals*, and preceding links of the same iron chain!

Against these Tenets I maintain, that a Will conceived separate from Intelligence is a Non-entity, and a mere Phantasm of Abstraction; and that a Will, the state of which does in *no sense* originate in its own act, is an absolute contradiction. It might be an Instinct, an Impulse, a plastic Power, and, if accompanied with consciousness, a Desire; but a Will it *could* not be! And this *every* Human Being *knows* with equal *clearness*, though different minds may *reflect* on it with different degrees of *distinctness*; for who would not smile at the notion of a Rose *willing* to put forth its Buds and expand them into Flowers? That such a phrase would be deemed a *poetic* Licence proves the difference in the things: for all metaphors are grounded on an apparent likeness of things essentially different. I utterly disclaim the idea, that any *human* Intelligence, with whatever power it might manifest itself, is *alone* adequate to the office of restoring health to the Will: but at the same time I deem it impious and absurd to hold, that the Creator would have *given* us the faculty of Reason, or that the Redeemer would in so many varied forms of Argument and Persuasion have *appealed* to it, if it had been either totally useless or wholly impotent. Lastly, I find all these several Truths reconciled and united in the belief, that the

imperfect human understanding can be effectually exerted only in *subordination* to, and in a dependent *alliance* with, the means and aids supplied by the all-perfect and supreme Reason; but that under these conditions it is not only an admissible, but a necessary, instrument of ameliorating both ourselves and others.

We may now proceed to our reflections on the *Spirit of Religion*. The first three or four Aphorisms I have selected from the Theological Works of Dr. Henry More, a contemporary of Archbishop Leighton's, and like him, held in suspicion by the Calvinists of that time as a Latitudinarian and Platonizing Divine, and probably, like him, would have been arraigned as a Calvinist by the Latitudinarians (I cannot say, Platonists) of this Day, had the suspicion been equally groundless. One or two the Editor has ventured to add from his own Reflections. The purpose, however, is the same in all—that of declaring, in the first place, what Spiritual Religion is *not*, what is *not* a Religious Spirit, and what are *not* to be deemed influences of the Spirit. If after these Disclaimers the Editor shall without proof be charged by any with renewing or favouring the errors of the *Familists*, *Vanists*, *Seekers*, *Behmenists*, or by whatever other names Church History records the poor bewildered Enthusiasts, who in the swarming time of our Republic turned the facts of the Gospel into allegories, and superseded the written Ordinances of Christ by a pretended Teaching and sensi-

ble Presence of the Spirit, he appeals against them to their own consciences, as wilful Slanderers. But if with proof, I have in these Aphorisms signed and sealed my own Condemnation.

“ These things I could not forbear to write. For *the Light within me*, that is, *my Reason and Conscience*, does assure me, that the Ancient and Apostolic Faith according to the *historical* Meaning thereof, and in the *literal* sense of the Creed, is solid and true: and that *Familism* in its fairest form and under whatever disguise is a smooth Tale to seduce the simple from their Allegiance to Christ.”

HENRY MORE'S Theological Works, p. 372.

APHORISMS ON SPIRITUAL RELIGION.

And here it will not be impertinent to observe, that what the eldest Greek Philosophy entitled *the Reason* (ΝΟΥΣ) and *Ideas*, the philosophic Apostle names *the Spirit* and *Truths spiritually discerned*: while to those who in the pride of Learning or in the over-weening meanness of modern Metaphysics decry the doctrine of the Spirit in Man and its possible communion with the Holy Spirit, as *vulgar* enthusiasm; I submit the following Sentences from a Pagan Philosopher, a Nobleman and a Minister of State—"Ita dico, Lucili! SACER INTRA NOS SPIRITUS SEDET, malorum bonorumque nostrorum observator et custos. Hic prout a nobis tractatus est, ita nos ipse tractat. BONUS VIR SINE DEO NEMO EST." SENECA.

APHORISMS ON SPIRITUAL RELIGION.

APHORISM I.

H. MORE.

EVERY one is *to give a reason of his faith*; but Priests and Ministers more punctually than any, their province being to make good every sentence of the Bible to a rational enquirer into the truth of these Oracles. Enthusiasts find it an easy thing to heat the fancies of unlearned and unreflecting Hearers; but when a sober man would be satisfied of the *Grounds* from whence they speak, he shall not have one syllable or the least tittle of a pertinent Answer. Only they will talk big of THE SPIRIT, and inveigh against *Reason* with bitter Reproaches, calling it carnal or fleshly, though it be indeed no soft flesh, but enduring and penetrant steel, even the sword of the Spirit, and such as pierces to the Heart.

APHORISM II.

H. MORE.

There are two very bad things in this resolving of men's Faith and Practice into *the immediate suggestion* of a Spirit not acting on our Understandings, or rather into the illumination of such a Spirit as they can

give no account of, such as does not enlighten their reason or enable them to render their doctrine intelligible to others. First, it defaces and makes useless that part of the Image of God in us, which we call REASON : and secondly, it takes away that advantage, which raises Christianity above all other Religions, that she dare appeal to so solid a faculty.

APHORISM III.

EDITOR.

It is the glory of the Gospel Charter and the Christian Constitution, that its Author and Head is the Spirit of Truth, Essential Reason as well as Absolute and Incomprehensible Will. Like a just Monarch, he refers even his own causes to the Judgment of his high Courts.—He has his King's Bench in the Reason, his Court of Equity in the Conscience; *that* the representative of his Majesty and universal Justice, *this* the nearest to the King's heart, and the Dispenser of his particular Decrees. He has likewise his Court of Common Pleas in the Understanding, his Court of Exchequer in the Prudence. The Laws are *his* Laws. And though by Signs and Miracles he has mercifully condescended to interline here and there with his own hand the great Statute-book, which he had dictated to his Amanuensis, Nature; yet has he been graciously pleased to forbid our receiving as the *King's* Mandates aught that is not stamped with the Great Seal of the Conscience, and countersigned by the Reason.

APHORISM IV.

ON AN UNLEARNED MINISTRY, UNDER PRETENCE OF
A CALL OF THE SPIRIT, AND INWARD GRACES SUPER-
SEDING OUTWARD HELPS.

Tell me, Ye high-flown *Perfectionists*, Ye Boasters of the *Light within* you, could the highest perfection of your inward Light ever show to you the History of past Ages, the state of the World at present, the Knowledge of Arts and Tongues, without Books or Teachers? How then can you understand the Providence of God, or the age, the purpose, the fulfilment of Prophecies, or distinguish such as have been fulfilled from those to the fulfilment of which we are to look forward? How can you judge concerning the authenticity and uncorruptedness of the Gospels, and the other sacred Scriptures? And how without this knowledge can you support the truth of Christianity? How can you either have, or give a reason for the faith which you profess? This *Light within*, that loves Darkness, and would exclude those excellent Gifts of God to Mankind, Knowledge and Understanding, what is it but a sullen self-sufficiency within you, engendering contempt of Superiors, pride and a Spirit of Division, and inducing you to reject for yourselves and to undervalue in others the *Helps without*, which the Grace of God has provided and appointed for his Church—nay, to make them grounds or pretexts of your dislike or suspicion of Christ's Ministers who have

fruitfully availed themselves of the Helps afforded them?—HENRY MORE.

APHORISM V.

There are Wanderers, whom neither pride nor a perverse humour have led astray; and whose condition is such, that I think few more worthy of a man's best directions. For the more imperious Sects having put such unhandsome vizards on Christianity, and the sincere Milk of the *Word* having been every where so sophisticated by the humours and inventions of men, it has driven these anxious Melancholists to seek for a *Teacher* that cannot deceive, the Voice of the *eternal* Word within them; to which if they be faithful, they assure themselves it will be faithful to them in return. Nor would this be a groundless Pre-sumption, if they had sought this Voice in the Reason and the Conscience, with the Scripture articulating the same, instead of giving heed to their Fancy and mistaking bodily disturbances, and the vapors resulting therefrom, for inspiration and the teaching of the Spirit.—HENRY MORE.

APHORISM VI.

When every man is his own end, all things will come to a bad end. Blessed were those days, when every man thought himself rich and fortunate by the good success of the public wealth and glory. We want public Souls, we want them. I speak it with compas-

sion : there is no sin and abuse in the world that affects my thought so much. Every man thinks, that he is a whole Commonwealth in his private Family. Omnes quæ sua sunt quærunt. All seek their own.—BISHOP HACKET'S Sermons, p. 449.

COMMENT.

Selfishness is common to all ages and countries. In all ages Self-seeking is the Rule, and Self-sacrifice the Exception. But if to seek our private advantage in harmony with, and by the furtherance of, the public prosperity, and to derive a portion of our happiness from sympathy with the prosperity of our fellow-men—if this be Public Spirit, it would be morose and querulous to pretend that there is any want of it in this country and at the present time. On the contrary, the number of “public souls” and the general readiness to contribute to the public good, in science and in religion, in patriotism and in philanthropy, stand prominent* among the characteristics of this and the pre-

* The very marked, *positive* as well as comparative, magnitude and prominence of the Bump, entitled BENEVOLENCE (see *Spurzheim's Map of the Human Skull*) on the head of the late Mr. John Thurtel, has wofully unsettled the faith of many ardent Phrenologists, and strengthened the previous doubts of a still greater number into utter disbelief. On MY mind this fact (for a *fact* it is) produced the direct contrary effect; and inclined me to suspect, for the first time, that there may be some truth in the Spurzheimian Scheme. Whether future Craniologists may not see cause to *new-name* this and one or two other of these convex gnomons, is quite a different question. At present,

ceding generation. The habit of referring Actions and Opinions to fixed laws; Convictions rooted in Principles; Thought, Insight, System;—these, had the good Bishop lived in our times, would have been his *Desiderata*, and the theme of his Complaints. “We want *thinking* Souls, we *want them*.”

This and the three preceding Extracts will suffice as precautionary Aphorisms. And here again, the Reader may exemplify the great advantages to be obtained from the habit of tracing the *proper* meaning and history of Words. We need only recollect the common and idiomatic phrases in which the word “Spirit” occurs in a physical or material sense (ex. gr. fruit has lost its *spirit* and flavour), to be convinced that its property is to improve, enliven, actuate some other thing, not to be or constitute a thing in its own name. The enthusiast may find one exception to this where the material itself is called *Spirit*. And when he calls to mind, how *this* spirit acts when taken *alone* by the unhappy persons who in their first exultation will boast that it is Meat, Drink, Fire, and Clothing to them, all in one—when he reflects, that its properties are to inflame, intoxicate, madden, with exhaustion, lethargy, and according to the present use of words, any such change would be premature: and we must be content to say, that Mr. Thurtel’s Benevolence was insufficiently modified by the unprotrusive and unindicated Convulutes of the Brain, that secrete honesty and common-sense. The organ of Destructiveness was indirectly *potenziated* by the absence or imperfect developement of the Glands of Reason and Conscience, in this “*unfortunate Gentleman!*”

and atrophy for the Sequels—well for him, if in some lucid interval he should fairly put the question to his own mind, how far this is *analogous* to his own case, and whether the Exception does not confirm the Rule. The *Letter* without the Spirit killeth; but does it follow, that the Spirit is to kill the Letter? To kill that which it is its appropriate office to enliven?

However, where the Ministry is not invaded, and the plain sense of the Scriptures is left undisturbed, and the Believer looks for the suggestions of the Spirit only or chiefly in applying particular passages to his own individual case and exigencies; though in this there may be much weakness, some Delusion and imminent Danger of more, I cannot but join with Henry More in avowing, that I feel knit to such a man in the bonds of a common faith far more closely, than to those who receive neither the Letter, nor the Spirit, turning the one into metaphor and oriental hyperbole, in order to explain away the other into the influence of motives suggested by their own understandings, and realized by their own strength.

APHORISMS

ON THAT

WHICH IS INDEED SPIRITUAL RELIGION.

IN the selection of the Extracts that form the remainder of this Volume and of the Comments affixed, the Editor had the following Objects principally in view. First, to exhibit the true and scriptural meaning and intent of several Articles of Faith, that are rightly classed among the Mysteries and peculiar Doctrines of Christianity. Secondly, to show the perfect rationality of these Doctrines, and their freedom from all just Objection when examined by their proper Organ, the Reason and Conscience of Man. Lastly, to exhibit from the Works of Leighton, who perhaps of all our learned protestant Theologians best deserves the title of a Spiritual Divine, an instructive and affecting picture of the contemplations, reflections, conflicts, consolations and monitory experiences of a philosophic and richly-gifted mind, amply stored with all the knowledge that Books and long intercourse with men of the most discordant characters can give, under the convictions, impressions, and habits of a Spiritual Religion.

To obviate a possible disappointment in any of my Readers, who may chance to be engaged in theological studies, it may be well to notice, that in vindicating the peculiar tenets of our Faith, I have not entered on the Doctrine of the Trinity, or the still profounder Mystery of the Origin of Moral Evil—and this for the reasons following: 1. These Doctrines are not (strictly speaking) subjects of *Reflection*, in the proper sense of this word: and both of them demand a power and persistency of Abstraction, and a previous discipline in the highest forms of human thought, which it would be unwise, if not presumptuous, to expect from any, who require “*Aids to Reflection*,” or would be likely to seek them in the present Work. 2. In my intercourse with men of various ranks and ages, I have found the far larger number of serious and inquiring Persons little if at all disquieted by doubts respecting Articles of Faith, that are simply above their comprehension. It is only where the Belief required of them jars with their *moral* feelings; where a Doctrine in the sense, in which they have been taught to receive it, appears to contradict their clear notions of Right and Wrong, or to be at variance with the divine Attributes of Goodness and Justice; that these men are surprised, perplexed, and alas! not seldom offended and alienated. Such are the Doctrines of Arbitrary Election and Reprobation; the Sentence to everlasting Torment by an eternal and necessitating Decree; vicarious Atonement, and the necessity of the Abasement, Agony and ignominious Death of a most holy and meritorious Person, to ap-

pease the Wrath of God. Now it is more especially for such Persons, unwilling Sceptics, who believing earnestly ask help for their unbelief, that this Volume was compiled, and the Comments written: and therefore, to the Scripture Doctrines, *intended* by the above-mentioned, my principal attention has been directed.

But lastly, the whole Scheme of the Christian Faith, including *all* the Articles of Belief common to the Greek and Latin, the Roman and the Protestant Church, with the threefold proof, that it is *ideally*, *morally*, and *historically* true, will be found exhibited and vindicated in a proportionally larger Work, the principal Labour of my Life since Manhood, and which I am now preparing for the Press under the title, Assertion of Religion, as necessarily *involving* Revelation; and of Christianity, as the only Revelation of permanent and universal validity.

APHORISM I.

LEIGHTON.

Where, if not in Christ, is the Power that can persuade a Sinner to return, that can *bring home a Heart to God?*

Common mercies of God, though they have a leading faculty to repentance, (Rom. ii. 4.) yet, the rebellious heart will not be led by them. The judgments of God, public or personal, though they ought to drive us to God, yet the heart, unchanged, runs the further from God. Do we not see it by ourselves and other sinners about us? They look not at all towards Him who smites, much less do they return; or

if any more serious thoughts of returning arise upon the surprise of an affliction, how soon vanish they, either the stroke abating, or the heart, by time, growing hard and senseless under it! Leave Christ out, I say, and all other means work not this way; neither the works nor the word of God sounding daily in his ear, *Return, return.* Let the noise of the rod speak it too, and both join together to make the cry the louder, *yet the wicked will do wickedly,* Dan. xii. 10.

COMMENT.

By the phrase “in Christ,” I mean all the supernatural Aids vouchsafed and conditionally promised in the Christian Dispensation: and among them the Spirit of Truth, which the world cannot receive, were it only that the knowledge of *spiritual* Truth is of necessity immediate and *intuitive*: and the World or Natural Man possesses no higher intuitions than those of the pure *Sense*, which are the subjects of *Mathematical* Science. But *Aids*, observe! Therefore, not *by* the Will of man alone; but neither *without* the Will. The doctrine of modern Calvinism, as layed down by Jonathan Edwards and the late Dr. Williams, which represents a Will absolutely passive, clay in the hands of a Potter, destroys all Will, takes away its essence and definition, as effectually as in saying—This Circle is square—I should deny the figure to be a Circle at all. It was in strict consistency therefore, that these Writers supported the Necessitarian Scheme, and made the relation of Cause and Effect the Law of the Uni-

verse, subjecting to its mechanism the moral World no less than the material or physical. It follows, that all is Nature. Thus, though few Writers use the term Spirit more frequently, they in effect deny its existence, and evacuate the term of all its proper meaning. With such a system not the Wit of Man nor all the Theodices ever framed by human ingenuity before and since the attempt of the celebrated Leibnitz, can reconcile the Sense of Responsibility, nor the fact of the difference *in kind* between REGRET and REMORSE. The same compulsion of Consequence drove the Fathers of Modern (or Pseudo-) Calvinism to the origination of Holiness in Power, of Justice in Right of Property, and whatever other outrages on the common sense and moral feelings of Mankind they have sought to cover, under the fair name of *Sovereign Grace*.

I will not take on me to defend sundry harsh and inconvenient Expressions in the Works of Calvin. Phrases equally strong and Assertions not less rash and startling are no rarities in the Writings of Luther : for Catachresis was the favourite Figure of Speech in that age. But let not the opinions of either on this most fundamental Subject be confounded with the New-England System, now entitled Calvinistic. The fact is simply this. Luther considered the Pretensions to Free-will *boastful*, and better suited to the budge Doctors of the Stoic Fur, than to the Preachers of the Gospel, whose great Theme is the Redemption of the Will from Slavery ; the restoration of the Will to perfect Freedom being the *end* and consummation of the

redemptive Process, and the same with the entrance of the Soul into Glory, *i. e.* its union with Christ: "GLORY" (John xvii. 5.) being one of the names of the Spiritual Messiah. Prospectively to this we are to understand the words of our Lord, At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, John xiv. 20: the freedom of a finite will being possible under this condition only, that it has become one with the will of God. Now as the difference of a captive and enslaved Will, and *no* Will at all, such is the difference between the *Lutheranism* of Calvin and the Calvinism of Jonathan Edwards.

APHORISM II.

LEIGHTON.

There is nothing in religion farther out of Nature's reach, and more remote from the natural man's liking and believing, than the doctrine of Redemption by a Saviour, and by a crucified Saviour. It is comparatively easy to persuade men of the necessity of an amendment of conduct; it is more difficult to make them see the necessity of Repentance in the *Gospel* sense, the necessity of a change in the *principle* of action; but to convince men of the necessity of the Death of Christ is the most difficult of all. And yet the first is but varnish and white-wash without the second; and the second but a barren notion without the last. Alas! of those who admit the doctrine in words, how large a number evade it in fact, and empty it of all its substance and efficacy, making the effect the efficient cause, or attributing their election to Salvation to a

supposed Foresight of their Faith, Obedience. But it is most vain to imagine a faith in such and such men, which, being foreseen by God, determined him to elect them for salvation: were it only that nothing at all is *future*, or can have this imagined *futurition*, but *as* it is decreed, and *because* it is decreed by God so to be.

COMMENT.

No impartial person, competently acquainted with the History of the Reformation, and the works of the earlier protestant Divines at home and abroad, even to the close of Elizabeth's reign, will deny that the Doctrines of Calvin on Redemption and the natural state of fallen Man, are in all essential points the same as those of Luther, Zuinglius, and the first reformers collectively. These Doctrines have, however, since the re-establishment of the Episcopal Church at the return of the second Charles, been as generally* ex-

* At a period, in which Doctors Marsh and Wordsworth have, by the Zealots on one side, been charged with popish principles on account of their *Anti-bibliolatry*, and the sturdy Adherents of the doctrines common to Luther and Calvin, and the literal interpreters of the Articles and Homilies, are (I wish I could say, *altogether* without any fault of their own) regarded by the Clergy generally as virtual Schismatics, Dividers of, though not *from*, the Church, it is serving the cause of charity to assist in circulating the following instructive passage from the Life of Bishop Hackett respecting the disputes between the Augustinians, or Luthero-calvinistic Divines and the Grotians of his Age: in which controversy (says his Biographer) he, Hackett, "was ever very moderate."

changed for what is commonly entitled Arminianism, but which, taken as a complete and explicit Scheme of Belief, it would be both historically and theologically more accurate to call *Grotianism*, or Christianity according to Grotius. The change was not, we may readily believe, effected without a struggle. In the Romish Church this latitudinarian System, patronized by the Jesuits, was manfully resisted by Jansenius, Arnauld, and Pascal; in our own Church by the Bishops Davenant, Sanderson, Hall, and the Arch-

“ But having been bred under Bishop Davenant and Dr. Ward in Cambridge, he was addicted to their sentiments. Archbishop Usher would say, that Davenant understood those controversies better than ever any man did since St. Augustin. But he (Bishop Hackett) used to say, that he was *sure* he had *three* excellent men of his mind in this controversy, 1. *Padre Paulo* (Father Paul) whose Letter is extant to Heinsius, *anno* 1604. 2. *Thomas Aquinas*. 3. St. Augustin. But besides and above them all, he believed in his Conscience that St. Paul was of the same mind likewise. Yet at the same time he would profess, that he disliked no Arminians, but such as revile and defame every one who is *not so*: and he would often commend Arminius himself for his excellent Wit and Parts, but only tax his want of reading and knowledge in Antiquity. And he ever held, it was the foolishhest thing in the world to say the Arminians were *popishly* inclined, when so many Dominicans and Jansenists were rigid followers of Augustin in these points: and no less foolish to say that the *Anti-arminians* were Puritans or Presbyterians when *Ward*, and *Davenant*, and *Prideaux*, and *Brownrig*, those stout Champions for Episcopacy, were decided Anti-Arminians: while Arminius himself was ever a Presbyterian. Therefore he greatly commended the moderation of our Church, which extended equal Communion to both.”

bishops Usher and Leighton: and in the latter half of the preceding Aphorism the Reader has a *specimen* of the *reasonings* by which Leighton strove to invalidate or counterpoise the *reasonings* of the Innovators.

Passages of this sort are, however, of rare occurrence in Leighton's works. Happily for thousands, he was more usefully employed in making his Readers feel, that the Doctrines in question, *scripturally treated, and taken as co-organized parts of a great organic whole*, need no such reasonings. And better still would it have been, had he left them altogether for those, who severally detaching the great Features of Revelation from the living Context of Scripture, do by that very act destroy their life and purpose. And then, like the Eyes of the *Aranea prodigiosa**, they become clouded microscopes, to exaggerate and distort all the other parts and proportions. No offence then will be occasioned, I trust, by the frank avowal that I have given to the preceding passage a place among the Spiritual Aphorisms for the sake of the Comment: the following Remark having been the first marginal Note I had pencilled on Leighton's Pages, and thus (remotely, at least), the occasion of the present Work.

Leighton, I observed, throughout his inestimable Work, avoids all metaphysical views of Election, relatively to God, and confines himself to the Doctrine in its relation to Man: and in that sense too, in which every Christian may judge who strives to be sincere with his

* The gigantic Indian Spider. See Baker's Microscopic Experiments.

own heart. The following may, I think, be taken as a safe and useful Rule in religious inquiries. Ideas, that derive their origin and substance from the *Moral Being*, and to the reception of which as true *objectively* (*i. e.* as corresponding to a *reality* out of the human mind) we are determined by a *practical* interest exclusively, may not, like theoretical or speculative Positions, be pressed onward into all their possible *logical* consequences. The Law of Conscience, and not the Canons of discursive Reasoning, must decide in such cases. At least, the latter has no validity, which the single *Veto* of the former is not sufficient to nullify. The most pious conclusion is here the most legitimate.

It is too seldom considered, though most worthy of consideration, how far even those Ideas or Theories of pure Speculation, that bear the same name with the Objects of Religious Faith, are indeed the same. Out of the principles necessarily presumed in all discursive Thinking, and which being, in the first place, *universal*, and secondly, antecedent to every particular exercise of the Understanding, are therefore referred to the Reason, the human Mind (wherever its powers are sufficiently developed, and its attention strongly directed to speculative or theoretical inquiries,) forms certain Essences, to which for its own purposes it gives a sort of notional *Subsistence*. Hence they are called *Entia rationalia*: the conversion of which into *Entia realia*, or real Objects, by aid of the Imagination, has in all times been the fruitful Stock of empty Theories, and mischievous Superstitions, of surreptitious Pre-

mises and extravagant Conclusions. For as these substantiated Notions were in many instances expressed by the same terms, as the objects of religious Faith ; as in most instances they were applied, though deceptively, to the explanation of real experiences ; and lastly, from the gratifications, which the pride and ambition of man received from the supposed extension of his Knowledge and Insight ; it was too easily forgotten or overlooked, that the stablest and most indispensable of these notional Beings were but the necessary *forms* of Thinking, taken abstractedly : and that like the breadthless Lines, depthless Surfaces, and perfect Circles of Geometry, they subsist wholly and solely in and for the Mind, that contemplates them. Where the evidence of the Senses fails us, and beyond the precincts of sensible experience, there is no *Reality* attributable to any Notion, but what is given to it by Revelation, or the Law of Conscience, or the necessary interests of Morality.

Take an instance ;

It is the office, and as it were, the instinct of Reason to bring a unity into all our conceptions and several knowledges. On this all system depends : and without this we could reflect connectedly neither on nature or our own minds. Now this is possible only on the assumption or hypothesis of a ONE as the ground and cause of the Universe, and which in all succession and through all changes is the subject neither of Time or Change. The ONE must be contemplated as Eternal and Immutable.

Well! the Idea, which is the basis of Religion, commanded by the Conscience and required by Morality, contains the same truths, or at least Truths that can be expressed in no other terms; but this Idea presents itself to our mind with additional Attributes, and these too not formed by mere Abstraction and Negation—with the Attributes of Holiness, Providence, Love, Justice, and Mercy. It comprehends, moreover, the independent (*extra-mundane*) existence and personality of the supreme ONE, as our Creator, Lord, and Judge.

The hypothesis of a *one* Ground and Principle of the Universe (necessary as an *hypothesis*; but having only a *logical* and *conditional* necessity) is thus raised into the Idea of the LIVING GOD, the supreme Object of our Faith, Love, Fear, and Adoration. Religion and Morality do indeed constrain us to declare him Eternal and Immutable. But if from the Eternity of the Supreme Being a Reasoner should deduce the impossibility of a Creation; or conclude with Aristotle, that the Creation was co-eternal; or, like the later Platonists, should turn Creation into *Emanation*, and make the universe proceed from Deity, as the Sunbeams from the Solar Orb;—or if from the divine Immutability he should infer, that all Prayer and Supplication must be vain and superstitious: then however evident and logically necessary such conclusions may appear, it is scarcely worth our while to examine, whether they are so or not. The Positions themselves *must* be false. For were they true, the Idea would lose the sole ground of its *reality*. It would be no longer the Idea intended

by the Believer in *his* premise—in the Premise, with which alone Religion and Morality are concerned. The very subject of the discussion would be changed. It would no longer be the GOD, in whom we *believe*; but a stoical FATE, or the superessential ONE of Plotinus, to whom neither Intelligence, or Self-consciousness, or Life, or even *Being* dare be attributed; or lastly, the World itself, the indivisible one and only substance (*substantia una et unica*) of Spinoza, of which all Phænomena, all particular and individual Things, Lives, Minds, Thoughts, and Actions are but modifications.

Let the Believer never be alarmed by Objections wholly speculative, however plausible on speculative grounds such objections may appear, if he can but satisfy himself, that the *Result* is repugnant to the dictates of Conscience, and irreconcilable with the interests of Morality. For to baffle the Objector we have only to demand of him, by what right and under what authority he converts a Thought into a Substance, or asserts the existence of a real somewhat corresponding to a Notion not derived from the experience of his Senses. It will be of no purpose for him to answer, that it is a *legitimate* Notion. The *Notion* may have its mould in the understanding; but its realization must be the work of the FANCY.

A reflecting Reader will easily apply these remarks to the subject of Election, one of the stumbling stones in the ordinary conceptions of the Christian Faith, to which the Infidel points in scorn, and which far better

men pass by in silent perplexity. Yet surely, from mistaken conceptions of the Doctrine. I suppose the person, with whom I am arguing, already so far a Believer, as to have convinced himself, both that a state of enduring Bliss is attainable under certain conditions; and that these conditions consist in his compliance with the directions given and rules prescribed in the Christian Scriptures. These rules he likewise admits to be such, that, by the very law and constitution of the human mind, a full and faithful compliance with them cannot but have *consequences*, of some sort or other. But these *consequences* are moreover distinctly described, enumerated, and promised in the same Scriptures, in which the Conditions are recorded; and though some of them may be apparent to God only, yet the greater number are of such a nature that they cannot exist unknown to the Individual, in and for whom they exist. As little possible is it, that he should find these consequences in himself, and not find in them the sure marks and the safe pledges, that he is at the time in the right road to the Life promised under these conditions. Now I dare assert, that no such man, however fervent his charity, and however deep his humility, may be, can peruse the records of History with a reflecting spirit, or “look round the world” with an observant eye, and not find himself compelled to admit, that *all* men are *not* on the right Road. He cannot help judging, that even in Christian countries Many, a fearful Many! have not their faces turned toward it.

This then is mere matter of fact. Now comes the question. Shall the Believer, who thus hopes on the appointed *grounds* of Hope, attribute this distinction exclusively to his own resolves and strivings? or if not exclusively, yet primarily and principally? Shall he refer the first movements and preparations to his own Will and Understanding, and bottom his claim to the Promises on his own comparative excellence? If not, if no man dare take this honour to himself, to whom shall he assign it, if not to that Being in whom the Promise originated and on whom its Fulfilment depends? If he stop here, who shall blame him? By what argument shall his reasoning be invalidated, that might not be urged with equal force against any essential difference between Obedient and Disobedient, Christian and Worldling? that would not imply that both *sorts* alike are, in the sight of God, the Sons of God by adoption? If he stop here, I say, who shall drive him from his position? For thus far he is practically concerned—this the Conscience requires, this the highest interests of Morality demand. It is a question of Facts, of the Will and the Deed, to argue against which on the abstract notions and possibilities of the speculative Reason is as unreasonable, as an attempt to decide a question of Colours by pure Geometry, or to unsettle the classes and specific characters of Natural History by the Doctrine of Fluxions.

But if the Self-examinant will abandon this position, and exchange the safe circle of Religion and practical Reason for the shifting Sand-wastes and *Mirages* of

Speculative Theology; if instead of seeking after the *marks* of Election in himself he undertakes to determine the ground and origin, the possibility and mode of Election itself *in relation to God*;—in this case, and whether he does it for the satisfaction of curiosity, or from the ambition of answering those, who would call God himself to account, why and by what right certain Souls were born in Africa instead of England? or why (seeing that it is against all reason and goodness to choose a worse when being omnipotent he could have created a better) God did not create Beasts Men, and Men Angels? or why God created any men but with pre-knowledge of their obedience, and left any occasion for Election?—in this case, I say, we can only regret, that the Inquirer had not been better instructed in the nature, the bounds, the true purposes and proper objects of his intellectual faculties, and that he had not previously asked himself, by what appropriate Sense, or Organ of Knowledge, he hoped to secure an insight into a Nature which was neither an Object of his Senses, nor a part of his Self-consciousness! and so leave him to ward off shadowy Spears with the shadow of a Shield, and to retaliate the nonsense of Blasphemy with the Abracadabra of Presumption. He that will fly without wings must fly in his dreams: and till he awakes, will not find out, that to fly in a dream is but to dream of flying.

Thus then the Doctrine of Election is in itself a necessary inference from an undeniable fact—necessary at least for all who hold that the best of men are what they are through the grace of God. In relation to the

Believer it is a *Hope*, which if it spring out of Christian Principles, be examined by the tests and nourished by the means prescribed in Scripture, will become a *lively*, an *assured Hope*, but which cannot in this life pass into *knowledge*, much less certainty of fore-knowledge. The contrary belief does indeed make the article of Election both tool and parcel of a mad and mischievous fanaticism. But with what force and clearness does not the Apostle confute, disclaim, and prohibit the pretence, treating it as a downright contradiction in terms! See Romans, viii. 24.

But though I hold the doctrine handled as Leighton handles it (that is practically, morally, *humanly*) rational, safe, and of essential importance, I see many * reasons resulting from the peculiar circumstances, under

* *Exempli gratia*: at the date of St. Paul's Epistles the (Roman) World may be resembled to a Mass in the Furnace in the first moment of fusion, here a speck and there a spot of the melted Metal shining pure and brilliant amid the scum and dross. To have received the *name* of Christian was a privilege, a high and distinguishing favour. No wonder therefore, that in St. Paul's writings the words, Elect and Election, often, nay, most often mean the same as *eccalūmeni*, *ecclesia*, i. e. those who have been *called out* of the World: and it is a dangerous perversion of the Apostle's word to interpret it in the sense, in which it was used by our Lord, viz. in *opposition to the Called*. (Many are *called* but few *chosen*). In St. Paul's sense and at that time the Believers collectively formed a small and select number; and every Christian, real or nominal, was one of the Elect. Add too, that this ambiguity is increased by the accidental circumstance, that the *kyriak*, *Ædes Dominicæ*, Lord's House, *Kirk*; and *Ecclesia*, the sum total of the *Eccalūmeni*, *evocati*, *Called-out*; are both rendered by the same word Church.

which St. Paul preached and wrote, why a discreet Minister of the Gospel should avoid the frequent use of the *term*, and express the *meaning* in other words perfectly equivalent and equally scriptural: lest in *saying* truth he might convey error.

Had my purpose been confined to one particular Tenet, an apology might be required for so long a Comment. But the Reader will, I trust, have already perceived, that my Object has been to establish a general Rule of interpretation and vindication applicable to *all* doctrinal Tenets, and especially to the (so called) Mysteries of the Christian Faith: to provide a *Safety-lamp* for religious inquirers. Now this I find in the principle, that all Revealed Truths are to be judged of by us, as far as they are possible subjects of human Conception, or grounds of Practice, or in some way connected with our moral and spiritual Interests. In order to have a reason *for* forming a judgment on any given article, we must be sure that we possess a Reason, by and according to which a judgment may be formed. Now in respect of all Truths, to which a *real* independent existence is assigned, and which yet are not contained in, or to be imagined under, any form of Space or Time, it is strictly demonstrable, that the human Reason, considered abstractly as the source of positive *Science* and theoretical *Insight*, is *not* such a Reason. At the utmost, it has only a *negative* voice. In other words, nothing can be allowed as true for the human Mind, which directly contradicts this Reason. But even here, before we admit the existence of any such

contradiction, we must be careful to ascertain, that there is no equivocation in play, that two different subjects are not confounded under one and the same word. A striking instance of this has been adduced in the difference between the notional ONE of the Ontologists, and the Idea of the Living God.

But if not the abstract or speculative Reason, and yet a Reason there must be in order to a rational Belief—then it must be the *Practical* Reason of Man, comprehending the Will, the Conscience, the Moral Being with its inseparable Interests and Affections—that Reason, namely, which is the Organ of *Wisdom*, and (as far as Man is concerned) the Source of living and actual Truths.

From these premises we may further deduce, that every doctrine is to be interpreted in reference to those, to whom it has been revealed, or who have or have had the means of knowing or hearing the same. For instance: the Doctrine that there is no name under Heaven, by which a man can be saved, but the name of Jesus. If the word here rendered *Name*, may be understood (as it well may, and as in other texts it must be) as meaning the Power, or originating Cause, I see no objection on the part of the Practical Reason to our belief of the declaration in its whole extent. It is true universally or not true at all. If there be any redemptive Power not contained in the Power of Jesus, then Jesus is not *the* Redeemer: not the Redeemer of the *World*, not the Jesus (i. e. Saviour) of *Mankind*. But if with Tertullian and Augustin we make the

Text assert the condemnation and misery of all who are not Christians by Baptism and explicit Belief in the Revelation of the New Covenant—then I say, the doctrine is true *to all intents and purposes*. It is true, in every respect, in which any practical, moral, or spiritual Interest or End can be connected with its truth. It is true in respect to every man who has had, or who might have had, the Gospel preached to him. It is true and obligatory for every Christian Community and for every individual Believer, wherever the opportunity is afforded of spreading the *Light* of the Gospel and making *known* the name of the only Saviour and Redeemer. For even though the uninformed Heathens should *not* perish, the *guilt* of their Perishing will attach to those who not only had no certainty of their safety, but who were commanded to *act* on the supposition of the contrary. But if, on the other hand, a theological Dogmatist should attempt to persuade me, that this Text was intended to give us an historical knowledge of God's future Actions and Dealings—and for the gratification of our Curiosity to inform us, that Socrates and Phocion, together with all the Savages in the untravelled Woods and Wilds of Africa and America, will be sent to keep company with the Devil and his Angels in everlasting Torments—I should remind him, that the purpose of Scripture was to teach us our duty, not to enable us to sit in judgment on the souls of our fellow creatures.

One other instance will, I trust, prevent all misconception of my meaning. I am clearly convinced, that

the scriptural and only true* Idea of God will, in its developement, be found to involve the Idea of the Trinity. But I am likewise convinced, that previous to the promulgation of the Gospel the Doctrine had no claim on the Faith of Mankind: though it might have been a legitimate Contemplation for a speculative philosopher, a Theorem in Metaphysics valid in the Schools.

I form a certain notion in my mind, and say: this is what *I* understand by the term, God. From books and conversation I find, that the Learned generally connect the same notion with the same word. I then apply the Rules, laid down by the Masters of Logic, for the involution and evolution of Terms, and prove (to as many as agree with me in my premises) that the Notion, God, involves the Notion, Trinity. I now pass out of the Schools, and enter into discourse with some friend or neighbour, unversed in the *formal* sciences, unused to the processes of Abstraction, neither Logician or Metaphysician; but sensible and single-minded, “an Israelite indeed,” trusting in “the Lord God of his Fathers, even the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob.” If I speak of God to *him*, what will *he* understand me to be speaking of? What does he mean, and suppose me to mean, by the word? An Accident or Product of the reasoning faculty, or an Abstraction which the human Mind forms by reflect-

* Or (I might have added) *any* Idea which does not either identify the Creator with the Creation; or else represent the Supreme Being as a mere impersonal LAW or *Ordo ordinans*, differing from the Law of Gravitation only by its *universality*.

ing on its own thoughts and forms of thinking? No. By God he understands me to mean an existing and self-subsisting reality*, a real and personal Being—

* I have elsewhere remarked on the assistance which those that labour after distinct conceptions would receive from the re-introduction of the terms *objective* and *subjective*, *objective and subjective reality*, &c. as substitutes for *real* and *notional*, and to the exclusion of the false antithesis between *real* and *ideal*. For the Student in that noblest of the Sciences, the Scire teipsum, the advantage would be especially great*. The few sentences that follow, in illustration of the terms here advocated, will not, I trust, be a waste of the Reader's Time.


The celebrated Euler having demonstrated certain properties of Arches, adds: "All experience is in contradiction to this; but this is no reason for doubting its truth." The words *sound paradoxical*; but mean no more than this—that the mathematical properties of Figure and Space are not less certainly the properties of Figure and Space because they can never be perfectly realized in wood, stone, or iron. Now this assertion of Euler's might be expressed at once, briefly and simply, by saying, that the properties in question were *subjectively* true, though not *objectively*—or that the Mathematical Arch possessed a *subjective reality*, though incapable of being realized *objectively*.

In like manner if I had to express my conviction, that Space was not itself a *Thing*, but a *mode* or *form* of perceiving, or the inward ground and condition in the Percipient, in consequence of which Things are seen as outward and co-existing, I convey

* See the "*Selection from Mr. Coleridge's Literary Correspondence*" in Blackwood's Ed. Magazine, for October 1821, Letter ii. p. 244—253, which, however, should any of my Readers take the trouble of consulting, he must be content with such parts as he finds intelligible at the first perusal. For from defects in the MS., and without any fault on the part of the Editor, too large a portion is so printed that the man must be equally bold and fortunate in his conjectural readings who can make out any meaning at all.

even the *Person*, the I AM, who sent Moses to his Forefathers in Egypt. Of the actual existence of this at once by the words, Space is *subjective*, or Space is real in and for the *Subject* alone.

If I am asked, why not say in and for the *mind*, which every one would understand? I reply: we know indeed, that all minds are Subjects; but are by no means certain, that all Subjects are Minds. For a Mind is a Subject that knows itself, or a Subject that is its own Object. The inward principle of Growth and individual Form in every Seed and Plant is a *Subject*, and without any exertion of poetic privilege Poets may speak of the *Soul* of the Flower. But the man would be a Dreamer, who otherwise than poetically should speak of Roses and Lilies as *self-conscious* Subjects. Lastly, by the assistance of the terms, Object and Subject, thus used as correspondent Opposites, or as Negative and Positive in Physics (ex. gr. Neg. and Pos. Electricity) we may arrive at the distinct import and proper use of the strangely misused word, Idea. And as the Forms of Logic are all borrowed from Geometry (*Ratiocinatio discursiva formas suas sive canonas recipit ab intuitu*), I may be permitted so to elucidate my present meaning. Every Line may be, and by the ancient Geometricians was, considered as a point *produced*, the two extremes being its poles, while the Point itself remains in, or is at least represented by, the mid-point, the Indifference of the two poles or correlative opposites. Logically applied, the two extremes or poles are named Thesis and Antithesis: thus in the line



we have T = Thesis, A = Antithesis, and I = Punctum Indifferens sive *Amphotericum*, which latter is to be conceived as *both* in as far as it may be *either* of the two former. Observe: not both at the same time in the same relation: for this would be the *Identity* of T and A, not the *Indifference*. But so, that relatively to A I is equal to T, and relatively to T it becomes = A. Thus in chemistry Sulphuretted Hydrogen is an Acid.

this divine Person he has the same historical assurance as of theirs; confirmed indeed by the Book of Nature,

relatively to the more powerful Alkalis, and an Alkali relatively to a powerful Acid. Yet one other remark, and I pass to the question. In order to render the constructions of pure Mathematics applicable to Philosophy, the Pythagoreans, I imagine, represented the Line as *generated*, or, as it were, radiated, by a Point not contained in the Line but independent, and (in the language of that School) transcendent to all production, which it caused but did not partake in. *Facit, non patitur*. This was the *Punctum invisibile, et presuppositum*: and in this way the Pythagoreans guarded against the error of Pantheism, into which the later schools fell. The assumption of this Point I call the logical PROTHESIS. We have now therefore four Relations of Thought expressed: *viz.* 1. Prothesis, or the Identity of T and A, which is neither, because in it, as the transcendent of both, both are contained and exist as one. Taken *absolutely*, this finds its application in the Supreme Being alone, the Pythagorean TETRACTYS; the INEFFABLE NAME, to which no Image dare be attached; the Point, which has no (real) Opposite or Counter-point, &c. But *relatively* taken and inadequately, the germinal power of every seed (see p. 68) might be generalized under the relation of Identity. 2. Thesis or Position. 3. Antithesis, or Opposition. 4. Indifference. (To which when we add the Synthesis or Composition, in its several forms of Equilibrium, as in quiescent Electricity; of Neutralization, as of Oxygen and Hydrogen in Water; and of Predominance, as of Hydrogen and Carbon with Hydrogen predominant, in pure Alcohol, or of Carbon and Hydrogen, with the comparative predominance of the Carbon, in Oil; we complete the five most general Forms or Preconceptions of Constructive Logic).

And now for the Answer to the Question, What is an IDEA, if it mean neither an Impression on the Senses, nor a definite Conception, nor an abstract Notion? (And if it does mean either of these, the word is superfluous: and while it remains

as soon and as far as that stronger and better Light has taught him to read and construe it—confirmed by

undetermined which of these is meant by the word, or whether it is not *which you please*, it is worse than superfluous. See the STATESMAN'S MANUAL, Appendix *ad finem*). But supposing the word to have a meaning of its own, what does it mean? What is an IDEA? In answer to this I commence with the *absolutely* Real, as the PROTHESIS; the *subjectively* Real as the THESIS; the *objectively* Real as the ANTITHESIS: and I affirm, that Idea is the INDIFFERENCE of the two—so namely, that if it be conceived as in the Subject, the Idea is an Object, and possesses Objective Truth; but if in an Object, it is then a Subject, and is necessarily thought of as exercising the powers of a Subject. Thus an IDEA conceived as subsisting in an Object becomes a LAW; and a Law contemplated *subjectively* (in a mind) is an Idea.

In the third and last Section of my “Elements of Discourse;” in which (after having in the two former sections treated of the Common or Syllogistic Logic—the science of legitimate *Conclusions*; and the Critical Logic, or the Criteria of Truth and Falsehood in all *Premises*) I have given at full my scheme of Constructive Reasoning, or “Logic as the Organ of Philosophy,” in the same sense as the Mathematics are the Organ of Science; the Reader will find proofs of the Utility of this Scheme, including the five-fold Division above-stated, and numerous examples of its application. Nor is it only in Theology that its importance will be felt, but equally, nay in a greater degree, as an instrument of Discovery and universal Method in Physics, Physiology, and Statistics. As this third Section does not pretend to the forensic and comparatively popular character and utility of the parts preceding, one of the Objects of the present Note is to obtain the opinions of judicious friends respecting the expedience of publishing it, in the same form, indeed, and as an Annexment to the “Elements of Discourse,” yet so as that each may be purchased separately.

it, I say, but not derived from it. Now by what right can I require this Man (and of such men the great majority of serious Believers consisted, previous to the Light of the Gospel) to receive a *Notion* of mine, wholly alien from his habits of thinking, because it may be logically deduced from another Notion, with which he was almost as little acquainted, and not at all concerned? Grant for a moment, that the latter (i. e. the Notion, with which I first set out) as soon as it is combined with the assurance of a corresponding Reality becomes identical with the true and effective Idea of God! Grant, that in thus *realizing* the Notion I am warranted by Revelation, the Law of Conscience, and the interests and necessities of my Moral Being! Yet by what authority, by what inducement, am I entitled to attach the same reality to a second Notion, a Notion drawn from a Notion? It is evident, that if I have the same Right, it must be on the same grounds. Revelation must have assured it, my Conscience required it—or in some way or other I must have an *interest* in this belief. It must *concern* me, as a moral and responsible Being. Now these grounds were first given in the Redemption of Mankind by Christ, the Saviour and Mediator: and by the utter incompatibility of these offices with a mere Creature. On the doctrine of Redemption depends the *Faith*, the *Duty*, of believing in the Divinity of our Lord. And this again is the strongest Ground for the reality of that Idea, in which alone this Divinity can be received without breach of the faith in the unity of the Godhead. But such is the Idea of the Trinity. Strong as the motives are that

induce me to defer the full discussion of this great Article of the Christian Creed, I cannot withstand the request of several Divines, whose situation and extensive services entitle them to the utmost deference, that I should so far deviate from my first intention as at least to indicate the point on which I stand, and to prevent the misconception of my purpose: as if I held the doctrine of the Trinity for a truth which Men could be called on to believe by mere force of reasoning, independently of any positive *Revelation*. In short, it had been reported in certain circles, that I considered this doctrine as a demonstrable part of the Religion of Nature. Now though it might be sufficient to say, this I regard the very phrase “*Revealed Religion*” as a pleonasm, inasmuch as a religion not revealed is, in my judgment, no religion at all; I have no objection to announce more particularly and distinctly what I do and what I do not maintain on this point: provided that in the following paragraph, with this view inserted, the reader will look for nothing more than a plain *statement* of my Opinions. The grounds on which they rest, and the arguments by which they are to be vindicated, are for another place.

I hold then, it is true, that all the (so called) Demonstrations of a God either prove too little, as that from the Order and apparent Purpose in Nature; or too much, *viz.* that the World is itself God; or they clandestinely involve the conclusion in the Premises, passing off the mere analysis or explication of an Assertion for the Proof of it,—a species of logical legerdemain not unlike that of the Jugglers at a Fair,

who putting into their mouths what seems to be a walnut, draw out a score yards of Ribbon—as in the Postulate of a First Cause. And lastly, all these Demonstrations presuppose the Idea or Conception of a God without being able to authenticate it, i. e. to give an account whence they obtained it. For it is clear, that the Proof first mentioned and the most natural and convincing of all (the Cosmological I mean or that from the Order in Nature) presupposes the Ontological—i. e. the proof of a God from the necessity and necessary *Objectivity* of the Idea. *If* the latter can assure us of a God as an existing Reality, the former will go far to prove his Power, Wisdom, and Benevolence. All this I hold. But I also hold, that this Truth, the hardest to demonstrate, is the one which of all others least needs to be demonstrated; that though there may be no conclusive demonstrations of a good, wise, living and personal God, there are so many convincing reasons for it, within and without—a grain of sand sufficing, and a whole universe at hand to echo the decision!—that for every mind not devoid of all reason, and desperately conscience-proof, the Truth which it is the least possible to prove, it is little less than impossible not to believe! only indeed just so much short of impossible, as to leave some room for the will and the moral election, and thereby to keep it a truth of Religion, and the possible subject of a Commandment*.

* In a letter to a Friend on the mathematical Atheists of the French Revolution, La Lande and others, or rather on a young man

On this account I do not demand of a *Deist*, that he should adopt the doctrine of the Trinity. For he might very well be justified in replying, that he rejected the doctrine, *not* because it could not be *demonstrated*, nor yet on the score of any incomprehensibilities and seeming contradictions that might be objected to it, as knowing that these might be, and in fact had been, urged with equal force against a personal God under any form capable of Love and Veneration; *but* because he had not the same theoretical necessity, the same interests and instincts of Reason for the one hypothesis as for the other. It is not enough, the Deist might justly say, that there is no cogent reason why I should *not* believe the Trinity: you must show me some cogent reason why I *should*.

But the case is quite different with a Christian, who of distinguished abilities, but an avowed and proselyting Partizan of their Tenets, I concluded with these words: "The man who will believe nothing but by force of demonstrative evidence (even though it is strictly demonstrable that the demonstrability required would countervene all the purposes of the Truth in question, all that render the belief of the same desirable or obligatory) is not in a state of mind to be reasoned with on any subject. But if he further denies the *fact* of the Law of Conscience, and the essential difference between Right and Wrong, I confess, he puzzles me. I cannot without gross inconsistency appeal to his Conscience and Moral Sense, or I should admonish him that, as an honest man, he ought to *advertise* himself, with a *Cavete omnes! Scelus sum.* And as an honest man myself, I dare not advise him on prudential grounds to keep his opinions secret, lest I should make myself his accomplice, and *be helping him on with a Wrap-rascal.*"

accepts the Scriptures as the Word of God, yet refuses his assent to the plainest declarations of these Scriptures, and explains away the most express texts into metaphor and hyperbole, *because* the literal and obvious interpretation is (according to *his* notions) absurd and contrary to reason. *He* is bound to show, that it is so in any sense, not equally applicable to the texts asserting the Being, Infinity, and Personality of God the Father, the Eternal and Omnipresent ONE, who *created* the Heaven and the Earth. And the more is he bound to do this, and the greater is my right to demand it of him, because the doctrine of Redemption from Sin supplies the Christian with motives and reasons for the divinity of the Redeemer far more *concerning* and coercive *subjectively*, i. e. in the economy of his own Soul, than are all the inducements that can influence the Deist *objectively*, i. e. in the interpretation of Nature.

Do I then utterly exclude the speculative Reason from Theology? No! It is its office and rightful privilege to determine on the *negative* truth of whatever we are required to believe. The Doctrine must not *contradict* any universal principle: for this would be a Doctrine that contradicted itself. Or Philosophy? No. It may be and has been the servant and pioneer of Faith by convincing the mind, that a Doctrine is cogitable, that the soul can present the *Idea* to itself; and that *if* we determine to contemplate, or *think* of, the subject at all, so and in no other form can this be effected. So far are both Logic and Philosophy to be

received and trusted. But the *duty*, and in some cases and for some persons even the *right*, of thinking on subjects beyond the bounds of sensible experience; the grounds of the *real* truth; the *Life*, the *Substance*, the *Hope*, the *Love*, in one word, the *Faith*; these are Derivatives from the practical, moral, and spiritual Nature and Being of Man.

APHORISM III.

That Religion is designed to improve the nature and faculties of Man, in order to the right governing of our actions, to the securing the peace and progress, external and internal, of Individuals and of Communities, and lastly, to the rendering us capable of a more perfect state, entitled the kingdom of God, to which the present Life is *probationary*—this is a Truth, which all who have truth only in view, will receive on its own evidence. If such then be the main end of Religion altogether (the improvement namely of our nature and faculties), it is plain, that every Part of Religion is to be judged by its relation to this main end. And since the Christian Scheme is Religion in its most perfect and effective Form, a revealed Religion, and therefore, in a *special* sense proceeding from that Being who made us and knows what we are, of course therefore adapted to the needs and capabilities of Human Nature; nothing can be a part of this holy faith that is not duly proportioned to this end.—*Extracted with slight alterations from Burnet's Preface to Vol. ii. of the Hist. of the Reformation.*

COMMENT.

This Aphorism should be borne in mind, whenever a theological *Resolve* is proposed to us as an article of Faith. Take, for instance, the Determinations passed at the Synod of Dort, concerning the Absolute Decrees of God in connexion with his Omniscience and Fore-knowledge. Or take the Decision in the Council of Trent on the Difference between the two kinds of Transubstantiation, the one in which both the Substance and the Accidents are changed, the same matter remaining—as in the conversion of Water to Wine at Cana; the other, in which the Matter and the Substance are changed, the Accidents remaining unaltered, as in the Eucharist—this latter being Transubstantiation *par eminentie!* Or rather take the still more tremendous Dogma, that it is indispensable to a saving Faith carefully to distinguish the one kind from the other, and to believe both, and to believe the necessity of believing both in order to Salvation! For each or either of these *extra-scriptural* Articles of Faith the preceding Aphorism supplies a safe criterion. Will the belief tend to the improvement of any of my moral or intellectual faculties? But before I can be convinced that a Faculty will be *improved*, I must be assured that it *exists*. On all these dark sayings, therefore, of Dort or Trent, it is quite sufficient to ask, by what *faculty, organ, or inlet* of knowledge we are to assure ourselves, that the words *mean* any thing, or correspond to any object out of our own mind or even in it: unless indeed the mere craving and striving to think *on*, after

all the materials for thinking have been exhausted, can be called an *object*. When a number of trust-worthy Persons assure me, that a portion of Fluid which they saw to be Water, by some change in the Fluid itself or in their Senses, suddenly acquired the Colour, Taste, Smell, and exhilarating property of Wine, I perfectly understand what they tell me, and likewise by what faculties they might have come to the knowledge of the Fact. But if any one of the number not satisfied with my acquiescence in the Fact, should insist on my believing, that the *Matter* remained the same, the Substance and the Accidents having been removed in order to make way for a different Substance with different Accidents, I must entreat his permission to wait till I can discover in myself any faculty, by which there can be presented to me a Matter distinguishable from Accidents, and a Substance that is different from both. It is true, I have a faculty of articulation; but I do not see that it can be *improved* by my using it for the formation of words without meaning, or at best, for the utterance of Thoughts, that mean only the act of so thinking, or of trying so to think. But the end of Religion is the improvement of our Nature and Faculties. Ergo, &c. Q. E. D. I sum up the whole in one great practical Maxim. The Object of *religious* Contemplation, and of a truly Spiritual Faith, is THE WAYS OF GOD TO MAN. Of the Workings of the Godhead, God himself has told us, My Ways are not as your Ways, nor my Thoughts as your Thoughts.

APHORISM IV.

THE CHARACTERISTIC DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE DISCIPLINE OF THE ANCIENT PHILOSOPHERS AND THE DISPENSATION OF THE GOSPEL.

By undeceiving, enlarging, and informing the Intellect, Philosophy sought to purify, and to elevate the Moral Character. Of course, those alone could receive the latter and incomparably greater Benefit, who by natural capacity and favourable contingencies of Fortune were fit Recipients of the former. How small the number, we scarcely need the evidence of History to assure us. Across the Night of Paganism, Philosophy flitted on, like the Lanthorn-fly of the Tropics, a Light to itself, and an Ornament, but alas! no more than an ornament, of the surrounding Darkness.

Christianity reversed the order. By means accessible to all, by inducements operative on all, and by convictions, the grounds and materials of which all men might find in themselves, her first step was to cleanse the *Heart*. But the benefit did not stop here. In preventing the rank vapours that steam up from the corrupt *Heart*, Christianity restores the *Intellect* likewise to its natural clearness. By relieving the mind from the distractions and importunities of the unruly passions, she improves the *quality* of the Understanding: while at the same time she presents for its contemplations Objects so great and so bright as cannot but enlarge the Organ, by which they are contemplated. The Fears, the Hopes, the Remembrances,

the Anticipations, the inward and outward Experience, the Belief and the Faith, of a Christian form of themselves a Philosophy and a Sum of Knowledge, which a Life spent in the Grove of Academus, or the "painted Porch," could not have attained or collected. The result is contained in the fact of a wide and still widening CHRISTENDOM.

Yet I dare not say, that the effects have been proportionate to the divine wisdom of the Scheme. Too soon did the Doctors of the Church forget that the *Heart*, the *Moral* Nature, was the Beginning and the End; and that Truth, Knowledge, and Insight were comprehended in its expansion. This was the true and first apostasy—when in Council and Synod the divine Humanities of the Gospel gave way to speculative Systems, and Religion became a Science of Shadows under the name of Theology, or at best a bare Skeleton of Truth, without life or interest, alike inaccessible and unintelligible to the majority of Christians. For these therefore there remained only rites and ceremonies and spectacles, shows and semblances. Thus among the learned the substance of things hoped for (Heb. xi. 1.) passed off into *Notions*; and for the Unlearned the surfaces of Things became * Substance. The Christian world was for centuries divided into the Many, that did not think at all, and the Few who did nothing but

* Virium et proprietatum, quæ non nisi de *Substantibus* predicari possunt, formis *superstantibus* Attributio, est SUPERSTITIO.

think—both alike *unreflecting*, the one from defect of the *Act*, the other from the absence of an *Object*.

APHORISM V.

There is small chance of Truth at the goal where there is not child-like Humility at the Starting-post.

COMMENT.

Humility is the safest Ground of Docility : and Docility the surest Promise of Docibility. Where there is no working of Self-love in the heart that secures a leaning beforehand ; where the great Magnet of the Planet is not overwhelmed or obscured by partial masses of Iron in close neighbourhood to the Compass of the Judgment, though hidden or unnoticed ; there will this great Desideratum be found of a child-like Humility. Do I then say, that I am to be influenced by *no* Interest ? Far from it ! There is an Interest of Truth : or how could there be a Love of Truth ? And that a love of Truth for its own sake, and merely as Truth, is possible, my Soul bears witness to itself in its inmost recesses. But there are other Interests—those of Goodness, of Beauty, of Utility. It would be a sorry proof of the Humility I am extolling, were I to ask for Angels' wings to overfly my own Human Nature. I exclude none of these. It is enough if the "*lene clinamen*," the gentle Bias, be given by no interest that concerns myself other than as I am a Man, and included in the great Family of Mankind ; but which does therefore especially concern me, because being a common Interest of *all* men it must needs

concern the very *essentials* of my Being, and because these essentials, as existing in *me*, are especially intrusted to my particular charge.

Widely different from this social and truth-attracted Bias, different both in its nature and its effects, is the Interest connected with the desire of *distinguishing* yourself from other men, in order to be distinguished by them. Hoc reverâ *est inter te et veritatem*. This Interest does indeed stand between thee and truth. I might add between thee and thy own soul. It is scarcely more at variance with the love of truth than it is unfriendly to the attainment that deserves that name. By your own act you have appointed the Many as your Judges and Appraisers: for the anxiety to be admired is a loveless passion, ever strongest with regard to those by whom we are least known and least cared for, loud on the Hustings, gay in the Ball-room, mute and sullen at the family Fireside. What you have acquired by patient thought and cautious discrimination, demands a portion of the same effort in those who are to receive it from you. But Applause and Preference are things of Barter; and if you trade in them, Experience will soon teach you that there are easier and less unsuitable ways to win golden judgments than by at once taxing the patience and humiliating the self-opinion of your judges. To obtain your end, your words must be as indefinite as their Thoughts: and how vague and general these are even on objects of Sense, the few who at a mature age have seriously set about the discipline of their faculties, and have honestly *taken stock*, best know by recollection of their own state. To be

admired you must make your auditors believe at least that they understand what you say; which, be assured, they never will, if it be worth understanding, or if you understand your own soul. But while your prevailing motive is to be compared and appreciated, is it credible, is it possible, that you should in earnest seek for a knowledge which is and must remain a hidden Light, a secret Treasure? Have you children, or have you lived among children, and do you not know, that in all things, in food, in medicine, in all their doings and abstinings they must believe in order to acquire a reason for their belief? But so is it with religious truths for all men. These we must all learn as children. The ground of the prevailing error on this point is the ignorance, that in spiritual concerns to believe and to understand are not diverse things, but the same thing in different periods of its growth. Belief is the seed, received into the will, of which the Understanding or Knowledge is the Flower, and the thing believed is the fruit. Unless ye believe (saith the Prophet) ye cannot understand: and unless ye be humble as children, ye not only *will* not, but ye *cannot* believe. Of such therefore is the Kingdom of Heaven. Yea, blessed is the calamity that makes us humble: though so repugnant thereto is our nature, in our present state, that after a while, it is to be feared, a second and sharper calamity would be wanted to cure us of our pride in having become so humble.

Lastly, there are among us, though fewer and less in fashion than among our ancestors, Persons who, like

Shaftsbury, do not belong to “the herd of Epicurus,” yet prefer a philosophic Paganism to the morality of the Gospel. Now it would conduce, methinks, to the child-like Humility, we have been discoursing of, if the use of the term, *Virtue*, in that high, comprehensive, and *notional* sense in which it was used by the ancient Stoics, were abandoned, as a relic of Paganism, to these modern Pagans: and if Christians restoring the word to its original import, viz. Manhood or Manliness, used it exclusively to express the quality of Fortitude; Strength of Character in relation to the resistance opposed by Nature and the irrational Passions to the Dictates of Reason; Energy of Will in preserving the Line of Rectitude tense and firm against the warping forces and treacheries of Temptation. Surely, it were far less unseemly to value ourselves on this moral Strength than on Strength of Body, or even Strength of Intellect. But we will rather value *it* for ourselves: and bearing in mind the old adage, *Quis custodiet ipsum Custodem?* we will value it the more, yea, then only will we allow it true spiritual *Worth*, when we possess it as a gift of *Grace*, a boon of Mercy undeserved, a fulfilment of a free *Promise* (1 Corinth. x. 13.) What more is meant in this last paragraph, let the venerable HOOKER say for me in the following

APHORISM VI.

What is *Virtue* but a *Medicine*, and *Vice* but a *Wound*? Yea, we have so often deeply wounded ourselves with *Medicine*, that God hath been fain to make

wounds medicinal; to cure by Vice where Virtue hath stricken; to suffer the just man to fall, that being raised he may be taught what power it was which upheld him standing. I am not afraid to affirm it boldly with St. Augustine, that Men puffed up through a proud Opinion of their own Sanctity and Holiness receive a benefit at the hands of God, and are assisted with his Grace when with his Grace they are *not* assisted, but permitted (and that grievously) to transgress. Whereby, as they were through over-great Liking of themselves supplanted (*tripped up*), so the dislike of that which did supplant them may establish them afterwards the surer. Ask the very Soul of PETER, and it shall undoubtedly itself make you this answer: My eager protestations made in the glory of my spiritual strength, I am ashamed of. But my shame and the Tears, with which my Presumption and my Weakness were bewailed, recur in the songs of my Thanksgiving. My Strength had been my Ruin, my Fall hath proved my Stay. *Sermon on the Nature of Pride*, HOOKER'S Works, p. 521.

APHORISM VII.

EDITOR.

The Being and Providence of One Living God, Holy, Gracious, Merciful, the Creator and Preserver of all things, and a Father of the Righteous; the Moral Law in its ¹ utmost height, breadth, and purity; a State of Retribution after Death; the ² Resurrection of the Dead; and a Day of Judgment—all these were known and received by the Jewish People, as esta-

blished Articles of the National Faith, at or before the Proclaiming of Christ by the Baptist. They are the ground-work of Christianity, and essentials in the Christian Faith, but not its characteristic and peculiar Doctrines: except indeed as they are confirmed, enlivened, realized and brought home to the *whole Being* of Man, Head, Heart, and Spirit, by the truths and influences of the Gospel.

Peculiar to Christianity are :

I. The belief that a Means of Salvation has been effected and provided for the Human Race by the incarnation of the Son of God in the person of Jesus Christ; and that his Life on earth, his Sufferings, Death, and Resurrection are not only proofs and manifestations, but likewise essential and effective parts of the great redemptive Act, whereby also the Obstacle from the corruption of our Nature is rendered no longer insurmountable.

II. The belief in the possible appropriation of this benefit by Repentance and Faith, including the Aids that render an effective Faith and Repentance themselves possible.

III. The belief in the reception (by as many as "shall be Heirs of Salvation") of a living and spiritual Principle, a Seed of Life capable of surviving this natural life, and of existing in a divine and immortal State.

IV. The belief in the awakening of the Spirit* in them that truly believe, and in the communion of the Spirit, thus awakened, with the Holy Spirit.

* See pp. 68—72.

V. The belief in the accompanying and consequent gifts, graces, comforts, and privileges of the Spirit, which acting primarily on the heart and will cannot but manifest themselves in suitable works of Love and Obedience, i. e. in right acts with right affections, from right principles.

Further, as Christians, we are taught, that these WORKS are the appointed signs and evidences of our FAITH; and that, under limitation of the power, the means, and the opportunities afforded us individually, they are the rule and measure, by which we are bound and enabled to judge, of *what* spirit we are: and all these with the doctrine the Fathers re-proclaimed in the everlasting Gospel, we receive in the full assurance, that God beholds and will finally judge us with a merciful consideration of our infirmities, a gracious acceptance of our sincere though imperfect strivings, a forgiveness of our defects through the mediation, and a completion of our deficiencies by the perfect righteousness, of the Man Christ Jesus, even the Word that was in the beginning with God, and who, being God, became Man for the redemption of Mankind.

COMMENT.

I earnestly entreat the Reader to pause awhile, and to join with me in reflecting on the preceding Aphorism. It has been my aim throughout this work to enforce two points: 1. That MORALITY arising out of the Reason and Conscience of Men, and PRUDENCE, which in like manner flows out of the Understanding

and the natural Wants and Desires of the Individual, are two distinct things; 2. That Morality with Prudence as its instrument has, considered abstractedly, not only a value but a *worth* in itself. Now the question is (and it is a question which every man must answer for himself) “From what you know of yourself; of your own Heart and Strength; and from what History and personal Experience have led you to conclude of mankind generally; dare you *trust* to it? Dare *you* trust to it? To *it*, and to it alone? If so, well! It is at your own risk. I judge you not. Before Him, who cannot be mocked, you stand or fall. But if not, if you have had too good reason to know, that your heart is deceitful and your strength weakness: if you are disposed to exclaim with Paul—the Law indeed is holy, just, good, spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin: for that which I do, I allow not; and what I would, that do I not!—in this case, there is a Voice that says, Come unto *me*: and I will give you rest. This is the Voice of Christ: and the Conditions, under which the promise was given by him, are that you believe *in* him, and believe his words. And he has further assured you, that *if* you do so, you will obey him. You are, in short, to embrace the *Christian* Faith as your Religion—those Truths which St. Paul believed *after* his conversion, and not those only which he believed no less undoubtingly while he was persecuting Christ, and an enemy of the Christian Religion. With what consistency could I offer you this volume as Aids to Reflection if I did not call on you to ascertain in

the first instance what these truths are? But these I could not lay before you without first enumerating certain other points of belief, which though truths, indispensable truths, and truths comprehended or rather pre-supposed in the Christian Scheme, are yet not *these* Truths. (1 John v. 17.)

While doing this, I was aware that the Positions, in the first paragraph of the preceding Aphorism, to which the numerical *marks* are affixed, will startle some of my Readers. Let the following sentences serve for the notes corresponding to the marks:

¹ Be you holy: even as God is holy.—What more does he require of thee, O man! than to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with the Lord thy God? To these summary passages from Moses and the Prophets (the first exhibiting the closed, the second the expanded, Hand of the Moral Law) I might add the Authorities of Grotius and other more orthodox and not less learned Divines, for the opinion, that the Lord's Prayer was a *selection*, and the famous Passage [The Hour is now coming, John v. 28, 29.] a *citation* by our Lord from the Liturgy of the Jewish Church. But it will be sufficient to remind the reader, that the apparent difference between the prominent *moral* truths of the Old and those of the New Testament results from the latter having been written in Greek; while the conversations recorded by the Evangelists took place in Hebrew or Syro-chaldaic. Hence it happened that where our Lord cited the original text, his Biographers substituted the Septuagint Version,

while our English Version is in *both* instances immediate and literal—in the Old Testament from the Hebrew Original, in the New Testament from the freer Greek Translation. Thus in the Text, Love your Neighbour as yourself, *Neighbour* in our New, and *Stranger* in our Old Testament represent one and the same Hebrew word. The text, “I give you a new commandment,” has no connexion with the present subject.

² There is a current mistake on this point likewise, though this article of the Jewish Belief is not only asserted by St. Paul, but is elsewhere spoken of as common to the Twelve Tribes. The mistake consists in supposing the Pharisees to have been a distinct *Sect*, and in strangely over-rating the number of the Sadducees. The former were distinguished not by holding, as matters of religious belief, articles different from the Jewish Church at large; but by their pretences to a more rigid orthodoxy, a more scrupulous performance. They were, in short (if I may dare use a phrase which I dislike as profane and denounce as uncharitable), the *Evangelicals* and strict *Professors* of the Day. The latter, the Sadducees, whose opinions much more nearly resembled those of the *Stoics* than the Epicureans (a remark that will appear paradoxical to those only who have abstracted their notions of the Stoic Philosophy from Epictetus, Mark Antonine, and certain brilliant inconsistencies of Seneca), were a handful of rich men, *romanized* Jews, not more numerous than Infidels among us, and held by the People at large in at least equal abhorrence. Their great argument was:

that the Belief of a future State of rewards and punishments injured or destroyed the purity of the Moral Law for the more enlightened Classes, and weakened the influence of the Laws of the Land for the People, the vulgar Multitude.

I will now suppose the Reader to have thoughtfully re-perused the Paragraph containing the Tenets peculiar to Christianity, and if he have his religious principles yet to form, I should expect to overhear a troubled Murmur: How can I comprehend this? How is this to be proved? To the first question I should answer: Christianity is not a Theory, or a Speculation; but a *Life*. Not a *Philosophy* of Life, but a Life and a living Process. To the second: TRY IT. It has been eighteen hundred Years in existence: and has one Individual left a record, like the following? [I tried it; and it did not answer. I made the experiment faithfully according to the directions; and the result has been, a conviction of my own credulity.] Have you, in your own experience, met with any one in whose words you could place full confidence, and who has seriously affirmed, [I have given Christianity a fair trial. I was aware, that its promises were made only *conditionally*. But my heart bears me witness, that I have to the utmost of my power complied with these conditions. Both outwardly and in the discipline of my inward acts and affections, I have performed the duties which it enjoins, and I have used the means,

which it prescribes. Yet my Assurance of its truth has received no increase. Its promises have not been fulfilled: and I repent me of my delusion !] If neither your own experience nor the History of almost two thousand years has presented a single testimony to this purport; and if you have read and heard of many who have lived and died bearing witness to the contrary: and if you have yourself met with some *one*, in whom on any other point you would place unqualified trust, who has on his own experience made report to you, that “he is faithful who promised, and what he promised he has proved himself able to perform:” is it bigotry, if I fear that the Unbelief, which prejudices and prevents the experiment, has its source elsewhere than in the uncorrupted judgement; that not the strong free Mind, but the enslaved Will, is the true original Infidel in this instance? It would not be the first time, that a treacherous Bosom-Sin had suborned the Understandings of men to bear false witness against its avowed Enemy, the right though unreceived Owner of the House, who had long *warned it out*, and waited only for its ejection to enter and take possession of the same.

I have elsewhere in the present Work, though more at large in the “Elements of Discourse” which, God permitting, will follow it, explained the difference between the Understanding and the Reason, by Reason meaning exclusively the speculative or scientific Power so called, the *Nous* or *Mens* of the Ancients. And wider still is the distinction between the Understanding and the Spiritual Mind. But no Gift of God does or can,

contradict any other Gift, except by misuse or misdirection. Most readily therefore do I admit, that there can be no contrariety between Revelation and the Understanding; unless you call the fact, that the Skin, though sensible of the warmth of the Sun, can convey no notion of its figure, or its joyous light, or of the colours, it impresses on the clouds, a contrariety between the Skin and the Eye; or infer that the cutaneous and the optic nerves *contradict* each other.

But we have grounds to believe, that there are yet other Rays or Effluences from the Sun, which neither Feeling nor Sight can apprehend, but which are to be inferred from the effects. And were it even so with regard to the Spiritual Sun, how would this contradict the Understanding or the Reason? It is a sufficient proof of the contrary, that the Mysteries in question are not *in the direction* of the Understanding or the (speculative) Reason. They do not move on the same line or plane with them, and therefore cannot contradict them. But besides this, in the Mystery that most immediately concerns the Believer, that of the birth into a new and spiritual life, the common sense and experience of mankind come in aid of their faith. The analogous facts, which we know to be true, not only facilitate the apprehension of the facts promised to us, and expressed by the same words in conjunction with a distinctive epithet; but being confessedly not less incomprehensible, the certain *knowledge* of the one disposes us to the *belief* of the other. It removes at least all objections to the truth of the doctrine derived from the

mysteriousness of its subject. The Life, we seek after, is a mystery; but so both in itself and in its origin is the Life we have. In order to meet this question, however, with minds duly prepared, there are two preliminary enquiries to be decided; the first respecting the *purport*, the second respecting the *language* of the Gospel.

First then of the *purport*, viz. what the Gospel does *not*, and what it *does* profess to be. The Gospel is not a system of Theology, nor a Syntagma of theoretical propositions and conclusions for the enlargement of speculative knowledge, ethical or metaphysical. But it is a History, a series of Facts and Events related or announced. These do indeed, involve, or rather I should say they at the same time *are*, most important doctrinal Truths; but still *Facts* and Declaration of *Facts*.

Secondly of the *language*. This is a wide subject. But the point, to which I chiefly advert, is the necessity of thoroughly understanding the distinction between *analogous*, and *metaphorical* language. *Analogies* are used in aid of *Conviction*: *Metaphors*, as means of *Illustration*. The language is analogous, wherever a thing, power, or principle in a higher dignity is expressed by the same thing, power, or principle in a lower but more known form. Such, for instance, is the language of John iii. 6. *That which is born of the Flesh, is Flesh; that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit.* The latter half of the verse contains the fact *asserted*; the former half the *analogous* fact, by which

it is rendered intelligible. If any man choose to call this *metaphorical* or figurative, I ask him whether with Hobbs and Bolingbroke he applies the same rule to the moral attributes of the Deity? Whether he regards the divine Justice, for instance, as a *metaphorical* term, a mere figure of speech? If he disclaims this, then I answer, neither do I regard the words, *born again*, or *spiritual life*, as figures or metaphors. I have only to add, that these analogies are the material, or (to speak chemically) the *base*, of Symbols and symbolical expressions; the nature of which as always *tautogorical* (i. e. expressing the *same* subject but with a *difference*) in contra-distinction from metaphors and similitudes, that are always *allegorical* (i. e. expressing a *different* subject but with a resemblance) will be found explained at large in the STATESMAN'S MANUAL, p. 35—38.

Of *metaphorical* language, on the other hand, let the following be taken as instance and illustration. I am speaking, we will suppose, of an Act, which in its own nature, and as a producing and efficient *cause*, is transcendent; but which produces sundry *effects*, each of which is the same in kind with an effect produced by a Cause well known and of ordinary occurrence. Now when I characterize or designate this transcendent Act, in exclusive reference to these its *effects*, by a succession of names borrowed from their ordinary causes; not for the purpose of rendering the Act itself, or the manner of the Agency, conceivable, but in order to show the nature and magnitude of the Benefits received

from it, and thus to excite the due admiration, gratitude, and love in the Receivers;—in this case I should be rightly described as speaking *metaphorically*. And in this case to confound *the similarity* in respect of the effects relatively to the Recipients with *an identity* in respect of the causes or modes of causation relatively to the transcendent Act or the Divine Agent, is a confusion of metaphor with analogy, and of figurative with literal; and has been and continues to be a fruitful source of superstition or enthusiasm in Believers, and of objections and prejudices to Infidels and Sceptics. But each of these points is worthy of a separate consideration: and apt occasions will be found of reverting to them severally in the following Aphorisms or the comments thereto attached.

APHORISM VIII.

LEIGHTON.

FAITH elevates the soul not only above Sense and sensible things, but above Reason itself. As Reason corrects the errors which Sense might occasion, so supernatural Faith corrects the errors of natural Reason judging according to Sense.

COMMENT.

The Editor's remarks on this aphorism from Archbishop Leighton cannot be better introduced, or their purport more distinctly announced, than by the following sentence from Harrington, with no other change than was necessary to make the words express without aid of the context what from the context it is evident

was the Writer's meaning. "The definition and proper character of Man—that, namely, which should contra-distinguish him from the Animals—is to be taken from his Reason rather than from his Understanding: in regard that in other creatures there may be something of Understanding but there is nothing of Reason." See the *FRIEND*, vol. i. p. 263—277: and the *APPENDIX* (Note C.) to the *STATESMAN'S MANUAL*.

Sir Thomas Brown, in his *Religio Medici*, complains, that there are not impossibilities enough in Religion for his active faith; and adopts by choice and in free preference such interpretations of certain texts and declarations of Holy Writ, as place them in irreconcilable contradiction to the demonstrations of science and the experience of mankind, because (says he) I love to lose myself in a mystery, and 'tis my solitary recreation to pose my apprehension with those involved enigmas and riddles of the 'Trinity and Incarnation"—and because he delights (as thinking" it no vulgar part of faith) to believe a thing not only above but contrary to Reason, and against the evidence of our proper senses. For the worthy knight could answer all the objections of the Devil and Reason (!!) "with the odd resolution he had learnt of Tertullian: *Certum est quia impossibile est*. It is certainly true because it is quite impossible!" Now this I call *ULTRA-FIDIANISM* *.

* There is this advantage in the occasional use of a newly minted term or title expressing the doctrinal schemes of particular sects or parties, that it avoids the inconvenience that presses on either side, whether we adopt the name which the Party itself has taken up to express it's peculiar tenets by,

Again, there is a scheme constructed on the principle of retaining the social sympathies, that attend on the

or that by which the same Party is designated by its opponents. If we take the latter, it most often happens that either the persons are invidiously aimed at in the designation of the principles, or that the name implies some consequence or occasional accompaniment of the principles denied by the parties themselves, as applicable to them collectively. On the other hand, convinced as I am, that current appellations are never wholly indifferent or inert; and that, when employed to express the characteristic Belief or Object of a *religious* confederacy, they exert on the Many a great and constant, though insensible, influence; I cannot but fear that in adopting the former I may be sacrificing the interests of Truth beyond what the duties of courtesy can demand or justify. In a tract published in the year 1816, I have stated my objections to the word *Unitarians*: as a name which in its proper sense can belong only to the Maintainers of the Truth impugned by the persons, who have chosen it as their designation. “For *Unity* or *Unition*, and indistinguishable *Unicity* or *Sameness*, are incompatible terms. We never speak of the *Unity of Attraction*, or the *Unity of Repulsion*; but of the *Unity of Attraction and Repulsion* in each corpuscle. Indeed, the essential diversity of the conceptions, *Unity* and *Sameness*, was among the elementary principles of the old Logicians: and Leibnitz in his critique on *Wissowatius* has ably exposed the sophisms grounded on the confusion of the two terms. But in the exclusive sense, in which the name, *Unitarian*, is appropriated by the Sect, and in which they mean it to be understood, it is a presumptuous Boast and an uncharitable calumny. No one of the Churches to which they on this article of the Christian Faith stand opposed, Greek or Latin, ever adopted the term, *Trini*—or *Tri-unitarians* as their ordinary and proper name: and had it been otherwise, yet *Unity* is assuredly no logical Opposite to *Tri-unity*, which expressly includes it. The triple Alliance is a fortiori Alliance. The true designation of

name of Believer, at the least possible expenditure of Belief—a scheme of picking and choosing Scripture

their characteristic Tenet, and which would simply and inoffensively express a fact admitted on all sides, is Psilanthropism or the assertion of the *mere* humanity of Christ.”

I dare not hesitate to avow my regret, that any scheme of doctrines or tenets should be the subject of penal law: though I can easily conceive, that any scheme, however excellent in itself, may be propagated, and however false or injurious, may be assailed, in a manner and by means that would make the Advocate or Assailant justly punishable. But then it is the *manner*, the *means*, that constitute the *crime*. The merit or demerit of the Opinions themselves depends on their originating and determining causes, which may differ in every different Believer, and are certainly known to Him alone, who commanded us; Judge not, lest ye be judged. At all events, in the present state of the Law I do not see where we can begin, or where we can stop, without inconsistency and consequent hardship. Judging by all that *we* can pretend to know or are entitled to infer, who among us will take on himself to deny that the late Dr. Priestley was a good and benevolent man, as sincere in his love, as he was intrepid and indefatigable in his pursuit, of Truth? Now let us construct three parallel tables, the first containing the Articles of Belief, moral and theological, maintained by the venerable Hooker, as the representative of the Established Church, each article being distinctly lined and numbered; the second the Tenets and Persuasions of Lord Herbert, as the representative of the platonizing Deists; and the third, those of Dr. Priestley. Let the points, in which the second and third agree with or differ from the first, be considered as to the comparative number modified by the comparative weight and importance of the several points—and let any competent and upright Man be appointed the Arbiter, to decide according to his best judgment, without any reference to the truth of the opinions, which of the two differed from the

texts for the support of doctrines that had been learned beforehand from the higher oracle of Common Sense ;

first the more widely ! I say this, well aware that it would be abundantly more prudent to leave it unsaid. But I say it in the conviction, that the *liberality* in the adoption of admitted *misnomers* in the naming of doctrinal systems, if only they have been negatively legalized, is but an equivocal proof of liberality towards the *persons* who dissent from us. On the contrary, I more than suspect that the former liberality does in too many men arise from a latent pre-disposition to transfer their reprobation and intolerance from the Doctrines to the Doctors, from the Belief to the Believers. Indecency, Abuse, Scoffing on subjects dear and awful to a multitude of our fellow-citizens, Appeals to the vanity, appetites, and malignant passions of ignorant and incompetent judges—these are flagrant overt-acts, condemned by the Law written in the heart of every honest man, Jew, Turk, and Christian. These are points respecting which the humblest honest man feels it his duty to hold himself infallible, and dares not hesitate in giving utterance to the verdict of his conscience, in the Jury-box as fearlessly as by his fireside. It is far otherwise with respect to matters of faith and inward conviction : and with respect to *these* I say—Tolerate no Belief, that you judge false and of injurious tendency : and arraign no Believer. The Man is more and other than his Belief : and God only knows, how small or how large a part of him the Belief in question may be, for good or for evil. Resist every false doctrine : and call no man heretic. The false doctrine does not necessarily make the man a heretic ; but an evil heart can make any doctrine heretical.

Actuated by these principles, I have objected to a false and deceptive designation in the case of one System. Persuaded, that the doctrines, enumerated in p. 190, 191, are not only *essential* to the Christian Religion, but those which contra-distinguish the religion as *Christian*, I merely *repeat* this persuasion in another form, when I assert, that (in *my* sense of the

which, as applied to the truths of Religion, means the popular part of the philosophy in fashion. Of course,

word, Christian) Unitarianism is not Christianity. But do I say, that those, who call themselves Unitarians, are not Christians? God forbid! I would not think, much less promulgate, a judgement at once so presumptuous and so uncharitable. Let a friendly antagonist retort on *my* scheme of faith, in the like manner: I shall respect him all the more for his consistency as a reasoner, and not confide the less in his kindness towards me as his Neighbour and Fellow-christian. This latter and most endearing name I scarcely know how to withhold even from my friend, HYMAN HURWITZ, as often as I read what every Reverer of Holy Writ and of the English Bible ought to read, his admirable VINDICIÆ HEBRAICÆ! It has trembled on the verge, as it were, of my lips, every time I have conversed with that pious, learned, strong-minded, and single-hearted Jew, an Israelite indeed and without guile—

Cujus cura sequi naturam, legibus uti,

Et mentem vitiis, ora negare dolis;

Virtutes opibus, verum præponere falso,

Nil vacuum sensu dicere, nil facere.

Post obitum vivam secum, secum requiescam,

Nec fiat melior sors mea sorte suâ!

*From a poem of Hildebert on his Master,
the persecuted Berengarius.*

Under the same feelings I conclude this *Aid to Reflection* by applying the principle to another misnomer not less inappropriate and far more influential. Of those, whom I have found most reason to respect and value, many have been members of the Church of Rome: and certainly I did not honour those the least, who scrupled even in common parlance to call our Church a reformed Church. A similar scruple would not, methinks,

the scheme differs at different times and in different Individuals in the number of articles excluded; but,

disgrace a Protestant as to the use of the words, Catholic or Roman Catholic; and if (tacitly at least, and in thought) he remembered that the Romish Anti-catholic Church would more truly express the fact.—*Romish*, to mark that the corruptions in discipline, doctrine, and practice do, for the far larger part, owe both their origin and perpetuation to the Romish *Court*, and the local Tribunals of the *City* of Rome; and neither are or ever have been *Catholic*, i. e. universal, throughout the Roman *Empire*, or even in the whole Latin or Western Church—and *Anti-catholic*, because no other Church acts on so narrow and excommunicative a principle, or is characterized by such a jealous spirit of monopoly. Instead of a Catholic (universal) spirit it may be truly described as a spirit of Particularism counterfeiting Catholicity by a *negative* totality, and heretical self-circumscription—in the first instances cutting off, and since then cutting herself off from, all the other members of Christ's Body. For the rest, I think as that man of true catholic spirit and apostolic zeal, Richard Baxter, thought; and my readers will thank me for conveying my reflections in his own words, in the following golden passage from his *Life*, “faithfully published from his own original MSS. by Matthew Silvester, 1696.”

“My censures of the Papists do much differ from what they were at first. I then thought, that their errors in the *doctrines of faith* were their most dangerous mistakes. But now I am assured that their misexpressions and misunderstanding us, with our mistakings of them and inconvenient expressing of our own opinions, have made the difference in most points appear much greater than it is; and that in some it is next to none at all. But the great and unreconcilable differences lie in their Church Tyranny; in the usurpations of their Hierarchy, and Priesthood, under the name of spiritual authority exercising a temporal

it may always be recognized by this permanent character, that its object is to draw religion down to the Believer's intellect, instead of raising his intellect up to religion. And this extreme I call MINIMIFIDIANISM.

Now if there be one Preventive of both these extremes more efficacious than another, and preliminary to all the rest, it is the being made fully aware of the diversity of Reason and Understanding. And this is the more expedient, because though there is no want of authorities ancient and modern for the distinction of the faculties and the distinct appropriation of the terms, yet our best writers too often confound the one with the other. Even Lord Bacon himself, who in his *Novum Organum* has so incomparably set forth the na-

Lordship; in their corruptions and abasement of God's Worship, but above all in their systematic befriending of Ignorance and Vice.

“At first I thought that Mr. Perkins well proved, that a Papist cannot go beyond a reprobate; but now I doubt not that God hath many sanctified ones among them who have received the true doctrine of Christianity so practically that their contradictory errors prevail not against them, to hinder their love of God and their salvation: but that their errors are like a conquerable dose of poison which a healthful nature doth overcome. *And I can never believe that a man may not be saved by that religion, which doth but bring him to the true Love of God and to a heavenly mind and life: nor that God will ever cast a Soul into hell, that truly loveth him.* Also at first it would disgrace any doctrine with me if I did but hear it called popery and anti-christian; but I have long learned to be more impartial, and to know that Satan can use even the names of Popery and Anti-christ, to bring a truth into suspicion and discredit.”—Baxter's *Life*, part I. p. 131.

ture of the difference, and the unfitness of the latter faculty for the objects of the former, does nevertheless in sundry places use the term Reason where he means the Understanding, and sometimes, though less frequently, Understanding for Reason. In consequence of thus confounding the two terms, or rather of wasting both words for the expression of one and the same faculty, he left himself no appropriate term for the other and higher gift of Reason, and was thus under the necessity of adopting fantastic and mystical phrases, ex. gr. the dry light (*lumen siccum*), the lucific vision, &c., meaning thereby nothing more than Reason in contra-distinction from the Understanding. Thus too in the preceding Aphorism, by Reason Leighton means the human Understanding, the explanation annexed to it being (by a noticeable coincidence) word for word the very definition which the Founder of the Critical Philosophy gives of the Understanding—namely, “the Faculty judging according to Sense.”

On the contrary, Reason is the Power of universal and necessary Convictions, the Source and Substance of Truths above Sense, and having their evidence in themselves. Its presence is always marked by the *necessity* of the position affirmed: this necessity being *conditional*, when a truth of Reason is applied to Facts of Experience or to the rules and maxims of the Understanding, but *absolute*, when the subject matter is itself the growth or offspring of the Reason. Hence arises a distinction in the Reason itself, derived from the different mode of applying it, and from the objects to

which it is directed: according as we consider one and the same gift, now as the ground of formal principles, and now as the origin of *Ideas*. Contemplated distinctively in reference to *formal* (or abstract) truth, it is the *speculative Reason*; but in reference to *actual* (or moral) truth, as the fountain of ideas and the *Light* of the Conscience, we name it the *practical Reason*. Whenever by self-subjection to this universal Light, the Will of the Individual, the *particular Will*, has become a Will of Reason, the man is regenerate: and Reason is then the *Spirit* of the regenerated man, whereby the Person is capable of a quickening intercommunion with the Divine Spirit. And herein consists the mystery of Redemption, that this has been rendered possible for us. "And so it is written: the first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam a quickening Spirit." (1 Cor. xv. 45.) We need only compare the passages in the writings of the Apostles Paul and John concerning the *Spirit* and Spiritual Gifts, with those in the Proverbs and in the Wisdom of Solomon respecting *Reason*, to be convinced that the terms are synonymous. In this at once most comprehensive and most appropriate acceptation of the word, Reason is pre-eminently spiritual, and a Spirit, even *our Spirit*, through an effluence of the same grace by which we are privileged to say Our Father!

On the other hand, the Judgements of the Understanding are binding only in relation to the objects of our Senses, which we *reflect* under the forms of the Understanding. It is, as Leighton rightly defines it,

“ the Faculty judging according to Sense.” Hence we add the epithet *human*, without tautology: and speak of the *human* Understanding, in disjunction from that of Beings higher or lower than man. But there is, in this sense, no *human* Reason. There neither is nor can be but one Reason, one and the same: even the Light that lighteth every man’s individual Understanding (*Discursus*) and thus maketh it a reasonable Understanding, *Discourse of Reason*—“ one only, yet manifold; it goeth through all understanding, and remaining in itself regenerateth all other powers.” (Wisdom of Solomon c. viii.) The same Writer calls it likewise “ an influence from the *Glory of the Almighty*,” this being one of the names of the Messiah, as the Logos, or co-eternal Filial Word. And most noticeable for its coincidence is a fragment of Heraclitus, as I have indeed already noticed elsewhere. “ To discourse rationally it behoves us to derive strength from that which is common to all men: for all human Understandings are nourished by the one DIVINE WORD.”

Beasts, we have said, partake of Understanding. If any man deny this, there is a ready way of settling the question. Let him give a careful perusal to Hüber’s two small volumes, on Bees and on Ants (especially the latter), and to Kirby and Spence’s Introduction to Entomology: and one or other of two things must follow. He will either change his opinion as irreconcilable with the facts: or he must deny the facts, which yet I cannot suppose, inasmuch as the denial would be tantamount to the no less extravagant than uncharitable

assertion, that Hüber, and the several eminent Naturalists, French and English, Swiss, German, and Italian, by whom Hüber's observations and experiments have been repeated and confirmed, had all conspired to impose a series of falsehoods and fairy-tales on the world. I see no way at least, by which he can get out of this dilemma, but by over-leaping the admitted Rules and Fences of all legitimate Discussion, and either transferring to the word, Understanding, the definition already appropriated to Reason, or defining Understanding *in genere* by the *specific* and *accessional* perfections which the *human* Understanding derives from its co-existence with Reason and Free-will in the same individual person; in plainer words, from its being exercised by a self-conscious and responsible Creature. And after all the supporter of Harington's position would have a right to ask him, by what other name he would designate the faculty in the instances referred to? If it be not Understanding, what is it?

In no former part of this volume has the Editor felt the same anxiety to obtain a patient Attention. For he does not hesitate to avow, that on his success in establishing the validity and importance of the distinction between Reason and Understanding, herests his hopes of carrying the Reader along with him through all that is to follow. Let the Student but clearly see and comprehend the diversity in the things themselves, the expediency of a correspondent distinction and appropriation of the *words* will follow of itself. Turn back for a moment to the Aphorism, and having re-

perused the first paragraph of this Comment thereon, regard the two following narratives as the illustration. I do not say proof: for I take these from a multitude of facts equally striking for the one only purpose of placing my *meaning* out of all doubt.

I. Huber put a dozen Humble-bees under a Bell-glass along with a comb of about ten silken cocoons so unequal in height as not to be capable of standing steadily. To remedy this two or three of the Humble-bees got upon the comb, stretched themselves over its edge, and with their heads downwards fixed their fore-feet on the table on which the comb stood, and so with their hind feet kept the comb from falling. When these were weary, others took their places. In this constrained and painful posture, fresh bees relieving their comrades at intervals, and each working in its turn, did these affectionate little insects support the comb for nearly three days: at the end of which they had prepared sufficient wax to build pillars with. But these pillars having accidentally got displaced, the bees had recourse again to the same manœuvre (or rather *pedœuvre*), till Huber pitying their hard case, &c.

II. "I shall at present describe the operations of a single ant that I observed sufficiently long to satisfy my curiosity.

"One rainy day, I observed a Labourer digging the ground near the aperture which gave entrance to the ant-hill. It placed in a heap the several fragments it had scraped up, and formed them into small pellets, which it deposited here and there upon the nest. It

returned constantly to the same place, and appeared to have a marked design, for it laboured with ardour and perseverance. I remarked a slight furrow, excavated in the ground in a straight line, representing the plan of a path or gallery. The Labourer, the whole of whose movements fell under my immediate observation, gave it greater depth and breadth, and cleared out its borders: and I saw at length, in which I could not be deceived, that it had the intention of establishing an avenue which was to lead from one of the stories to the under-ground chambers. This path, which was about two or three inches in length, and formed by a single ant, was opened above and bordered on each side by a buttress of earth; its concavity en forme de gouttiere was of the most perfect regularity, for the architect had not left an atom too much. The work of this ant was so well followed and understood, that I could almost to a certainty guess its next proceeding, and the very fragment it was about to remove. At the side of the opening where this path terminated, was a second opening to which it was necessary to arrive by some road. The same ant engaged in and executed alone this undertaking. It furrowed out and opened another path, parallel to the first, leaving between each a little wall of three or four lines in height. Those ants who lay the foundation of a wall, a chamber, or gallery, from working separately occasion now and then a want of coincidence in the parts of the same or different objects. Such examples are of no unfrequent occurrence, but they by no means embarrass them. What follows

proves that the workman, on discovering his error, knew how to rectify it. A wall had been erected with the view of sustaining a vaulted ceiling, still incomplete, that had been projected from the wall of the opposite chamber. The workman who began constructing it, had given it too little elevation to meet the opposite partition upon which it was to rest. Had it been continued on the original plan, it must infallibly have met the wall at about one half of its height, and this it was necessary to avoid. This state of things very forcibly claimed my attention, when one of the ants arriving at the place, and visiting the works, appeared to be struck by the difficulty which presented itself; but this it as soon obviated, by taking down the ceiling and raising the wall upon which it reposed. It then in my presence, constructed a new ceiling with the fragments of the former one."—*Huber's Natural Hist. of Ants*, p. 38—41.

Now I assert, that the faculty manifested in the acts here narrated does not differ *in kind* from Understanding, and that it *does* so differ from Reason. What I conceive the former to be, physiologically considered, will be shown hereafter. In this place I take the Understanding as it exists in *Men*, and in exclusive reference to its *intelligential* functions; and it is in this sense of the word that I am to prove the necessity of contra-distinguishing it from Reason.

Premising then, that two or more Subjects having the same essential characters are said to fall under the same General Definition, I lay it down, as a self-

evident truth (it is, in fact, an identical proposition), that whatever subjects fall under one and the same General Definition are of one and the same kind: consequently, that which does *not* fall under this definition, must differ in kind from each and all of those that *do*. Difference in degree does indeed suppose sameness in kind: and difference in kind precludes distinction from differences of degree. *Heterogenea non comparari, ergo nec distingui, possunt.* The inattention to this Rule gives rise to the numerous Sophisms comprised by Aristotle under the head of *Μεταβασις εις αλλο γενος, i. e.* Transition into a new kind, or the falsely applying to X what had been truly asserted of A, and might have been true of X, had it differed from A in its degree only. The sophistry consists in the omission to notice what not being noticed will be supposed not to exist; and where the silence respecting the difference in kind is tantamount to an assertion that the difference is merely in degree. But the fraud is especially gross, where the heterogeneous subject, thus clandestinely *slipt in*, is in its own nature insusceptible of degree: such as, for instance, Certainty or Circularity, contrasted with Strength, or Magnitude.

To apply these remarks for our present purpose, we have only to describe Understanding and Reason, each by its characteristic qualities. The comparison will show the difference.

UNDERSTANDING.

1. Understanding is discursive.

REASON.

1. Reason is fixed.

2. The Understanding in all its judgments refers to some other Faculty as its ultimate Authority.

3. Understanding is the Faculty of *Reflection*.

2. The Reason in all its decisions appeals to itself, as the ground and *substance* of their truth. (*Hebrews*, vi. v. 13.)

3. Reason of Contemplation. Reason indeed is far nearer to SENSE than to Understanding: for Reason (says our great HOOKER) is a direct Aspect of Truth, an inward Beholding, having a similar relation to the Intelligible or Spiritual, as SENSE has to the Material or Phenomenal.

The Result is: that neither falls under the definition of the other. They differ *in kind*: and had my object been confined to the establishment of this fact, the preceding Columns would have superseded all further disquisition. But I have ever in view the especial interests of my youthful Readers, whose reflective *power* is to be cultivated, as well as their particular reflections to be called forth and guided. Now the main chance of their *reflecting* on religious subjects *aright*, and of their attaining to the *contemplation* of spiritual truths *at all*, rests on their insight into the *nature* of this disparity still more than on their conviction of its existence. I now, therefore, proceed to

a brief analysis of the Understanding, in elucidation of the definitions already given.

The Understanding then (considered exclusively as an organ of human intelligence), is the Faculty by which we reflect and generalize. Take, for instance, any Object consisting of many parts, a House or a Group of Houses: and if it be contemplated, as a Whole, *i. e.* (as many constituting a One), it forms what in the technical language of Psychology is called a *total impression*. Among the various component parts of this we direct our attention especially to such as we recollect to have noticed in other total impressions. Then, by a voluntary Act we withhold our attention from all the rest to reflect exclusively on these; and these we henceforward use as *common characters*, by virtue of which the several Objects are referred to one and the same sort*. Thus, the whole Process may be reduced to three acts, all depending on and supposing a previous impression on the Senses: first, the appropriation of our Attention; 2. (and in order to the continuance of the first) Abstraction, or the voluntary withholding of the Attention; and 3. Generalization. And these are the proper Functions of the Under-

* According as we attend more or less to the differences, the *Sort* becomes, of course, more or less comprehensive. Hence there arises for the systematic Naturalist the necessity of subdividing the Sorts into Orders, Classes, Families, &c.: all which, however, resolve themselves for the mere Logician into the conception of Genus and Species, *i. e.* the comprehending, and the comprehended.

standing: and the power of so doing is what we mean when we say we possess Understanding, or are created with the Faculty of Understanding.

[It is obvious, that the third Function includes the act of comparing one object with another. In a note (for, not to interrupt the argument, I avail myself of this most useful contrivance), I have shown, that the act of comparing supposes in the comparing Faculty certain inherent Forms, that is, Modes of reflecting not referable to the Objects reflected on, but pre-determined by the Constitution and (as it were) mechanism of the Understanding itself. And under some one or other of these Forms*, the Resemblances and

* Were it not so, how could the first comparison have been possible? It would involve the absurdity of measuring a thing by itself. But if we fix on some one thing, the length of our own foot, or of our hand and arm from the elbow joint, it is evident that in *order* to do this we must have the conception of Measure. Now these antecedent and most general Conceptions are what is meant by the constituent *forms* of the Understanding: we call them *constituent* because they are not *acquired* by the Understanding, but are implied in its constitution. As rationally might a Circle be said to acquire a centre and circumference, as the Understanding to acquire these its inherent *forms*, or ways of conceiving. This is what Leibnitz meant, when to the old adage of the Peripatetics, *Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in Sensu* (There is nothing in the Understanding not derived from the Senses, or—There is nothing conceived that was not previously *perceived*); he replied—*præter intellectum ipsum* (except the Understanding itself).

And here let me remark for once and all: whoever would *reflect* to any purpose—whoever is in earnest in his pursuit of Self-knowledge, and of one of the principal means to this, an

Differences must be subsumed in order to be conceivable, and à fortiori therefore in order to be com-

insight into the meaning of the words he uses, and the different meanings properly or improperly conveyed by one and the same word, according as it is used in the Schools or the Market, according as the *kind* or a high *degree* is intended (ex. gr. Heat, Weight, &c. as employed scientifically, compared with the same word used popularly)—whoever, I say, seriously proposes this as his Object, must so far overcome his dislike of pedantry, and his dread of being sneered at as a Pedant, as not to quarrel with an uncouth word or phrase, till he is quite sure that some other and more familiar would not only have expressed the *precise* meaning with equal clearness, but have been as likely to draw his attention to *this* meaning exclusively. The ordinary language of a Philosopher in conversation or popular writings, compared with the language he uses in strict reasoning, is as his Watch compared with the Chronometer in his Observatory. He sets the former by the Town-clock, or even, perhaps, by the Dutch clock in his kitchen, not because he believes it right, but because his neighbour's and his Cook go by it. To afford the reader an opportunity for exercising the forbearance here recommended, I turn back to the phrase, "most general Conceptions," and observe, that in strict and severe propriety of language I should have said *generalific* or *generific* rather than general, and Concipiencies or Conceptive Acts rather than conceptions.

It is an old Complaint, that a Man of Genius no sooner appears, but the Host of Dunces are up in arms to repel the invading Alien. This observation would have made more converts to its truth, I suspect, had it been worded more dispassionately, and with a less contemptuous antithesis. For "Dunces" let us substitute "the Many," or the "τουτος κοσμος" (*this world*) of the Apostle, and we shall perhaps find no great difficulty in accounting for the fact. To arrive at the *root*, indeed, and last

párale. The Senses do not compare, but merely furnish the materials for comparison. But this the

Ground of the problem, it would be necessary to investigate the nature and effects of the sense of Difference on the human mind where it is not held in check by Reason and Reflection. We need not go to the savage tribes of North America, or the yet ruder Natives of the Indian Isles, to learn, how slight a degree of Difference will, in uncultured minds, call up a sense of Diversity, an inward perplexity and contradiction, as if the Strangers were and yet were not of the same *kind* with themselves. Who has not had occasion to observe the effect which the gesticulations and nasal tones of a Frenchman produce on our own Vulgar? Here we may see the origin and primary import of our "*Unkindness*." It is a sense of *Unkind*, and not the mere negation but the positive Opposite of the sense of *kind*. Alienation, aggravated now by fear, now by contempt, and not seldom by a mixture of both, aversion, hatred, enmity, are so many successive shapes of its growth and metamorphosis. In application to the present case, it is sufficient to say, that Pindar's remark on sweet Music holds equally true of Genius: as many as are not delighted by it are disturbed, perplexed, irritated. The Beholder either recognizes it as a projected Form of his own Being, that moves before him with a Glory round its head, or recoils from it as from a Spectre. But this speculation would lead us too far; we must be content with having referred to it as the ultimate ground of the fact, and pass to the more obvious and proximate causes. And as the first, I would rank the Person's *not* understanding what yet he expects to understand, and as if he had a *right* to do so. An original Mathematical Work, or any other that requires peculiar and (so to say) technical marks and symbols, will excite no uneasy feelings—not in the mind of a competent Reader, for he understands it; and not with others, because they neither expect nor are expected to understand it. The second place we may assign to the *Mis-*

Reader will find explained in the Note; and will now cast his eye back to the sentence immediately preceding this parenthesis.]

understanding, which is almost sure to follow in cases where the incompetent person, finding no outward marks (Diagrams, arbitrary signs, and the like) to inform him at first sight, that the Subject is one which he does not pretend to understand, and to be ignorant of which does not detract from his estimation as a man of abilities generally, *will* attach some meaning to what he hears or reads; and as he is out of humour with the Author, it will most often be such a meaning as he can quarrel with and exhibit in a ridiculous or offensive point of view.

But above all, the whole World almost of Minds, as far as regards intellectual efforts, may be divided into two classes of the Busy-indolent and Lazy-indolent. To both alike all Thinking is painful, and all attempts to rouse them to think, whether in the re-examination of their existing Convictions, or for the reception of new light, are irritating. “It *may* all be very deep and clever; but really one ought to be quite sure of it before one wrenches one’s brain to find out what it is. I take up a Book as a Companion, with whom I can have an easy cheerful chit-chat on what we both know beforehand, or else matters of fact. In our leisure hours we have a right to relaxation and amusement.”

Well! but in their *studious* hours, when their Bow is to be bent, when they are *apud Musas*, or amidst the Muses? Alas! it is just the same! The same craving for *amusement*, *i. e.* to be away from the Muses! for relaxation, *i. e.* the unbending of a Bow which in fact had never been strung! There are two ways of obtaining their applause. The first is: Enable them to reconcile in one and the same occupation the love of Sloth and the hatred of Vacancy! Gratify indolence, and yet save them from *Ennui*—in plain English, from themselves! For, spite of their antipathy to *dry* reading, the keeping com-

Now when a person speaking to us of any particular Object or Appearance refers it by means of some

pany with themselves is, after all, the insufferable annoyance : and the true secret of their dislike to a work of Thought and Inquiry lies in its tendency to make them acquainted with their own permanent Being. The other road to their favour is, to introduce to them their own thoughts and predilections, tricked out in the *fine* language, in which it would gratify their vanity to express them in their own conversation, and with which they can imagine themselves *showing off*: and this (as has been elsewhere remarked) is the characteristic difference between the second-rate Writers of the last two or three generations, and the same class under Elizabeth and the Stuarts. In the latter we find the most far-fetched and singular thoughts in the simplest and most native language ; in the former, the most obvious and common-place thoughts in the most far-fetched and motley language. But lastly, and as the sine quâ non of their patronage, a sufficient arc must be left for the Reader's mind to *oscillate* in—freedom of choice,

To make the shifting cloud be what you please,

save only where the attraction of Curiosity determines the line of Motion. The Attention must not be fastened down : and this every work of Genius, not simply narrative, must do before it can be justly appreciated.

In former times a *popular* work meant one that adapted the *results* of studious Meditation or scientific Research to the capacity of the People, presenting in the Concrete, by instances and examples, what had been ascertained in the Abstract and by discovery of the Law. *Now*, on the other hand, that is a popular Work which gives back to the People their own errors and prejudices, and flatters the Many by creating them, under the title of THE PUBLIC, into a supreme and inappellable Tribunal of intellectual Excellence. P. S. In a continuous

common character to a known class (which he does in giving it a Name), we say, that we understand him; *i. e.* we understand his words. The Name of a thing, in the original sense of the word, Name (*Nomen*, *ΝΟΜΜΕΝΟΝ*, τὸ *intelligibile*, *id quod intelligitur*) expresses that which is *understood* in an appearance, that which we place (or make to *stand*) *under* it, as the condition of its real existence, and in proof that it is not an accident of the Senses, or Affection of the Individual, not a phantom or *Apparition*, *i. e.* an Appearance that is *only* an Appearance. (See Gen. ii. 19. 20. Thus too, in Psalm xx. v. 1. and in fifty other places of the Bible, the identity of *nomen* with *numen*, *i. e.* invisible power and presence, the *nomen substantivum* of all real Objects, and the ground of their reality, independent of the Affections of Sense in the Percipient). In like manner, in a connected succession of Names, as the Speaker passes from one to the other, we say that we understand his *discourse* (*i. e.* *discursio* *intellectûs*, *discursus*, from *discurso* or *discurro*, to *course* or pass rapidly from one thing to another). Thus, in all instances, it is words, names, or, if images, yet images used as words or names, that are the alone subjects of Understanding. In no instance do we

work, the frequent insertion and length of Notes would need an Apology: in a book of Aphorisms and detached Comments none is necessary, it being understood beforehand, that the Sauce and the Garnish are to occupy the greater part of the Dish. S. T. C.

understand a thing in itself; but only the name to which it is referred. Sometimes indeed, when several classes are recalled conjointly, we identify the words with the Object—though by courtesy of idiom rather than in strict propriety of language. Thus, we may say that we *understand* a Rainbow, when recalling successively the several Names for the several sorts of Colours, we know that they are to be applied to one and the same Phænomenon, at once distinctly and simultaneously; but even in common parlance we should not say this of a single colour. No one would say he understands Red or Blue. He *sees* the Colour, and had seen it before in a vast number and variety of objects; and he understands the *word* red, as referring his fancy or memory to this his collective experience.

If this be so, and so it most assuredly is—if the proper functions of the understanding be that of generalizing the notices received from the Senses in order to the construction of *Names*; of referring particular notices (*i. e.* impressions or sensations) to their proper Name; and, vice versâ, names to their correspondent class or kind of Notices—then it follows of necessity, that the understanding is truly and accurately defined in the words of Leighton and Kant, a Faculty judging according to Sense.

Now whether in defining the speculative Reason (*i. e.* the Reason considered abstractedly as an *intellective* Power) we call it “the source of necessary

and universal Principles, according to which the Notices of the Senses are either affirmed or denied ;” or describe it as “ the Power by which we are enabled to draw from particular and contingent Appearances universal and necessary conclusions* : it is equally

* Take a familiar illustration. My Sight and Touch convey to me a certain impression, to which my Understanding applies it's pre-conceptions (*conceptus antecedentes et generalissimi*) of Quantity and Relation, and thus refers it to the Class and Name of three-cornered Bodies—We will suppose it the Iron of a Turf-spade. It compares the sides, and finds that any two measured as one are greater than the third ; and according to a law of the imagination, there arises a presumption that in all other Bodies of the same figure (*i. e.* three-cornered and equilateral) the same proportion exists. After this, the senses have been directed successively to a number of three-cornered bodies of *unequal* sides—and in these too the same proportion has been found without exception till at length it becomes a fact of *experience*, that in *all* Triangles hitherto seen the two sides are greater than the third : and there will exist no ground or analogy for anticipating an exception to a Rule, generalized from so vast a number of particular instances. So far and no farther could the Understanding carry us : and as far as this “ the faculty, judging according to sense,” conducts many of the *inferior* animals, if not in the same, yet in instances analogous and fully equivalent.

The Reason supersedes the whole process : and on the first conception presented by the Understanding in consequence of the first sight of a tri-angular Figure, of whatever sort it might chance to be, it affirms with an assurance incapable of future increase, with a perfect *certainty*, that in all possible Triangles any two of the inclosing Lines *will* and *must* be greater than the third. In short, Understanding in its highest form of Experience remains commensurate with the experimental notices

evident that the two definitions differ in their essential characters, and consequently (by Axiom, p. 215) the Subjects differ in *kind*. Q. E. D.

of the senses, from which it is generalized. Reason, on the other hand, either pre-determines Experience, or avails itself of a past Experience to supersede its necessity in all future time; and affirms truths which no Sense could perceive, nor Experiment verify, nor Experience confirm.

Yea, this is the test and character of a truth so affirmed, that in its own proper form it is *inconceivable*. For *to conceive* is a function of the Understanding, which can be exercised only on subjects subordinate thereto. And yet to the forms of the Understanding all truth must be reduced, that is to be fixed as an object of reflection, and to be rendered *expressible*. And here we have a second test and sign of a truth so affirmed, that it can come forth out of the moulds of the Understanding only in the disguise of two contradictory conceptions, each of which is partially true, and the conjunction of both conceptions becomes the representative or *expression* (= the *exponent*) of a truth *beyond* conception and inexpressible. Examples. Before Abraham *was*, I *am*.—God is a Circle whose centre is every where and circumference no where.—The Soul is all in every part.

If this appear extravagant, it is an extravagance which no man can indeed learn from another, but which (were this possible) I might have learnt from Plato, Kepler, and Bacon; from Luther, Hooker, Pascal, Leibnitz, and Fenelon. But in this last paragraph I have, I see, unwittingly overstepped my purpose, according to which we were to take Reason as a simply intellectual power. Yet even as such, and with all the disadvantage of a technical and arbitrary Abstraction, it has been made evident—1. that there is an *Intuition* or *immediate* Beholding, accompanied by a conviction of the necessity and universality of the truth so beheld not derived from the Senses, which Intuition, when it is *construed* by *pure* Sense, gives birth

The dependence of the Understanding on the representations of the Senses, and its consequent pos-

to the Science of Mathematics, and when applied to Objects supersensuous or spiritual is the Organ of Theology and Philosophy;—and 2. that there is likewise a reflective and discursive Faculty, or *mediate* Apprehension which, taken by itself and uninfluenced by the former, depends on the Senses for the Materials on which it is exercised, and is contained within the Sphere of the Senses. And this Faculty it is, which in generalizing the Notices of the Senses constitutes Sensible Experience, and gives rise to Maxims or Rules which may become more and more *general*, but can never be raised into universal Verities, or beget a consciousness of absolute Certainty; though they may be sufficient to extinguish all doubt. (Putting Revelation out of view, take our first Progenitor in the 50th or 100th year of his existence. His Experience would probably have freed him from all doubt, as the Sun sunk in the Horizon that it would re-appear the next morning. But compare this state of Assurance with that which the same Man would have had of the 37th Proposition of Euclid, supposing him like Pythagoras to have discovered the *Demonstration*). Now is it expedient, I ask, or conformable to the laws and purposes of Language, to call two so altogether disparate Subjects by one and the same name? Or, having two names in our language, should we call each of the two diverse subjects by both—*i. e.* by either name, as caprice might dictate? If not, then as we have the two words, Reason and Understanding (as indeed what Language of cultivated Man has not?) what should prevent us from appropriating the former to the Power distinctive of Humanity? We need only place the derivatives from the two terms in opposition (*ex. gr.* “A and B are both rational Beings; but there is no comparison between them in point of *intelligence*,” or “She always concludes *rationally*, though not a Woman of much *Understanding*”) to see, that we

teriority thereto, as contrasted with the independence and antecedency of Reason, are strikingly exemplified in the Ptolemaic System (that truly wonderful product and highest boast of the Faculty, judging according to the Senses!) compared with the Newtonian, as the Offspring of a yet higher Power, arranging, correcting, and annulling the representations of the Senses according to its own inherent Laws and constitutive Ideas.

APHORISM IV.

EDITOR.

In Wonder all Philosophy began: in Wonder it ends: and Admiration fills up the interspace. But the first Wonder is the Offspring of Ignorance: the

cannot reverse the order—*i. e.* call the higher Gift Understanding, and the lower Reason. What *should* prevent us? I asked. Alas! that which *has* prevented us—the *cause* of this confusion in the terms—is only too obvious: *viz.* inattention to the momentous distinction in the *things*, and (generally) to the duty and habit recommended in the Vth Introductory Aphorism of this Volume, (*see p. 2.*) But the cause of this, and of all its lamentable Effects and Subcauses, “false doctrine, blindness of Heart and contempt of the Word,” is best declared by the philosophic Apostle: “they did not *like* to retain God in their knowlege,” (Rom. i. 28,) and though they could not *extinguish* “the Light that lighteth every *man*,” and which “shone in the Darkness;” yet because the Darkness could not *comprehend* the Light, they refused to bear witness of it, and worshipped, instead, the shaping Mist, which the Light had drawn upward from *the Ground* (*i. e.* from the mere Animal nature and instinct), and which that Light alone had made visible (*i. e.* by super-inducing on the animal instinct the principle of Self-consciousness).

last is the Parent of Adoration. The First is the birth-throe of our knowlege: the Last is its euthanasy and apotheosis.

SEQUELÆ: OR THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY THE PRECEDING APHORISM.

As in respect of the first Wonder we are all on the same Level, how comes it that the philosophic mind should in all ages be the privilege of a Few? The most obvious reason is this: The Wonder takes place before the period of Reflection, and (with the great Mass of Mankind) long before the Individual is capable of directing his attention freely and consciously to the Feeling, or even to its exciting Causes. Surprise (the form and dress which the Wonder of Ignorance usually puts on) is worn away, if not precluded, by Custom and Familiarity. So is it with the Objects of the Senses, and the ways and fashions of the World around us: even as with the Beat of our own hearts, which we notice only in moments of Fear and Perturbation. But with regard to the concerns of our inward Being, there is yet another cause that acts in concert with the power in Custom to prevent a fair and equal exertion of reflective Thought. The great fundamental Truths and Doctrines of Religion, the existence and attributes of God, and the Life after Death, are in Christian Countries taught so early, under such circumstances, and in such close and vital association with whatever makes or marks *reality* for our infant minds, that the words ever after represent sensations, feelings, vital

assurances, sense of reality—rather than thoughts, or any distinct conception. Associated, *I had almost said identified*, with the parental Voice, Look, Touch, with the living warmth and pressure of the Mother, on whose lap the Child is first made to kneel, within whose palms its little hands are folded, and the motion of whose eyes *it's* eyes follow and imitate—(yea, what the blue sky is to the Mother, the Mother's upraised Eyes and Brow are to the Child, the Type and Symbol of an invisible Heaven!)—from within and from without, these great First Truths, these good and gracious Tidings, these holy and humanizing Spells, in the preconformity to which our very humanity may be said to consist, are so infused, that it were but a tame and inadequate expression to say, we all take them for granted. At a later period, in Youth or early Manhood, most of us, indeed, (in the higher and middle classes at least) read or hear certain PROOFS of these truths—which we commonly listen to, when we listen at all, with much the same feelings as a popular Prince on his Coronation Day, in the centre of a fond and rejoicing Nation, may be supposed to hear the Champion's challenge to all the Non-existents, that deny or dispute his Rights and Royalty. In fact, the order of Proof is most often reversed or transposed. As far, at least, as I dare judge from the goings on in my own mind, when with keen delight I first read the works of Derham, Niewentiet, and Lyonet, I should say, that the full and life-like conviction of a gracious Creator is the Proof (at all events,

performs the office and answers all the purpose of a Proof) of the wisdom and benevolence in the construction of the Creature.

Do I blame this? Do I wish it to be otherwise? God forbid! It is only one of its accidental, but too frequent, consequences, of which I complain, and against which I protest. I regret nothing that tends to make the Light become the Life of men, even as the Life in the eternal Word is their alone true light. But I do regret, that in after years—when by occasion of some new dispute on some old heresy, or any other accident, the attention has for the first time been distinctly attracted to the superstructure raised on these fundamental truths, or to truths of later revelation supplemental of these and not less important—all the doubts and difficulties, that cannot but arise where the Understanding, “*the mind of the flesh,*” is made the measure of spiritual things; all the sense of strangeness and seeming contradiction in terms; all the Marvel and the Mystery that belong equally to both; are first thought of and applied in objection exclusively to the latter. I would disturb no man’s faith in the great articles of the (falsely so called) Religion of Nature. But before the man rejects, and calls on other men to reject, the revelations of the Gospel and the Religion of all Christendom, I would have him place himself in the state and under all the privations of a Simonides, when on the fortieth day of his meditation the sage and philosophic Poet abandoned the Problem in despair. Ever and anon he seemed to have hold of the truth; but

when he asked himself, what he *meant* by it, it escaped from him, or resolved itself into meanings, that destroyed each other. I would have the Sceptic, while yet a Sceptic only, seriously consider whether a Doctrine, of the truth of which a Socrates could obtain no other assurance than what he derived from his strong *wish* that it should be true; or that which Plato found a Mystery hard to discover, and when discovered, communicable only to the fewest of men; can, consonantly with History or Common Sense, be classed among the Articles, the Belief of which is ensured to all men by their mere common sense? Whether, without gross outrage to fact, they can be said to constitute a Religion of Nature, or a Natural Theology antecedent to Revelation or superseding its necessity? Yes! in prevention (for there is little chance, I fear, of a *cure*) of the pugnacious dogmatism of *partial* Reflection, I would prescribe to every man, who feels a commencing alienation from the Catholic Faith, and whose studies and attainments authorise him to argue on the subject at all, a patient and thoughtful perusal of the arguments and representations which Bayle supposes to have passed through the mind of Simonides. Or I should be fully satisfied if I could induce these Eschewers of Mystery to give a patient, manly, and impartial perusal to the single Treatise of Pomponatius, *De Fato**.

* The Philosopher, whom the Inquisition would have burnt alive as an Atheist, had not Leo X. and Cardinal Bembo decided that the Work might be formidable to those semi-pagan Chri-

When they have fairly and satisfactorily overthrown the objections and cleared away the difficulties urged by this sharp-witted Italian against the Doctrines which they profess to retain, then let them commence their attack on those which they reject. As far as the supposed irrationality of the latter is the ground of Argument, I am much deceived if on reviewing their forces they would not find the ranks woefully thinned by the success of their own fire in the preceding Engagement—unless, indeed, by pure heat of Controversy, and to storm the lines of their Antagonists, they can bring to life again the Arguments, which they had themselves killed off in the defence of their own positions. In vain shall we seek for any other mode of meeting the broad facts of the scientific Epicurean, or the requisitions and queries of the all-analysing Pyrrhonist, than by challenging the tribunal to which they appeal, as incompetent to try the question. In order to *non-suit* the infidel Plaintiff, we must remove the cause from the Faculty, that judges according to Sense, and whose judgments, therefore, are valid only on objects of Sense, to the Superior Courts of Conscience and intuitive Reason! “*The words I speak unto you, are Spirit,*” and such only “*are life,*” *i. e.* have an inward and actual power abiding in them.

But the same truth is at once Shield and Bow. The Shaft of Atheism glances aside from it to strike and stians who regarded Revelation as a mere Make-weight to their boasted Religion of Nature; but contained nothing dangerous to the Catholic Church or offensive to a true Believer.

pierce the breast-plate of the Heretic. Well for the Latter, if plucking the weapon from the wound he recognizes an arrow from his own Quiver, and abandons a cause that connects him with such Confederates! Without further rhetoric, the sum and substance of the Argument is this: an insight into the proper functions and subaltern rank of the Understanding may not, indeed, disarm the Psilanthropist of his metaphorical Glosses, or of his *Versions* fresh from the forge and with no other stamp than the private mark of the individual Manufacturer; but it will deprive him of the only rational pretext for having recourse to tools so liable to abuse, and of such perilous example.

COMMENT.

Since the preceding pages were composed, and during an interim of depression and disqualification, I heard with a delight and an interest, that I might without hyperbole call medicinal, that the contra-distinction of Understanding from Reason, for which during twenty years I have been contending, “casting my bread upon the Waters” with a perseverance, which in the existing state of the public taste nothing but the deepest conviction of its importance could have inspired—has been lately adopted and sanctioned by the present distinguished Professor of Anatomy, in the Course of Lectures given by him at the Royal College of Surgeons, on the Zoological part of Natural History; and, if I am rightly informed, in one of the eloquent and impressive introductory Discourses. In

explaining the Nature of Instinct, as deduced from the actions and tendencies of animals successively presented to the Observation of the Comparative Physiologist in the ascending Scale of Organic Life—or rather, I should have said, in an attempt to determine that precise import of the *Term*, which is required by the facts*—the Professor explained the nature of what I have elsewhere called the *Adaptive Power*, i. e. the faculty of adapting means to proximate ends. [N. B. I mean here a *relative* end—that which relatively to one thing is an *end*, though relatively to some other it

* The word, Instinct, brings together a number of facts into one class by the assertion of a common ground, the nature of which ground it determines *negatively* only—i. e. the word does not explain *what* this common ground is; but simply indicates, that there *is* such a ground, and that it is different in kind from that in which the responsible and consciously voluntary Actions of Men originate. Thus, in its true and primary import, Instinct stands in antithesis to Reason; and the perplexity and contradictory statements into which so many meritorious Naturalists, and popular Writers on Natural History (Priscilla Wakefield, Kirby, Spence, Hüber, and even Reimarus) have fallen on this subject, arise wholly from their taking the word in opposition to Understanding. I notice this because I would not lose any opportunity of impressing on the mind of my youthful readers the important truth that Language (as the embodied and articulated Spirit of the Race, as the growth and emanation of a People, and not the work of any individual Wit or Will) is often inadequate, sometimes deficient, but never false or delusive. We have only to master the true origin and original import of any native and abiding word, to find in it, if not the *solution* of the facts expressed by it, yet a finger-mark pointing to the road on which this solution is to be sought for.

is itself a *means*. It is to be regretted, that we have no single word to express these ends, that are not *the* end: for the distinction between these and an end in the proper sense of the term is an important one.] The Professor, I say, not only explained, first, the Nature of the Adaptive Power *in genere*, and, secondly, the distinct character of the *same* Power as it exists *specifically* and exclusively in the *human* being, and acquires the name of Understanding; but he did it in a way which gave the whole sum and substance of my convictions, of all I had so long wished, and so often, but with such imperfect success, attempted to convey, free from all semblance of Paradoxy, and from all occasion of offence—*omnem offendiculi* ansam præcidens*. It is, indeed, for the *fragmentary* reader only that I have any scruple. In those who have had the patience to accompany me so far on the up-hill road to many Principles, I can have no reason to guard against that disposition to hasty offence from

* *Neque quicquam addubito, quin ea candidis omnibus faciat satis. Quid autem facias istis qui vel ob ingenii pertinaciam sibi satisfieri nolint, vel stupidiores sint quam ut satisfactionem intelligant? Nam quemadmodum Simonides dixit, Thessalos hebetiores esse quam ut possint a se decipi, ita quosdam videas stupidiores quam ut placari queant. Adhuc non mirum est invenire quod calumniatur qui nihil aliud quærit nisi quod calumniatur. (Erasmi Epist. ad Dorpium.)* At all events, the following Exposition having been received at second hand, and passing through the medium of my own prepossessions, if any fault be found with it, the fault probably, and the blame certainly, belongs to the Reporter.

Anticipation of *Consequences*, that faithless and loveless spirit of fear which plunged Galilæo into a Prison*—a spirit most unworthy of an educated man, who ought to have learnt that the Mistakes of scientific men have never injured Christianity, while every new truth discovered by them has either added to its evidence, or prepared the mind for its reception.

* And which (I might have added) in a more enlightened age, and in a Protestant Country, impelled more than one German University to anathematize Fr. Hoffman's discovery of Carbonic Acid Gas, and of its effects on animal life, as hostile to religion, and tending to Atheism! Three or four Students at the university of Jena, in the attempt to raise a Spirit for the discovery of a supposed hidden treasure, were strangled or poisoned by the fumes of the Charcoal they had been burning in a close Garden-house of a vineyard near Jena, while employed in their magic fumigations and charms. One only was restored to Life: and from his account of the Noises and Spectres (*in* his ears and eyes) as he was losing his senses, it was taken for granted that *the bad Spirit* had destroyed them. Frederic Hoffman admitted that it was a *very bad* spirit that had *tempted* them, the Spirit of Avarice and Folly; and that a *very noxious* Spirit (Gas, or Geist, is the *german* for Spirit) was the immediate cause of their death. But he contended that this latter Spirit was the *Spirit* of Charcoal, which would have produced the same effect, had the young men been chanting psalms instead of incantations: and acquitted the Devil of all *direct* concern in the business. The Theological Faculty took the alarm: even Physicians pretended to be horror-struck at Hoffman's audacity. The Controversy and its appendages embittered several years of this great and good man's life.

ON INSTINCT IN CONNEXION WITH THE UNDER-
STANDING.

It is evident, that the Definition of a Genus or Class is an *adequate* definition only of the lowest *species* of that Genus: for each higher species is distinguished from the lower by some additional character, while the General Definition includes only the characters common to *all* the Species. Consequently it *describes* the lowest only. Now I distinguish a Genus or *kind* of Powers under the name of Adaptive Power, and give as its generic definition—the Power of selecting, and adapting means to proximate ends; and as an instance of the lowest *species* of this Genus, I take the stomach of a Caterpillar. I ask myself, under what words I can generalize the action of this Organ; and I see, that it selects and adapts the appropriate means (*i. e.* the assimilable part of the vegetable *congesta*) to the proximate end, *i. e.* the growth or reproduction of the Insect's Body. This we call VITAL POWER, or *vita propria* of the Stomach; and this being the *lowest* species, its definition is the same with the definition of the *kind*.

Well! from the Power of the Stomach I pass to the Power exerted by the whole animal. I trace it wandering from spot to spot, and plant to plant, till it finds the appropriate vegetable; and again on this chosen vegetable, I mark it seeking out and fixing on the part of the plant, bark, leaf, or petal, suited to its nourishment: or (should the animal have assumed

the butterfly form), to the deposition of its eggs, and the sustentation of the future Larva. Here I see a power of selecting and adapting means to proximate ends *according to circumstances*: and this higher species of Adaptive Power we call INSTINCT.

Lastly, I reflect on the facts narrated and described in the preceding extracts from Hüber, and see a power of selecting and adapting the proper means to the proximate ends, according to *varying* circumstances. And what shall we call this yet higher species? We name the former, Instinct: we must call this INSTINCTIVE INTELLIGENCE.

Here then we have three Powers of the same kind, Life, Instinct, and instinctive Intelligence: the essential characters that define the genus existing equally in all three. But in addition to these, I find one other character common to the highest and lowest: viz. that the purposes are all manifestly pre-determined by the peculiar organization of the Animals; and though it may not be possible to discover any such immediate dependency in all the Actions, yet the Actions being determined by the purposes, the *result* is equivalent: and both the Actions and the Purposes are all in a necessitated reference to the preservation and continuance of the particular Animal or of the Progeny. There is selection, but not *choice*: volition rather than Will. The possible *knowledge* of a thing, or the desire to have that *thing* representable by a distinct correspondent *Thought*, does not, in the animal, suffice to render the thing an *object*, or the ground of a purpose.

I select and adapt the proper means to the separation of a stone from a rock, which I neither can, or desire to, make use of for food, shelter, or ornament: because, perhaps, I wish to measure the angles of its primary crystals, or, perhaps, for no better reason than the apparent *difficulty* of loosening the stone—stat pro ratione Voluntas—and thus make a motive out of the absence of all motive, and a reason out of the arbitrary will to act without any reason.

Now what is the conclusion from these premises? Evidently this: that if I suppose the Adaptive Power in its highest species or form of Instinctive Intelligence to co-exist with Reason, *Free* will, and Self-consciousness, it instantly becomes UNDERSTANDING: in other words, that Understanding differs indeed from the noblest form of Instinct, but not in itself or in its own essential properties, but in consequence of its co-existence with far higher Powers of a diverse kind in one and the same Subject. INSTINCT in a rational, responsible, and self-conscious Animal, is Understanding.

Such I apprehend to have been the Professor's View and Exposition of Instinct—and in confirmation of its truth, I would merely request my Readers, from the numerous well-authenticated instances on record, to recall some one of the extraordinary actions of Dogs for the preservation of their Masters' lives, and even for the avenging of their deaths. In these instances we have the third species of the Adaptive Power, in connexion with an apparently *moral* end—with an *end* in the proper sense of the word. *Here* the Adap-

tive Power co-exists with a purpose apparently *voluntary*, and the action seems neither predetermined by the organization of the Animal, nor in any direct reference to his own preservation, or to the continuance of his race. It is united with an imposing semblance of Gratitude, Fidelity, and disinterested Love. We not only *value* the faithful Brute: we attribute *worth* to him. This, I admit, is a problem, of which I have no solution to offer. One of the wisest of uninspired men has not hesitated to declare the Dog a great mystery, on account of this dawning of a *moral* nature unaccompanied by any the least evidence of *Reason*, in whichever of the two senses we interpret the word—whether as the *practical* Reason, *i. e.* the power of proposing an *ultimate* end, the determinability of the Will by IDEAS; or as the *sciential* Reason, *i. e.* the faculty of concluding universal and necessary truths from particular and contingent appearances. But in a question respecting the possession of Reason, the absence of all proof is tantamount to a proof of the contrary. It is, however, by no means equally clear to me, that the Dog may not possess an *analogon* of WORDS, which I have elsewhere shown to be the proper objects of the “Faculty, judging according to Sense.”

But to return to my purpose: I intreat the Reader to reflect on any one fact of this kind, whether occurring in his own experience, or selected from the numerous anecdotes of the Dog preserved in the writings of Zoologists. I will then confidently appeal to him, whether it is in his power not to consider the faculty

displayed in these actions as the same *in kind* with the Understanding, however inferior *in degree*. Or should he even in these instances prefer calling it *Instinct*, and this in *contra*-distinction from *Understanding*, I call on him to point out the boundary between the two, the chasm or partition-wall that divides or separates the one from the other. If he can, he will have done what none before him have been able to do, though many and eminent men have tried hard for it: and my recantation shall be among the first trophies of his success. If he cannot, I must infer that he is controlled by his dread of the *Consequences*, by an apprehension of some injury resulting to Religion or Morality from this opinion; and I shall console myself with the hope, that in the sequel of this work he will find proofs of the direct contrary tendency. Not only is this view of the Understanding, as differing in *degree* from Instinct and *in kind* from Reason, innocent in its possible influences on the religious character, but it is an indispensable preliminary to the removal of the most formidable obstacles to an intelligent Belief of the *peculiar* Doctrines of the Gospel, of the *characteristic* Articles of the Christian Faith, with which the Advocates of the truth in Christ have to contend; the evil *heart* of Unbelief alone excepted.

REFLECTIONS BY THE EDITOR INTRODUCTORY TO
APHORISM THE Xth.

The most *momentous* question a man can ask is, Have I a Saviour? And yet, as far as the individual Querist is concerned, it is premature and to no purpose, except another question has been previously put and answered (alas! too generally put after the wounded Conscience has already given the answer!) *viz.* Have I any need of a Saviour? For him who *needs* none (O bitter irony of the evil Spirit, whose whispers the proud Soul takes for its own thoughts, and knows not how the Tempter is scoffing the while!) there *is* none, as long as he feels no need. On the other hand, it is scarce possible to have answered this question in the affirmative, and not ask—first, *in what* the necessity consists? secondly, *whence* it proceeded? and, thirdly, how far the answer to this second question is or is not contained in the answer to the first? I intreat the intelligent Reader, who has taken me as his temporary guide on the strait, but yet, from the number of cross roads, difficult way of religious Inquiry, to halt a moment, and consider the main points that in this last division of our work have been already offered for his reflection. I have attempted then to fix the proper meaning of the words Nature and Spirit, the one being the *antithesis* to the other: so that the most general and *negative* definition of Nature is, Whatever is not Spirit; and *vice versâ* of Spirit, That which is not comprehended in Nature; or in the language of our

elder Divines, that which transcends Nature. But Nature is the term in which we comprehend all things that are representable in the forms of Time and Space, and subjected to the Relations of Cause and Effect: and the cause of whose existence therefore is to be sought for perpetually in something Antecedent. The word itself expresses this in the strongest manner possible: *Natura*, that which is *about to be* born, that which is always *becoming*. It follows, therefore, that whatever originates its own acts, or in any sense contains in itself the cause of its own state, must be *spiritual*, and consequently *super-natural*: yet not on that account necessarily *miraculous*. And such must the responsible WILL in us be, if it be at all. (See p. 131—139).

A prior step had been to remove all misconceptions from the subject; to show the reasonableness of a belief in the reality and real influence of a universal and divine Spirit; the compatibility and possible communion of such a Spirit with the Spiritual in Principle Individuals; and the analogy offered by the most undeniable truths of Natural Philosophy*. (See p. 67—74).

* It has in its consequences proved no trifling evil to the Christian World, that Aristotle's Definitions of Nature are all grounded on the petty and rather rhetorical than philosophical Antithesis of Nature to Art—a conception inadequate to the demands even of *his* Philosophy. Hence in the progress of his reasoning, he confounds the *Natura Naturata* (that is, the sum total of the Facts and Phænomena of the Senses) with an hypothetical *Natura Naturans*, a *Goddess* Nature, that has no better claim to a place in any sober system of Natural Philosophy

These Views of the Spirit, and of the Will as Spiritual, form the ground-work of our Scheme. Among the numerous Corollaries or Appendants, the first that presented itself respects the question, Whether there is any faculty in man by which a knowlege of spiritual truths, or of any truths not abstracted from Nature, is rendered possible? and an Answer is attempted in the Comment on Aphorism VIIIth. And here I beg leave to remark, that in this Comment the only Novelty, and, if there be Merit, the only Merit is—that there being two very different Meanings, and two different Words, I have here and in former Works appropriated one meaning to one of the Words, and the other to the other—instead of using the words indifferently and by hap-hazard: a confusion, the ill effects of which in this instance are so great and of such frequent occurrence in the works of our ablest Philosophers and Divines, that I should select it before all others in proof of Hobbes's Maxim: that it is a short and downhill passage from errors in words to errors in things. The distinctness of the Reason from than the Goddess *Multitudo*; yet to which Aristotle not rarely gives the name and attributes of the Supreme Being. The result was, that the Idea of God thus identified with this hypothetical *Nature* becomes itself but an *Hypothesis*, or at best but a precarious inference from incommensurate premises and on disputable Principles: while in other passages, God is confounded with (and everywhere, in Aristotle's *genuine* works, *included in*) the Universe: which most grievous error it is the great and characteristic Merit of Plato to have avoided and denounced.

the Understanding, and the imperfection and limited sphere of the latter, have been asserted by many both before and since Lord Bacon*; but still the habit of using Reason and Understanding as synonymes, acted as a disturbing force. Some it led into mysticism, others it set on explaining away a clear difference *in kind* into a mere superiority in degree: and it partially eclipsed the truth for all.

In close connexion with this, and therefore forming the Comment on the Aphorism next following, is the Subject of the legitimate exercise of the Understanding and its limitation to Objects of Sense; with the errors both of unbelief and of misbelief, that result from its extension beyond the sphere of possible Experience. Wherever the forms of Reasoning appropriate only to the *natural* world are applied to *spiritual* realities, it may be truly said, that the more strictly logical the Reasoning is in all its *parts*, the more irrational it is as a *whole*.

The Reader thus armed and prepared, I now venture

* Take one passage among many from the posthumous Tracts (1660) of John Smith, not the least Star in that bright Constellation of Cambridge Men, the contemporaries of Jeremy Taylor. "While we reflect on our own idea of Reason, we know that our own Souls are not it, but only partake of it; and that we have it *κατα μεθεξίν* and not *κατ' ουσίαν*. Neither can it be called a Faculty, but far rather a Light, which we enjoy, but the Source of which is not in ourselves, nor rightly by any individual to be denominated *mine*." This *pure* intelligence he then proceeds to contrast with the *Discursive* Faculty, *i. e.* the Understanding.

to present the so called mysteries of Faith, *i. e.* the peculiar tenets and especial Constituents of Christianity, or Religion in spirit and in truth. In right order I must have commenced with the Articles of the Trinity and the Apostacy, including the question respecting the Origin of Evil, and the Incarnation of the WORD. And could I have followed this order, some difficulties that now press on me would have been obviated. But (as has already been explained) the limits of the present Volume rendered it alike impracticable and inexpedient; for the necessity of my argument would have called forth certain hard though most true sayings, respecting the hollowness and tricky sophistry of the so called "Natural Theology," "Religion of Nature," "Light of Nature," &c. which a brief exposition could not save from innocent misconceptions, much less protect against plausible misinterpretation. And yet both Reason and Experience have convinced me, that in the greater number of our ALOGI, who feed on the husks of Christianity, the disbelief of the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ included, has its origin and support in the assumed self-evidence of this Natural Theology, and in their ignorance of the insurmountable difficulties which (on the same mode of reasoning) press upon the fundamental articles of their own Remnant of a Creed. But arguments, which would prove the falsehood of a known truth, must themselves be false, and can prove the falsehood of no other position in eodem genere.

This *hint* I have thrown out as a *Spark* that may

perhaps fall where it will kindle. The Reader desirous of more is again referred to the Work already announced. And worthily might the wisest of men make inquisition into the three momentous points here spoken of, for the purposes of speculative Insight, and for the formation of enlarged and systematic views of the destination of Man, and the dispensation of God. But the *practical* Inquirer (I speak not of those who inquire for the gratification of Curiosity, and still less of those who labour as students only to shine as disputants; but of one, who seeks the truth, because he feels the want of it), the practical Inquirer, I say, hath already placed his foot on the rock, if he have satisfied himself that whoever needs not a Redeemer is more than human. Remove for him the difficulties and objections, that oppose or perplex his belief of a crucified Saviour; convince him of the reality of Sin, which is impossible without a knowledge of its true nature and inevitable Consequences; and then satisfy him as to the *fact* historically, and as to the truth spiritually, of a redemption therefrom by Christ; do this for him, and there is little fear that he will permit either logical quirks or metaphysical puzzles to contravene the plain dictate of his Common Sense, that the Sinless One that redeemed Mankind from Sin, must have been more than Man; and that He who brought Light and Immortality into the World, could not in his own nature have been an inheritor of Death and Darkness. It is morally impossible, that a man with these convictions should suffer the Objection of Incomprehensibility (and

this on a subject of *Faith*) to overbalance the manifest absurdity and contradiction in the notion of a Mediator between God and the Human Race, at the same infinite distance from God as the Race for whom he mediates.

The Origin of Evil, meanwhile, is a question interesting only to the Metaphysician, and in a *system* of moral and religious Philosophy. The Man of sober mind, who seeks for truths that possess a moral and practical interest, is content to be *certain*, first, that Evil must have had a beginning, since otherwise it must either be God, or a co-eternal and co-equal Rival of God; both impious notions, and the latter foolish to boot. 2dly, That it could not originate in God; for if so, it would be at once Evil and not Evil, or God would be at once God (that is, infinite Goodness) and not God—both alike impossible positions. Instead therefore of troubling himself with this barren controversy, he more profitably turns his inquiries to *that* Evil which most concerns himself, and of which he *may* find the origin.

The entire Scheme of *necessary* Faith may be reduced to two heads, 1. the Object and Occasion, and 2. the fact and effect, of our redemption by Christ: and to this view does the order of the following Comments correspond. I have begun with ORIGINAL SIN, and proceeded in the following Aphorism to the doctrine of Redemption. The Comments on the remaining Aphorisms are all subsidiary to these, or written in the hope of making the minor tenets of general belief

be believed in a spirit worthy of these. They are, in short, intended to supply a febrifuge against aguish Scruples and Horrors, the hectic of the Soul! and “for servile and thrall-like fear to substitute that adoptive and chearful boldness, which our new alliance with God requires of us as Christians.” (*Milton*). NOT the Origin of Evil, NOT the *Chronology* of Sin, or the chronicles of the original Sinner; but Sin originant, underived from without, and no passive link in the adamantine chain of Effects, each of which is in its turn an *instrument* of Causation, but no one of them a Cause! NOT with Sin *inflicted*, which would be a Calamity! NOT with Sin (*i. e.* an evil tendency) *implanted*, for which let the Planter be responsible! But I begin with *Original Sin*. And for this purpose I have selected the Aphorism from the ablest and most formidable Antagonist of this Doctrine, Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR, and from the most eloquent work of this most eloquent of Divines. Had I said, of Men, the Soul of Cicero would forgive me, and Demosthenes nod assent*!

* We have the assurance of Bishop Horsley, that the Church of England does not demand the literal Understanding of the Document contained in the second (from verse 8) and third Chapters of Genesis as a point of faith, or regard a different interpretation as affecting the orthodoxy of the interpreter: Divines of the most unimpeachable orthodoxy, and the most averse to the allegorizing of Scripture history in general, having from the earliest ages of the Christian Church adopted or permitted it in this instance. And indeed no unprejudiced man can pretend to doubt, that if in any other work of Eastern

APHORISM X.

JEREMY TAYLOR.

ON ORIGINAL SIN.

Is there any such Thing? That is not the question. For it is a Fact acknowledged on all hands almost: and Origin he met with Trees of Life and of Knowledge; talking and conversable Snakes;

Inque rei signum *Serpentem serpere jussum*;

he would want no other proofs that it was an Allegory he was reading, and intended to be understood as such. Nor, supposing him conversant with Oriental works of any thing like the same antiquity, could it surprise him to find events of true history in connexion with, or historical personages among the Actors and Interlocutors of, the Parable. In the temple-language of Egypt the Serpent was the Symbol of the Understanding in its twofold function, namely, as the faculty of *means* to *proximate* or *medial* ends, analogous to the *instinct* of the more intelligent Animals, Ant, Bee, Beaver, &c. and opposed to the practical Reason, as the Determinant of the *ultimate* End; and again, as the discursive and logical Faculty possessed individually by each Individual—the *LOGOS ἐν ἐκαστῷ*, in distinction from the *Nous*, *i. e.* Intuitive Reason, the Source of Ideas and ABSOLUTE Truths, and the Principle of the Necessary and the Universal in our Affirmations and Conclusions. Without or in contravention to the Reason (*i. e.* “the *spiritual* mind” of St. Paul, and “the *Light that lighteth every man*” of St. John) this Understanding (*φρονήμα σαρκός*, or carnal mind) becomes the *sophistic* Principle, the wily Tempter to Evil by counterfeit Good; the Pander and Advocate of the Passions and Appetites; ever in league with, and always first applying to, the *Desire*, as the inferior nature in Man, the *Woman* in our Humanity; and through the *DESIRE* prevailing on the *WILL* (the *Manhood*, *Virtus*) against the command of the Universal Reason, and against the

even those who will not confess it in words, confess it in their complaints. For my part I cannot but confess

Light of Reason in the WILL itself. (N.B. This essential inherence of an intelligential Principle (Φῶς νοερόν) in the Will (ἀρχὴ θελητικὴ), or rather the Will itself thus considered, the Greeks expressed by an appropriate word (βουλή). This, but little differing from Origin's interpretation or hypothesis, is supported and confirmed by the very old Tradition of the *Homo androgynus*, *i. e.* that the original Man, the Individual first created, was bi-sexual: a chimæra, of which and of many other mythological traditions the most probable explanation is, that they were originally symbolical *Glyphs* or Sculptures, and afterwards translated into *words*, yet *literally, i. e.* into the common names of the several Figures and Images composing the Symbol, while the symbolic *meaning* was left to be decyphered as before, and sacred to the Initiate. As to the abstruseness and subtlety of the Conceptions, this is so far from being an objection to this oldest *Gloss* on this venerable Relic of Semitic, not impossibly ante-diluvian, Philosophy, that to those who have carried their researches farthest back into Greek, Egyptian, Persian, and Indian Antiquity, it will seem a strong confirmation. Or if I chose to address the Sceptic in the language of the Day, I might remind him, that as Alchemy went before Chemistry, and Astrology before Astronomy, so in all countries of civilized Man have Metaphysics outrun Common Sense. Fortunately for us that they have so! For from all we know of the *unmeta-*physical tribes of New Holland and elsewhere, a Common Sense not preceded by Metaphysics is no very enviable Concern. O be not cheated, my youthful Reader! by this shallow prate! The creed of true Common Sense is composed of the *Results* of Scientific Meditation, Observation, and Experiment, as far as they are *generally* intelligible. It differs therefore in different countries and in every different age of the same Country. The Common Sense of a People is the moveable *index* of its

that *to be*, which I feel and groan under, and by which all the world is miserable.

average judgment and information. Without Metaphysics Science could have had no language, and Common Sense no materials.

But to return to my subject. It cannot be impugned, that the Mosaic Narrative thus interpreted gives a just and faithful exposition of the birth and parentage and successive moments of *phænomenal Sin* (*Peccatum phænomenon: Crimen primarium et commune*), that is, of Sin as it reveals itself *in time*, and is an immediate Object of Consciousness. And in this sense most truly does the Apostle assert, that in Adam we all fell. The first human Sinner is the adequate Representative of all his Successors. And with no less truth may it be said, that it is the same Adam that falls in every man, and from the same reluctance to abandon the too dear and undivorceable Eve: and the same EVE tempted by the same serpentine and perverted Understanding which, framed originally to be the Interpreter of the Reason and the ministering Angel of the Spirit, is henceforth sentenced and bound over to the service of the Animal Nature, its needs and its cravings, dependent on the Senses for all its Materials, with the World of Sense for its appointed Sphere: "Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." I have shown elsewhere, that as the Instinct of the mere intelligence differs in degree not in kind, and circumstantially not essentially from the *Vis Vitæ*, or Vital Power in the assimilative and digestive functions of the Stomach and other organs of Nutrition, that even so the Understanding, in itself and distinct from the Reason and Conscience, differs in degree only from the Instinct in the Animal. It is still but "a beast of the field," though "more subtle than any beast of the field," and therefore in its corruption and perversion "cursed above any"—a pregnant Word! of which, if the Reader wants an exposition or paraphrase, he may find one more than two thousand years

Adam turned his back on the Sun, and dwelt in the Dark and the Shadow. He sinned, and brought evil

old among the fragments of the Poet Menander. (See Cumberland's Observer, No. CL. vol. iii. p. 289, 290.) This is the *Understanding* which in its "every Thought" is to be brought "under obedience to Faith;" which it can scarcely fail to be, if only it be first subjected to the Reason, of which spiritual Faith is even the Blossoming and the fructifying process. For it is indifferent whether I say that Faith is the interpenetration of the Reason and the Will, or that it is at once the Assurance and the Commencement of the approaching Union between the Reason and the *Intelligible* Realities, the *Living* and *Substantial* Truths, that are even in this life its most proper Objects.

I have thus put the reader in possession of my own opinions respecting the Narrative in Gen. ii. and iii. "Ἐσιν οὖν δὴ, ὡς ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ, ἱερός μῦθος, ἀληθέστατον καὶ ἀρχαιότατον φιλοσόφημα, ἐυσέβεισι μὲν σέβασμα, συνετοῖς τε φωνᾶν· ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν ἐρμηνέως χατίζει. Or I might ask with Augustine, Why not both? Why not at once Symbol and History? or rather how should it be otherwise? Must not of necessity the FIRST MAN be a SYMBOL of Mankind, in the fullest force of the word, Symbol, rightly defined—viz. *A Symbol is a sign included in the Idea, which it represents*: ex. gr. an actual *part* chosen to represent the *whole*, as a lip with a chin prominent is a Symbol of Man; or a *lower* form or species of a higher in the same *kind*: by which definition the Symbolical is distinguished *toto genere* from the Allegoric and Metaphorical. But, perhaps, parables, allegories, and allegorical or typical applications, are incompatible with *inspired* Scripture! The writings of St. Paul are sufficient proof of the contrary. Yet I readily acknowledge, that allegorical *applications* are one thing, and allegorical *interpretation* another: and that where there is no ground for supposing such a sense to have entered into the intent and purpose of the sacred Penman, they are not to be commended. So far, indeed, am I from entertaining any predilection for them,

into his *Supernatural* endowments, and lost the Sacrament and instrument of Immortality, the Tree of Life in the centre of the Garden. He then fell under the evils of a sickly Body, and a passionate and ignorant Soul. His Sin made him sickly, his Sickness made him peevish: his Sin left him ignorant, his Ignorance made him foolish and unreasonable. His sin left him to his *Nature*: and by Nature, whoever was to be born at all was to be born a child, and to do before he could understand, and to be bred under laws to which he was always bound, but which could not always be exacted; and he was to choose when he could not reason, and had passions most strong when he had his understanding most weak; and the more need he had of a curb, the less strength he had to use it! And this being the case of all the world, what was *every* man's evil became

or any favourable opinion of the Rabbinical Commentators and Traditionists, from whom the fashion was derived, that in carrying it as far as our own Church has carried it, I follow her judgment and not my own. But in the first place, I know but one other part of the Scriptures not universally held to be parabolical, which, not without the sanction of great authorities, I am disposed to regard as an Apologue or Parable, namely, the Book of Jonas; the reasons for believing the Jewish Nation collectively to be therein impersonated, seeming to me unanswerable. (See the Appendix to the Statesman's Manual, Note II.) Secondly, as to Chapters now in question—that such interpretation is at least tolerated by our church, I have the word of one of her most Zealous Champions. And lastly, it is my deliberate and conscientious conviction, that the proofs of such having been the intention of the inspired Writer or Compiler of the book of Genesis, lie on the face of the Narrative itself.

all men's greater evil; and though alone it was very bad, yet when they came together it was made much worse. Like ships in a storm, every one alone hath enough to do to outride it; but when they meet, besides the evils of the Storm, they find the intolerable calamity of their mutual concussion; and every Ship that is ready to be oppressed with the tempest, is a worse Tempest to every Vessel against which it is violently dashed. So it is in Mankind. Every man hath evil enough of his own, and it is hard for a man to live up to the rule of his own Reason and Conscience. But when he hath Parents and Children, Friends and Enemies, Buyers and Sellers, Lawyers and Clients, a Family and a Neighbourhood—then it is that every man dashes against another, and one relation requires what another denies; and when one speaks another will contradict him; and that which is well spoken is sometimes innocently mistaken; and that upon a good cause produces an evil effect; and by these, and ten thousand other concurrent causes, man is made more than most miserable.

COMMENT.

The first question we should put to ourselves, when we have read a passage that perplexes us in a work of authority, is: What does the Writer *mean* by all this? And the second question should be, What does he intend by all this? In the passage before us, Taylor's *meaning* is not quite clear. A Sin is an Evil which has its ground or origin in the Agent, and not in the

Circumstances. Circumstances are compulsory from the absence of a power to resist or control them: and if this absence likewise be the effect of Circumstance (*i. e.* if it have been neither directly nor indirectly caused by the Agent himself) the Evil *derives* from the Circumstances; and therefore (in the Apostle's sense of the word, Sin, when he speaks of the exceeding sinfulness of Sin) such *evil* is not *sin*; and the person who suffers it, or who is the compelled instrument of its infliction on others, may feel *regret*, but cannot feel *remorse*. So likewise of the word origin, original, or originant. The reader cannot too early be warned that it is not applicable, and, without abuse of language, can never be applied, to a mere *link* in a chain of effects, where each, indeed, stands in the relation of a *cause* to those that follow, but is at the same time the *effect* of all that precede. For in these cases a cause amounts to little more than an antecedent. At the utmost it means only a *conductor* of the causative influence: and the old axiom, *Causa causæ causa causati*, applies, with a never-ending regress to each several link, up the whole chain of nature. But this (as I have elsewhere shown at large) is Nature: and no *Natural* thing or act can be called originant, or be truly said to have an *origin** in any other. The moment we

* This sense of the word is implied even in its metaphorical or figurative use. Thus we may say of a *River* that it *originates* in such or such a *fountain*; but the water of a *Canal* is *derived* from such or such a *River*. The Power which we call Nature, may be thus defined: A Power subject to the Law of

assume an Origin in Nature, a true *Beginning*, an actual First—that moment we rise *above* Nature, and

Continuity (*Lex Continui. In Naturâ non datur Saltus.*) which law the human Understanding, by a necessity arising out of its own constitution, can *conceive* only under the form of Cause and Effect. That this *form* (or law) of Cause and Effect is (relatively to the World *without*, or to Things as they subsist independently of our perceptions) only a form or mode of *thinking*; that it is a law inherent in the Understanding itself (just as the symmetry of the miscellaneous objects seen by the kaleidoscope inheres in (*i. e.* results from) the mechanism of the kaleidoscope itself)—this becomes evident as soon as we attempt to apply the pre-conception directly to any operation of Nature. For in this case we are forced to represent the cause as being at the same instant the effect, and vice versâ the effect as being the cause—a relation which we seek to express by the terms Action and Re-action; but for which the term Reciprocal Action or the Law of Reciprocity (*germanicè* Wechselwirkung) would be both more accurate and more expressive.

These are truths which can scarcely be too frequently impressed on the Mind that is in earnest in the wish to *reflect* aright. Nature is a Line in constant and continuous evolution. Its *beginning* is lost in the Super-natural: and *for our understanding*, therefore, it must appear as a continuous line without beginning or end. But where there is no discontinuity there can be no origination. and every appearance of origination in *Nature* is but a shadow of our own casting. It is a reflection from our own *Will* or Spirit. Herein, indeed, the *Will* consists. This is the essential character by which *WILL* is *opposed* to Nature, as *Spirit*, and raised *above* Nature as *self-determining* Spirit—this, namely, that it is a power of *originating* an act or state.

A young friend or, as he was pleased to describe himself, *a pupil of mine, who is beginning to learn to think*, asked me to explain by an instance what is meant by “*originating* an act

are compelled to assume a *supernatural* Power. (Gen. I. v. 1.)

or state." My answer was—This morning I awoke with a dull pain, which I knew from experience the Getting up would remove; and yet by adding to the drowsiness and by weakening or depressing the *volition* (*voluntas sensorialis seu mechanica*) the very pain seemed to *hold me back*, to fix me (as it were) to the bed. After a peevish ineffectual quarrel with this painful disinclination, I said to myself: Let me count twenty, and the moment I come to nineteen I will leap out of bed. So said, and so done. Now should you ever find yourself in the same or in a similar state, and should attend to *the Goings-on* within you, you will learn what I mean by *originating* an act. At the same time you will see that it belongs *exclusively* to the Will (*arbitrium*); that there is nothing analogous to it in outward experiences; and that I had, therefore, no way of explaining it but by referring you to an *Act* of your own, and to the peculiar self-consciousness preceding and accompanying it. As we know what Life is by *Being*, so we know what Will is by *Acting*. That in *willing* (replied my young Friend) we *appear* to ourselves to constitute an actual *Beginning*, and that this seems *unique*, and without any example in our *sensible* experience, or in the phænomena of Nature, is an undeniable *fact*. But may it not be an illusion arising from our ignorance of the antecedent causes? You *may* suppose this (I rejoined) That the soul of every man should impose a *Lie* on itself; and that this Lie, and the acting on the faith of its being the most important of all truths and the most real of all realities, should form the main contra-distinctive character of Humanity, and the only basis of that distinction between Things and Persons on which our whole moral and criminal Law is grounded—You *can* suppose this! I cannot, as I could in the case of an arithmetical or geometrical proposition, render it *impossible* for you to suppose it. Whether you can reconcile such a supposition with the

It will be an equal convenience to myself and to my Readers, to let it be agreed between us, that we will

belief of an All-wise Creator, is another question. But, taken singly, it is doubtless in your power to suppose this. Were it not, the belief of the contrary would be no subject of a *Command*, no part of a moral or religious *Duty*. You would not, however, suppose it *without a reason*. But all the pretexts that ever have been or ever can be offered for this supposition, are built on certain *Notions* of the Understanding that have been generalized from *Conceptions*; which conceptions, again, are themselves generalized or abstracted from objects of Sense. Neither the one or the other, therefore, have any force except in application to objects of Sense and within the sphere of sensible Experience. What but absurdity can follow, if you decide on Spirit by the laws of Matter? if you judge that which, if it be at all, must be *super-sensual*, by that faculty of your mind, the very definition of which is “the Faculty judging *according* to Sense?” These then are unworthy the name of *reasons*: they are only pretexts. But *without* reason to contradict your own Consciousness in defiance of your own Conscience, is *contrary* to Reason. Such and such Writers, you say, have made a great *sensation*. If so, I am sorry for it; but the fact I take to be this. From a variety of causes the more austere Sciences have fallen into discredit, and Impostors have taken advantage of the general ignorance to give a sort of mysterious and terrific importance to a parcel of trashy Sophistry, the Authors of which would not have employed themselves more irrationally in submitting the works of Rafael or Titian to Canons of Criticism deduced from the Sense of Smell. Nay, less so. For here the Objects and the Organs are only disparate: while in the other case they are absolutely diverse. I conclude this note by reminding the reader, that my first object is to make myself *understood*. When he is in full possession of my *meaning*, then let him consider whether it deserves to be received as *the truth*.

generalize the word Circumstance so as to understand by it, as often as it occurs in this Comment, all and every thing not connected with the Will, past or present, of a Free Agent. Even though it were the blood in the chambers of his Heart, or his own inmost Sensations, we will regard them as *circumstantial, extrinsic, or from without.*

In this sense of the word Original, and in the sense before given of Sin, it is evident that the phrase, Original Sin, is a Pleonasm, the epithet not adding to the thought, but only enforcing it. For if it be Sin, it must be *original*: and a State or Act, that has not its origin in the will, may be calamity, deformity, disease, or mischief; but a *Sin* it cannot be. It is not enough that the Act appears voluntary, or that it is intentional; or that it has the most hateful passions or debasing appetite for its proximate cause and accompaniment. All these may be found in a Mad-house, where neither Law nor Humanity permit

Had it been my immediate purpose to make him *believe* me as well as *understand* me, I should have thought it necessary to warn him that a *finite* Will does indeed originate an *act*, and may originate a *state* of being; but yet only *in* and *for* the Agent himself. A finite Will *constitutes* a true Beginning; but with regard to the series of motions and changes by which the free act is manifested and made *effectual*, the *finite* Will *gives* a beginning only by co-incident with that *absolute* WILL, which is at the same time *Infinite* POWER! Such is the language of Religion, and of Philosophy too in the last instance. But I express the same truth in ordinary language when I say, that a finite Will, or the Will of a finite Free-agent, acts outwardly by confluence with the Laws of Nature.

us to condemn the Actor of Sin. The Reason of Law declares the Maniac not a Free-Agent; and the Verdict follows of course—Not guilty. Now Mania, as distinguished from Ideocy, Frenzy, Delirium, Hypochondria, and Derangement (the last term used specifically to express a suspension or disordered state of the Understanding or Adaptive Power) is the Occultation or Eclipse of Reason, as the Power of ultimate ends. The Maniac, it is well known, is often found clever and inventive in the selection and adaptation of means to *his* ends; but his *ends* are madness. He has lost his Reason. For though Reason, in finite Beings, is not the Will—or how could the Will be opposed to the Reason?—yet it is the *condition*, the *sine quâ non* of a *Free-will*.

We will now return to the Extract from Jeremy Taylor on a theme of deep interest in itself, and trebly important from its *bearings*. For without just and distinct views respecting the Article of Original Sin, it is impossible to understand aright any one of the peculiar doctrines of Christianity. Now my first complaint is, that the eloquent Bishop, while he admits the *fact* as established beyond controversy by universal experience, yet leaves us wholly in the dark as to the main point, supplies us with no answer to the principal question—why he names it Original Sin? It cannot be said, We know what the Bishop *means*, and what matters the name? for the *nature* of the fact, and in what light it should be regarded by us, depends on the nature of our answer to the question, whether

Original Sin is or is not the right and proper designation. I can imagine the same quantum of *Sufferings*, and yet if I had reason to regard them as symptoms of a commencing Change, as pains of growth, the temporary deformity and misproportions of immaturity, or (as in the final sloughing of the Caterpillar) as throes and struggles of the waxing or evolving PSYCHE, I should think it no stoical flight to doubt, how far I was authorised to declare the Circumstance an *Evil* at all. Most assuredly I would not express or describe the fact as an evil having an origin in the Sufferers themselves, or as Sin.

Let us, however, waive this objection. Let it be supposed that the Bishop uses the word in a different and more comprehensive Sense, and that by Sin he understands Evil of all kind connected with or resulting from *Actions*—though I do not see how we can represent the properties even of inanimate Bodies (of poisonous substances for instance) except as *Acts* resulting from the constitution of such bodies! Or if this sense, though not unknown to the Mystic Divines, should be *too* comprehensive and remote, we will suppose the Bishop to comprise under the term Sin, the Evil accompanying or consequent on *human* Actions and Purposes:—though here too, I have a right to be informed, for what reason and on what grounds Sin is thus limited to *human* Agency? And truly, I should be at no loss to assign the reason. But then this reason would instantly bring me back to my first definition; and any other reason, than that the human Agent is endowed

with Reason, and with a Will which can place itself either in subjection or in opposition to his Reason—in other words, that Man is alone of all known Animals a responsible Creature—I neither know or can imagine.

Thus, then, the Sense which Taylor—and with him the Antagonists generally of this Article as propounded by the first Reformers—attaches to the words, Original Sin, needs only be carried on into its next consequence, and it will be found to *imply* the sense which I have given—namely, that Sin is Evil having an *Origin*. But inasmuch as it is *evil*, in God it cannot originate: and yet in some *Spirit* (*i. e.* in some *supernatural* power) it *must*. For in *Nature* there is no origin. Sin therefore is spiritual Evil: but the spiritual in Man is the Will. Now when we do not refer to any particular Sins, but to that state and constitution of the Will, which is the ground, condition and common Cause of all Sins; and when we would further express the truth, that this corrupt *Nature* of the Will must in some sense or other be considered as its own act, that the corruption must have been self-originated;—in this case and for this purpose we may, with no less propriety than force, entitle this dire spiritual evil and source of all evil, that is absolutely such, Original Sin. (I have said, “the corrupt *Nature* of the Will.” I might add, that the admission of a *Nature* into a spiritual essence by its own act *is* a corruption.)

Such, I repeat, would be the inevitable conclusion, *if* Taylor’s Sense of the term were carried on into its immediate consequences. But the whole of his most

eloquent Treatise makes it certain that Taylor did not carry it on: and consequently Original Sin, according to his conception, is a Calamity which being common to all men must be supposed to result from their common Nature: in other words, the universal Calamity of Human *Nature*!

Can we wonder, then, that a mind, a heart like Taylor's, should reject, that he should strain his faculties to explain away, the belief that this Calamity, so dire in itself, should appear to the All-merciful God a rightful cause and motive for inflicting on the wretched Sufferers a Calamity infinitely more tremendous? nay, that it should be incompatible with Divine Justice *not* to punish it by everlasting torment? Or need we be surprised if he found nothing, that could reconcile his mind to such a belief, in the circumstance that the acts now *consequent* on this Calamity and either directly or indirectly *effects* of the same were, five or six thousand years ago in the instance of a certain Individual and his Accomplice, *anterior* to the Calamity, and the *Cause* or *Occasion* of the same? that what in all other men is *Disease*, in these two Persons was *Guilt*? that what in *us* is *hereditary*, and consequently *Nature*, in *them* was *original*, and consequently *Sin*? Lastly, might it not be presumed, that so enlightened, and at the same time so affectionate, a Divine, would even fervently disclaim and reject the pretended justifications of God grounded on flimsy analogies drawn from the imperfections of human ordinances and human justice-courts—some of very

doubtful character even as human Institutes, and all of them just only as far as they are necessary, and rendered necessary chiefly by the weakness and wickedness, the limited powers and corrupt passions, of mankind? The more confidently might this be presumed of so acute and practised a Logician, as Jeremy Taylor, in addition to his other extra-ordinary Gifts, is known to have been, when it is demonstrable that the most current of these justifications rests on a palpable equivocation: viz. the gross misuse of the word Right*. An

* It may conduce to the readier comprehension of this point if I say, that the Equivoque consists in confounding the almost technical Sense of the *Noun Substantive*, Right (a sense most often determined by the genitive case following, as the Right of Property, the Right of Husbands to chastise their Wives, and so forth) with the popular sense of the *Adjective*, right: though this likewise has, if not a double sense, yet a double application—the first, when it is used to express the fitness of a mean to a relative End, *ex. gr.* “the *right* way to obtain the *right* distance at which a Picture should be examined,” &c.; and the other, when it expresses a perfect conformity and commensurateness with the immutable Idea of Equity, or perfect Rectitude. Hence the close connexion between the words, righteousness and godliness, *i. e.* godlikeness.

I should be tempted to subjoin a few words on a predominating doctrine closely connected with the present argument—the Palæian Principle of GENERAL CONSEQUENCES; but the inadequacy of this Principle as a criterion of Right and Wrong, and above all its utter unfitness as a Moral Guide, have been elsewhere so fully stated (FRIEND, vol. ii. p. 216—240), that even in again referring to the Subject, I must shelter myself under Seneca's rule, that what we cannot too frequently think

instance will explain my meaning. In as far as, from the known frequency of dishonest or mischievous persons, it may have been found *necessary*, in so far is the Law *justifiable* in giving Landowners the Right of proceeding against a neighbour or fellow-citizen for even a slight trespass on that which the Law has made their Property:—nay, of proceeding in sundry instances criminally and even capitally. (Where at least from the known poverty of the Trespasser it is fore-known that the consequences will be penal. Thus: three poor men were fined Twenty Pounds each, the one for knocking down a Hare, the other for picking it up, and third for carrying it off: and not possessing as many Pence, were sent to Jail.) But surely, either there is no religion in the

of, we cannot too often be made to recollect. It is, however, of immediate importance to the point in discussion, that the Reader should be made to see how altogether incompatible the principle of judging by General Consequences is with the Idea of an Eternal, Omnipresent and Omniscient Being! that he should be made aware of the absurdity of attributing *any* form of Generalization to the all-perfect Mind. *To generalize* is a faculty and function of the Human Understanding, and from its imperfection and limitation are the use and the necessity of generalizing derived. Generalization is a Substitute for Intuition, for the Power of *intuitive* (that is, immediate) knowledge. As a Substitute, it is a gift of inestimable Value to a finite Intelligence, such as *Man* in his present state is endowed with and capable of exercising; but yet a *Substitute* only, and an imperfect one to boot. To attribute it to God is the grossest Anthropomorphism: and grosser instances of Anthropomorphism than are to be found in the controversial writings on Original Sin and Vicarious Satisfaction, the Records of Superstition do not supply.

world, and nothing obligatory in the precepts of the Gospel, or there are occasions in which it would be very *wrong* in the Proprietor to exercise the *Right*, which yet it may be highly *expedient* that he should possess. On this ground it is, that Religion is the sustaining Opposite of Law.

That Jeremy Taylor, therefore, should have striven fervently against the Article so interpreted and so vindicated, is (for me, at least,) a subject neither of Surprise nor of Complaint. It is the doctrine which he *substitutes*, it is the weakness and inconsistency betrayed in the defence of this substitute, it is the unfairness with which he blackens the established Article—for to give it, as it had been caricatured by a few Ultra-Calvinists during the fever of the (so called) *quinquarticular* Controversy, was in effect to blacken it—and then imposes another scheme, to which the same objections apply with even increased force, a scheme which seems to differ from the former only by adding fraud and mockery to injustice: these are the things that excite my wonder, it is of these that I complain! For what does the Bishop's scheme amount to? God, he tells us, required of Adam a perfect obedience, and made it possible by endowing him “with perfect rectitudes and super-natural heights of grace” proportionate to the obedience which he required. As a *consequence* of his disobedience, Adam lost this rectitude, this perfect sanity and proportionateness of his intellectual, moral and corporeal state, powers and impulses; and as the *penalty* of his crime,

he was deprived of all super-natural aids and graces. The Death, with whatever is comprised in the scriptural sense of the word, Death, began from that moment to work in him, and this *consequence* he conveyed to his offspring, and through them to all his posterity, *i. e.* to all mankind. They were *born* diseased in mind, body and will. For what less than disease can we call a necessity of error and a predisposition to sin and sickness? Taylor, indeed, *asserts*, that though perfect Obedience became incomparably more difficult, it was not, however, absolutely *impossible*. Yet he himself admits that the contrary was *universal*; that of the countless millions of Adam's Posterity, not a single Individual ever realized, or approached to the realization of, this possibility; and (if my memory does not deceive me) Taylor himself has elsewhere exposed—and if he have not, yet Common Sense will do it for him—the sophistry in asserting of a whole what may be true, but is true only, of each of its component parts. Any one may snap a horse-hair: therefore, any one may perform the same feat with the horse's tail. On a level floor (on the hardened sand, for instance, of a sea-beach) I chalk two parallel strait lines, with a width of eight inches. It is *possible* for a man, with a bandage over his eyes, to keep within the path for two or three paces: therefore, it is *possible* for him to walk blindfold for two or three leagues without a single deviation! And this *possibility* would suffice to acquit me of *injustice*, though I had placed man-traps within an inch of one

line, and knew that there were pit-falls and deep wells beside the other!

This *assertion*, therefore, without adverting to its discordance with, if not direct contradiction to, the tenth and thirteenth Articles of our Church, I shall not, I trust, be thought to rate below its true value, if I treat it as an *infinitesimal* possibility that may be safely dropped in the calculation: and so proceed with the argument. The consequence then of Adam's Crime was, by a natural necessity, inherited by Persons who could not (the Bishop affirms) in any sense have been accomplices in the crime or partakers in the guilt: and yet consistently with the divine Holiness, it was not possible that the same perfect Obedience should not be required of them. Now what would the Idea of Equity, what would the Law inscribed by the Creator in the heart of Man, seem to dictate in this case? Surely, that the supplementary Aids, the supernatural Graces correspondent to a Law above Nature, should be increased in proportion to the diminished strength of the Agents, and the increased resistance to be overcome by them! But no! not only the consequence of Adam's act, but the penalty due to his crime, was perpetuated. His descendants were despoiled or left destitute of these Aids and Graces, while the obligation to perfect obedience was continued; an obligation too, the non-fulfilment of which brought with it Death and the unutterable Woe that cleaves to an immortal Soul for ever alienated from its Creator!

Observe, Reader! all these *results* of Adam's Fall enter into Bishop Taylor's scheme of Original Sin equally as into that of the first Reformers. In this respect the Bishop's doctrine is the same with that layed down in the Articles and Homilies of the Established Church. The only difference that has hitherto appeared, consists in the aforesaid *mathematical* possibility of fulfilling the whole Law, which in the Bishop's scheme is affirmed to remain still in human Nature, or (as it is elsewhere expressed) in the Nature of the human Will*. But though it were possible to grant

* Availing himself of the equivocal sense, and (I most readily admit) the injudicious use, of the word "free" in the—even on this account—*faulty* phrase, "*free only to sin*," Jeremy Taylor treats the notion of a power in the Will of determining itself to Evil without an equal power of determining itself to Good, as a "*foolery*." I would this had been the only instance in his "*Deus Justificatus*" of that inconsiderate contempt so frequent in the polemic treatises of minor Divines, who will have Ideas of Reason, Spiritual Truths that can only be spiritually discerned, translated for them into adequate conceptions of the Understanding. The great articles of Corruption and Redemption are *propounded* to us as Spiritual Mysteries; and every interpretation, that pretends to explain them into comprehensible notions, does by its very success furnish presumptive proof of its failure. The acuteness and logical dexterity, with which Taylor has brought out the falsehood or semblance of falsehood in the Calvinistic scheme, are truly admirable. Had he next centered his thoughts in tranquil meditation, and asked himself: What then *is* the truth? If a Will *be* at all, what must a will be!—he might, I think, have seen that a *Nature* in a Will implies already a *Corruption* of that Will; that a *Nature*

this existence of a power in all men, which in no one man was ever exemplified, and where the *non-actualization* of such power is, a priori, so certain, that the belief or imagination of the contrary in any Individual is expressly given us by the Holy Spirit as a test, whereby it may be known that the truth is not in him! as an infallible sign of imposture or self-delusion! Though it were possible to grant this, which, consistently with Scripture and the principles of reasoning which we apply in all other cases, it is not possible to grant; and though it were possible likewise to overlook the glaring sophistry of concluding, in relation to a series of indeterminate length, that whoever can do any one, can therefore do all; a conclusion, the futility of which must force itself on the common-sense of every man who understands the proposition;—still the question will arise—Why, and on what principle of equity, were the unoffending sentenced to be born with so fearful a disproportion of their powers to their duties? Why were they subjected to a Law, the fulfilment of which was all but impossible, yet the penalty on the failure tremendous? Admit that for those who

is as inconsistent with *freedom*, as free choice with an incapacity of choosing aught but evil. And lastly, a free power in a *Nature* to fulfil a Law *above Nature*!—I, who love and honour this good and great man with all the reverence that can dwell “on this side idolatry,” dare not retort on this assertion the charge of *Foolery*; but I find it a Paradox as startling to my *Reason* as any of the hard sayings of the Dorp Divines were to his *Understanding*. S. T. C.

had never enjoyed a happier lot, it was no punishment to be made inhabit a ground which the Creator had cursed, and to have been born with a body prone to sickness, and a Soul surrounded with temptation, and having the worst temptation within itself in its own *temptibility!* To have the duties of a Spirit with the wants and appetites of an Animal! Yet on such imperfect Creatures, with means so scanty and impediments so numerous, to impose the same task-work that had been required of a Creature with a pure and entire nature, and provided with super-natural Aids—if this be not to inflict a penalty!—Yet to be placed under a Law, the difficulty of obeying and the consequences of not obeying which are both infinite, and to have momentarily to struggle with this difficulty, and to live in momentarily hazard of these consequences—if this be no punishment!—words have no correspondence with thoughts, and thoughts are but shadows of each other, shadows that own no substance for their anti-type!

Of such an outrage on common-sense Taylor was incapable. He himself calls it a penalty; he admits that in effect it is a punishment: nor does he seek to suppress the question that so naturally arises out of this admission—On what principle of Equity were the innocent offspring of Adam *punished* at all? He meets it, and puts in an answer. He states the problem, and gives his solution—namely, that “God on Adam’s Account *was so exasperated with Mankind, that being angry* he would still continue the punishment!” The case (says the Bishop) is this: “Jonathan and Michal

were Saul's Children. It came to pass, that Seven of Saul's Issue were to be hanged: all equally innocent, EQUALLY CULPABLE." [*Before I quote further, I feel myself called on to remind the Reader, that these two last words were added by Jeremy Taylor without the least ground of Scripture, according to which (2 Samuel, lxxi.) no crime was laid to their charge, no blame imputed to them. Without any pretence of culpable conduct on their part, they were arraigned as Children of Saul, and sacrificed to a point of state-expediencce. In recommencing the quotation, therefore, the Reader ought to let the sentence conclude with the words—*]" "all equally innocent. David took the five Sons of Michal, for she had left him unhandsomely. Jonathan was his Friend: and therefore he spared *his* Son, Mephibosheth. Now here it was indifferent as to the guilt of the persons (*Bear in mind, Reader! that no guilt was attached to either of them!*) whether David should take the Sons of Michal or Jonathan's; but it is likely that as upon the kindness that David had to Jonathan he spared his son; so upon the just provocation of Michal, he made that evil fall upon them, which, it may be, they should not have suffered if their mother had been kind. ADAM WAS TO GOD AS MICHAL TO DAVID." (Taylor's Polem. Tracts, p. 711.)

This Answer, this Solution, proceeding too from a Divine so pre-eminently gifted, and occurring (with other passages not less startling) in a vehement refutation of the received doctrine on the express ground of its opposition to the clearest conceptions and

best feelings of mankind—this it is, that surprises me! It is of this that I complain! The Almighty Father *exasperated* with those, whom the Bishop has himself in the same treatise described as “innocent and most unfortunate”—the two things best fitted to conciliate love and pity! Or though they did not remain innocent, yet those whose abandonment to a mere nature, while they were left amenable to a law above nature, he affirms to be the irresistible cause, that they, one and all, *did sin!* And this decree illustrated and justified by its analogy to one of the worst actions of an imperfect Mortal! Let such of my Readers as possess the Volume of Polemical Discourses, or the opportunity of consulting it, give a thoughtful perusal to the pages from 869 to 893 (*Third Edition enlarged, 1674*). I dare anticipate their concurrence with the judgment which I here transcribe from the blank space at the end of the Deus Justificatus in my own Copy; and which, though twenty years have elapsed since it was written, I have never seen reason to recant or modify. “This most eloquent Treatise may be compared to a Statue of Janus, with the one face, which we must suppose fronting the Calvinistic Tenet, entire and fresh, as from the Master’s hand; beaming with life and force, a witty scorn on the Lip, and a Brow at once bright and weighty with satisfying reason! the other, looking toward the ‘*something to be put in its place,*’ maimed, featureless, and weather-bitten into an almost visionary confusion and indistinctness.”

With these expositions I hasten to contrast the *scriptural* article respecting Original Sin, or the corrupt and sinful Nature of the Human Will, and the belief which alone is required of us, as Christians. And here the first thing to be considered, and which will at once remove a world of error, is: that this is no Tenet first introduced or imposed by Christianity; and which, should a man see reason to disclaim the authority of the Gospel, would no longer have any claim on his attention. It is no perplexity that a man may get rid of by ceasing to be a Christian, and which has no existence for a philosophic Deist. It is a FACT, affirmed, indeed, in the Christian Scriptures alone with the force and frequency proportioned to its consummate importance; but a fact acknowledged in *every* Religion that retains the least glimmering of the patriarchal faith in a God infinite yet *personal*! A fact assumed or implied as the basis of every Religion, of which any relics remain of earlier date than the last and total Apostacy of the Pagan World, when the faith in the great I AM, the *Creator*, was extinguished in the sensual polytheism, which is inevitably the final result of Pantheism or the Worship of Nature; and the only form under which the pantheistic Scheme—that, according to which the World is God, and the material universe itself the one only *absolute* Being—can exist for a People, or become the popular Creed. Thus in the most ancient Books of the Brahmins, the deep sense of this Fact, and the doctrines grounded on obscure traditions of the promised Remedy, are seen struggling,

and now gleaming, now flashing, through the Mist of Pantheism, and producing the incongruities and gross contradictions of the Brahmin Mythology: while in the rival Sect—in that most strange Phænomenon, the religious Atheism of the Buddhists! with whom God is only universal Matter considered abstractedly from all particular forms—the fact is placed among the delusions natural to man, which, together with other superstitions grounded on a supposed *essential* difference between Right and Wrong, *the Sage* is to decompose and precipitate from the menstruum of *his* more refined apprehensions! Thus in denying the fact, they virtually acknowledge it.

From the remote East turn to the mythology of Minor Asia, to the Descendants of Javan *who dwelt in the tents of Shem, and possessed the Isles*. Here again, and in the usual form of an historic Solution, we find the same *Fact*, and as characteristic of the Human *Race*, stated in that earliest and most venerable Mythus (or symbolic Parable) of Prometheus—that truly wonderful Fable, in which the characters of the rebellious Spirit and of the Divine Friend of Mankind (Θέος φιλόανθρωπος) are united in the same Person: and thus in the most striking manner noting the forced amalgamation of the Patriarchal Tradition with the incongruous Scheme of Pantheism. This and the connected tale of Io, which is but the sequel of the Prometheus, stand alone in the Greek Mythology, in which elsewhere both Gods and Men are mere Powers and Products of Nature. And most noticeable

it is, that soon after the promulgation and spread of the Gospel had awakened the moral sense, and had opened the eyes even of its wiser Enemies to the necessity of providing some solution of this great problem of the Moral World, the beautiful Parable of Cupid and Psyche was brought forward as a *rival* FALL OF MAN: and the fact of a moral corruption connatural with the human race was again recognized. In the assertion of ORIGINAL SIN the Greek Mythology rose and set.

But not only was the *fact* acknowledged of a Law in the Nature of Man resisting the Law of God. (And whatever is placed in active and direct Oppugnancy to the Good is, ipso facto, positive Evil.) It was likewise an acknowledged MYSTERY, and one which by the nature of the Subject must ever remain such—a problem, of which any other solution, than the statement of the *Fact* itself, was demonstrably *impossible*. That it is so, the least reflection will suffice to convince every man, who has previously satisfied himself that he is a responsible Being. It follows necessarily from the postulate of a responsible Will. Refuse to grant this, and I have not a word to say. Concede this, and you concede all. For this is the essential attribute of a Will, and contained in the very *idea*, that whatever determines the Will acquires this power from a previous determination of the Will itself. The Will is ultimately self-determined, or it is no longer a *Will* under the law of perfect Freedom, but a *Nature* under the mechanism of Cause and Effect. And if by an act, to

which it had determined itself, it has subjected itself to the determination of Nature (in the language of St. Paul, to the Law of the Flesh), it receives a nature into itself, and so far it becomes a Nature: and this is a corruption of the Will and a corrupt Nature. It is also a *Fall of Man*, inasmuch as his Will is the condition of his Personality; the ground and condition of the attribute which constitutes him *Man*. And the ground-work of *Personal Being* is a capacity of acknowledging the Moral Law (the Law of the Spirit, the Law of Freedom, the Divine Will) as that which should, of itself, suffice to determine the Will to a free obedience of the Law, the Law working thereon *by its own exceeding lawfulness*. This, and this alone, is *positive Good*: good in itself, and independent of all relations. Whatever resists and, as a positive force, opposes *this* in the Will is therefore evil. But an Evil in the Will is an evil Will; and as all moral Evil (*i. e.* all evil that is evil without reference to its contingent physical consequences) is *of* the Will, this evil Will must have its source in the Will. And thus we might go back from act to act, from evil to evil, ad infinitum without advancing a step.

We call an Individual a *bad Man*, not because an action is contrary to the Law, but because it has led us to conclude from it some *Principle* opposed to the Law, some private Maxim or By-law in the Will contrary to the universal Law of right Reason in the Conscience, as the *Ground* of the action. But this evil Principle again must be grounded in some other Prin-

ciple which has been made determinant of the Will by the Will's own self-determination. For if not, it must have its ground in some necessity of Nature, in some instinct or propensity imposed not acquired, another's work not our own. Consequently, neither Act nor Principle could be imputed; and relatively to the Agent, not *original*, not *Sin*.

Now let the grounds, on which the fact of an Evil inherent in the Will is affirmable in the instance of any one Man, be supposed equally applicable in *every* instance, and concerning all men: so that the fact is asserted of the Individual, *not* because he has committed this or that crime, or because he has shown himself to be *this* or *that* Man, but simply because he is *a* Man. Let the evil be supposed such as to imply the impossibility of an Individual's referring to any particular time at which it might be conceived to have commenced, or to any period of his existence at which it was not existing. Let it be supposed, in short, that the subject stands in no relation whatever to Time, can neither be called *in* time or *out of* time; but that all relations of Time are as alien and heterogeneous in this question, as the relations and attributes of Space (north or south, round or square, thick or thin) are to our Affections and Moral Feelings. Let the reader suppose this, and he will have before him the precise import of the scriptural *doctrine* of Original Sin: or rather of the Fact acknowledged in all Ages, and recognized, but not originating, in the Christian Scriptures.

In addition to this Memento it will be well to re-

mind the Inquirer, that the stedfast conviction of the existence, personality, and moral attributes of God is pre-supposed in the acceptance of the Gospel, or required as its indispensable preliminary. It is taken for granted as a point which the Hearer had already decided for himself, a point finally settled and put at rest: not by the removal of all difficulties, or by any such increase of Insight as enabled him to meet every objection of the Epicurean or the Sceptic with a full and precise answer; but because he had convinced himself that it was folly as well as presumption in so imperfect a Creature to expect it; and because these difficulties and doubts disappeared at the beam, when tried against the weight and convictive power of the reasons in the other scale. It is, therefore, most unfair to attack Christianity, or any article which the Church has declared a Christian Doctrine, by arguments, which, if valid, are valid against all religion. Is there a Disputant who scorns a mere *Postulate*, as the basis of any argument in support of the Faith; who is too high-minded *to beg* his ground, and will take it by a strong hand? Let him fight it out with the Atheists, or the Manichæans; but not stoop to pick up their arrows, and then run away to discharge them at Christianity or the Church!

The only true way is to state the doctrine, believed equally by Saul of Tarsus, "yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against" the Church of Christ, as by Paul the Apostle "fully preaching the Gospel of Christ." A moral Evil is an Evil that has its origin in

a Will. An Evil common to all must have a ground common to all. But the actual existence of moral evil we are bound in conscience to admit; and that there is an Evil common to all is a Fact; and this Evil must therefore have a common ground. Now this evil ground cannot originate in the Divine Will: it must therefore be referred to the Will of Man. And this evil Ground we call Original Sin. It is a *Mystery*, that is, a Fact, which we see, but cannot explain; and the doctrine a truth which we apprehend, but can neither comprehend nor communicate. And such by the quality of the Subject (*viz.* a responsible *Will*) it must be, if it be truth at all.

A sick man, whose complaint was as obscure as his sufferings were severe and notorious, was thus addressed by a humane Stranger: My poor Friend! I find you dangerously ill, and on this account only, and having certain information of your being so, and that you have not wherewithal to pay for a Physician, I have come to you. Respecting your disease, indeed, I can tell you nothing, that you are capable of understanding, more than you know already, or can only be taught by reflection on your own experience. But I have rendered the Disease no longer irremediable. I have brought the remedy with me: and I now offer you the means of immediate relief, with the assurance of gradual convalescence, and a final perfect Cure; nothing more being required on your part, but your best endeavours to follow the prescriptions I shall leave with you. It is, indeed, too probable, from the nature of

your disease, that you will occasionally neglect or transgress them. But even this has been calculated on in the plan of your cure, and the remedies provided, if only you are sincere and in right earnest with yourself, and have your *heart* in the work. Ask me not, how such a Disease can be conceived possible! Enough for the present that you know it to be real: *and I come to cure the Disease, not to explain it.*

Now, what if the Patient or some of his Neighbors should charge this good Samaritan with having given rise to the mischievous notion of an inexplicable Disease, involving the honour of the King of the Country? should inveigh against *him* as the Author and first Introducer of the Notion, though of the numerous medical works composed ages before *his* arrival, and by Physicians of the most venerable Authority, it was scarcely possible to open a single volume without finding some description of the Disease, or some lamentation of its malignant and epidemic character! And, lastly, what if certain pretended Friends of this good Samaritan, in their zeal to vindicate him against this absurd charge, should assert that he was a perfect Stranger to this Disease, and boldly deny that he had ever said or done any thing connected with it, or that implied its existence?

In this Apologue or imaginary Case, Reader! you have the true bearings of Christianity on the fact and doctrine of Original Sin. The doctrine (that is, the confession of a known fact) Christianity has only in common with every Religion, and with every Philo-

sophy, in which the reality of a responsible Will and the *essential* difference between Good and Evil were recognized. *Peculiar* to the Christian Religion are the Remedy and (for all purposes but those of a merely speculative Curiosity) the Solution! By the annunciation of the Remedy it affords all the solution that our *moral* interests require; and even in that which remains, and must remain, unfathomable the Christian finds a new motive to walk humbly with the Lord his God!

Should a professed Believer ask you whether that, which is the ground of responsible action in *your* will, could in any way be responsibly present in the Will of Adam? Answer him in these words: *You, Sir!* can no more demonstrate the Negative, than I can conceive the Affirmative. The corruption of my will may very warrantably be spoken of as a *Consequence* of Adam's Fall, even as my Birth of Adam's Existence; as a consequence, a link in the historic Chain of Instances, whereof Adam is the first. But that it is *on account* of Adam; or that this evil principle was, a priori, inserted or infused into my Will by the Will of another—which is indeed a contradiction in terms, my Will in such case being no *Will*—*this* is nowhere asserted in Scripture explicitly or by implication. It belongs to the very essence of the doctrine, that in respect of Original Sin *every* man is the adequate representative of *all* men. What wonder, then, that where no inward ground of preference existed, the choice should be determined by outward relations, and that the first *in time* should be

taken as the Diagram? Even in Genesis the word, Adam, is distinguished from a Proper Name by an Article before it. It is *the* Adam, so as to express the *genus*, not the Individual—or rather, perhaps, I should say, *as well as* the Individual. But that the word with its equivalent, *the old man*, is used symbolically and universally by St. Paul, (1 Cor. xv. 22. 45. Eph. iv. 22. Col. iii. 9. Rom. vi. 6.) is too evident to need any proof.

I conclude with this remark. The doctrine of Original Sin concerns all men. But it concerns Christians *in particular* no otherwise than by its connexion with the doctrine of Redemption; and with the Divinity and Divine Humanity of the Redeemer as a corollary or necessary inference from both mysteries. BEWARE OF ARGUMENTS AGAINST CHRISTIANITY, THAT CANNOT STOP THERE, AND CONSEQUENTLY OUGHT NOT TO HAVE COMMENCED THERE. Something I might have added to the clearness of the preceding views, if the limits of the work had permitted me to clear away the several delusive and fanciful assertions respecting the state * of our First Parents, their wisdom, science, and angelic Faculties, assertions without the slightest ground in Scripture! Or if consistently with the wants and preparatory studies of those, for whose use the Volume

* For a specimen of these Rabbinical Dotages I refer, not to the writings of Mystics and Enthusiasts, but to the shrewd and witty Dr. South, one of whose most elaborate Sermons stands prominent among the many splendid extravaganzas on this subject.

was especially intended, I could have entered into the momentous subject of a Spiritual Fall or Apostacy *antecedent* to the formation of Man—a belief, the scriptural grounds of which are few and of diverse interpretation, but which has been almost universal in the Christian Church. Enough, however, has been given, I trust, for the Reader to see and (as far as the subject is capable of being understood) to understand this long controverted Article in the sense, in which alone it is binding on his faith. Supposing him, therefore, to know the meaning of original sin, and to have decided for himself on the fact of its actual existence, as the antecedent ground and occasion of Christianity, we may now proceed to Christianity itself, as the Edifice raised on this ground, *i. e.* to the great Constituent Article of the Faith in Christ, as the Remedy of the Disease—the Doctrine of Redemption.

But before we proceed to this momentous doctrine, let me briefly remind the young and friendly Pupil, to whom I would still be supposed to address myself, that in the Aphorism to follow, the word Science, is used in its strict and narrowest sense. By a Science I here mean any Chain of Truths that are either absolutely certain, or necessarily true for the human mind from the laws and constitution of the mind itself. In neither case is our conviction derived, or capable of receiving any addition, from outward Experience, or *empirical* data—*i. e.* matter-of-fact *given* to us through the medium of the Senses—though these Data may have been the occasion, or may even be an indispensable condi-

tion, of our reflecting on the former and thereby becoming *conscious* of the same. On the other hand, a connected series of conclusions grounded on empirical Data, in contra-distinction from Science, I beg leave (no better term occurring) in this place and for this purpose, to denominate a Scheme.

APHORISM XI.

EDITOR.

In whatever age and country, it is the prevailing mind and character of the nation to regard the present life as subordinate to a Life to come, and to mark the present state, *the World of their Senses*, by signs, instruments and mementos of its connexion with a future state and a spiritual World; where the Mysteries of Faith are brought within the *hold* of the People at large, not by being explained away in the vain hope of accommodating them to the average of their Understanding, but by being made the objects of Love by their combination with events and epochs of History, with national traditions, with the monuments and dedications of Ancestral faith and zeal, with memorial and symbolical observances, with the realizing influences of social devotion, and above all, by early and habitual association with Acts of the Will; *there* Religion is. *There*, however obscured by the hay and straw of human Will-work, the foundation is safe! In *that* country, and under the predominance of such Maxims, the national church is no mere *State-Institutc*. It is the State itself in its intensest federal union; yet at the same moment the Guardian and Representative

of all personal Individuality. For the Church is the Shrine of Morality: and in Morality alone the Citizen asserts and reclaims his personal independence, his *integrity*. Our outward Acts are efficient, and most often possible, only by coalition. As an efficient power, the Agent is but *a fraction* of Unity: he becomes an *integer* only in the recognition and performance of the Moral Law. Nevertheless it is most true (and a truth which cannot with safety be overlooked) that Morality, *as Morality*, has no existence for *a People*. It is either absorbed and lost in the quicksands of Prudential Calculus, or it is taken up and transfigured into the duties and mysteries of Religion. And no wonder: since Morality (including the *personal* being, the I-AM, as its subject) is itself a Mystery, and the ground and *suppositum* of all other Mysteries, relatively to Man.

APHORISM XII.

EDITOR.

Schemes of conduct, grounded on calculations of Self-interest; or on the average Consequences of Actions, supposing them *general*; form a branch of Political Economy, to which let all due honour be given. Their utility is not here questioned. But however estimable within their own sphere such schemes, or any one of them in particular, may be, they do not belong to Moral Science, to which both in kind and purpose they are in all cases *foreign*, and when substituted for it, *hostile*. Ethics, or the *Science* of Morality, does indeed in no wise exclude the consideration of *Action*; but it con-

templates the same in its originating spiritual *Source*, without reference to Space or Time or Sensible Existence. Whatever springs out of “the perfect Law of Freedom,” which exists only by its unity with the Will, inherence in the Word, and communion with the Spirit, of God—*that* (according to the principles of Moral Science) is GOOD—it is Light and Righteousness and very Truth. Whatever seeks to separate itself from the Divine Principles, and proceeds from a false centre in the Agent’s particular Will, is EVIL—a work of darkness and contradiction! It is Sin and essential Falsehood. Not the outward Deed, constructive, destructive or neutral; not the Deed as a possible Object of the Senses; is the Object of Ethical Science. For this is no Compost, Collectorium or Inventory of Single Duties: nor does it seek in the “multitudinous Sea,” in the predetermined waves, tides and currents of Nature that freedom, which is exclusively an attribute of Spirit. Like all other pure Sciences, whatever it enunciates, and whatever it concludes, it enunciates and concludes *absolutely*. Strictness is its essential Character: and its first Proposition is, “Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.” (*James* ii. 10.) For as the Will or Spirit, the Source and Substance of Moral Good, is one, and all in every part: so must it be the Totality, the whole articulated Series of Single Acts, taken as Unity, that can alone, in the severity of Science, be recognized as the proper Counterpart and adequate Representative of a good Will. Is

it in this or that limb, or not rather in the whole body, the entire Organismus, that the Law of Life reflects itself? Much less then can the Law of the Spirit work in fragments.

APHORISM XIII.

EDITOR.

Wherever there exists a permanent * Learned Class, having authority and possessing the respect and confidence of the Country; and where the Science of Ethics is acknowledged and taught in *this* class as a regular part of a learned education to its future Members generally, but as the special study and indispensable ground-work of such as are intended for Holy Orders;—*there* the Article of Original Sin will be an AXIOM of Faith in *all* Classes. Among the Learned an undisputed *truth*, and with the People a fact, which no man imagines it possible to deny, the Doctrine, thus inwoven in the faith of all and co-eval with the

* A Learned Order must be supposed to consist of three Classes. First, those who are employed in adding to the existing Sum of Power and Knowledge. Second, and most numerous Class, those whose office it is to diffuse through the community at large the practical Results of Science, and that kind and degree of knowledge and cultivation, which for all is requisite or clearly useful. Third, the Formers and Instructors of the Second—in Schools, Halls, and Universities, or through the medium of the Press. The second Class includes not only the Parochial Clergy, and all others duly ordained to the Ministerial Office; but likewise all the Members of the Legal and Medical Professions, who have received a learned education under accredited and responsible Teachers.

consciousness of each, will for each and all possess a reality, *subjective* indeed, yet virtually equivalent to that which we intuitively give to the Objects of our Senses.

With the Learned this will be the case: because the Article is the first—I had almost said, *spontaneous*—product of the Application of Moral Science to History, of which it is the Interpreter. A Mystery in its own right, and by the necessity and essential character of its Subject—(for the Will, like the Life, in every act and product pre-supposes itself, a Past always present, a Present that evermore resolves itself into a Past!)—the Doctrine of Original Sin gives to all the other Mysteries of Religion a common Basis, a connexion of dependency, an intelligibility of relation, and a total harmony, that supersede extrinsic proof. There is here that same proof from unity of purpose, that same evidence of Symmetry, which in the contemplation of a human skeleton flashed conviction on the mind of GALEN and kindled meditation into a hymn of praise.

Meanwhile the People, not goaded into doubt by the lessons and examples of their Teachers and Superiors; not drawn away from the Fixed Stars of Heaven, the form and magnitude of which are the same for the naked eye of the Shepherd as for the Telescope of the Sage—from the immediate truths, I mean, of Reason and Conscience to an exercise, they have not been trained to, of a Faculty which has been imperfectly developed, on a subject not within the

sphere of the Faculty nor in any way amenable to its judgment; the PEOPLE will need no arguments to receive a doctrine confirmed by their own experience from within and from without, and intimately blended with the most venerable Traditions common to all races, and the Traces of which linger in the latest twilight of Civilization.

Among the revulsions consequent on the brute bewilderingments of a godless Revolution, a great and active Zeal for the interests of Religion may be one. I dare not trust it, till I have seen *what* it is that gives Religion this interest, till I am satisfied that they are not the Interests of this World; necessary and laudable interests, perhaps, but which may, I dare believe, be secured as effectually and more suitably by the Prudence of this World, and by this World's powers and motives. At all events, I find nothing in the fashion of the day to deter me from adding, that the Reverse of the preceding—that where Religion is valued and patronized as a supplement of Law, or an Aid extraordinary of Police; where Moral SCIENCE is exploded as the mystic Jargon of Dark Ages; where a lax System of Consequences, by which every iniquity on earth may be (and how many *have* been!) denounced and defended with equal plausibility, is publicly and authoritatively taught as Moral Philosophy; where the Mysteries of Religion, and Truths supersensual, are either cut and squared for the comprehension of the Understanding, “the faculty judging according to Sense,” or desperately torn asunder from

the Reason, nay, fanatically opposed to it; lastly, where Private* Interpretation is every thing and the Church nothing—*there* the Mystery of Original Sin will be either rejected, or evaded, or perverted into the monstrous fiction of Hereditary Sin, Guilt inherited;

* The Author of the STATESMAN'S MANUAL must be the most inconsistent of men, if he can be justly suspected of a leaning to the Romish Church: or if it be necessary for him to repeat his fervent Amen to the Wish and Prayer of our late good old King, that every Adult in the British Empire should be able to read his Bible, and have a Bible to read! Nevertheless, it may not be superfluous to declare, that in thus protesting against the *licence* of private interpretation, the Editor does not mean to condemn the exercise or deny the right of individual judgment. He condemns only the pretended right of every Individual, competent and incompetent, to interpret Scripture in a sense of his own, in opposition to the judgment of the Church, without knowledge of the Originals or of the Languages, the History, Customs, Opinions, and Controversies of the Age and Country in which they were written; and where the Interpreter judges in ignorance or in contempt of uninterrupted Tradition, the unanimous Consent of Fathers and Councils, and the universal Faith of the Church in all ages. It is not the attempt to form a judgment, which is here called in question; but the grounds, or rather the *no-grounds*, on which the judgment is formed and relied on—the self-willed and separative (*schismatic*) Setting-up (*hæresis*). See note to page 19.

My fixed Principle is: that a CHRISTIANITY WITHOUT A CHURCH EXERCISING SPIRITUAL AUTHORITY IS VANITY AND DISSOLUTION. And my *belief* is, that when Popery is rushing in on us like an inundation, the Nation will find it to be so. I say *Popery*: for this too I hold for a delusion, that Romanism or *Roman Catholicism* is separable from Popery. Almost as readily could I suppose a Circle without a Centre.

in the Mystery of Redemption metaphors will be obtruded for the reality; and in the mysterious Appurtenants and Symbols of Redemption (Regeneration, Grace, the Eucharist, and Spiritual Communion) the realities will be evaporated into metaphors.

APHORISM XIV.

LEIGHTON.

As in great Maps or Pictures you will see the border decorated with meadows, fountains, flowers, &c. represented in it, but in the middle you have the main design: so amongst the works of God is it with the fore-ordained Redemption of Man. All his other works in the world, all the beauty of the creatures, the succession of ages and the things that come to pass in them, are but as the Border to this as the Main-piece. But as a foolish unskilful beholder, not discerning the excellency of the principal piece in such maps or pictures, gazes only on the fair Border, and goes no farther—thus do the greatest part of us as to this great Work of God, the redemption of our personal Being, and the re-union of the Human with the Divine, by and through the Divine Humanity of the Incarnate Word.

APHORISM XV.

LUTHER.

It is a hard matter, yea, an impossible thing for thy human strength, whosoever thou art (without God's assistance), at such a time when Moses setteth on thee with the Law (see Aphorism XII.), when the holy Law written in thy heart accuseth and condemneth thee,

forcing thee to a comparison of thy heart therewith, and convicting thee of the incompatibleness of thy Will and Nature with Heaven and Holiness and an immediate God—that then thou shouldest be able to be of such a mind as if no Law nor Sin had ever been! I say it is in a manner impossible that a human creature, when he feeleth himself assaulted with trials and temptations, and the Conscience hath to do with God, and the tempted man knoweth that the root of temptation is within him, should obtain such mastery over his thoughts as then to think no otherwise than that FROM EVERLASTING NOTHING HATH BEEN BUT ONLY AND ALONE CHRIST, ALTOGETHER GRACE AND DELIVERANCE!

COMMENT.

In irrational Agents, viz. the Animals, the Will is hidden or absorbed in the Law. The Law is their *Nature*. In the original purity of a rational Agent the uncorrupted Will is identical with the Law. Nay, inasmuch as a Will perfectly identical with the Law is one with the *divine* Will, we may say, that in the unfallen rational Agent the Will *constitutes* the Law. But it is evident that the holy and spiritual Power and Light, which by a *prolepsis* or anticipation we have *named* Law, is a grace, an inward perfection, and without the commanding, binding and menacing character which belongs to a Law, acting as a Master or Sovereign distinct from, and existing, as it were, externally for, the Agent who is bound to obey it. Now

this is St. Paul's sense of the Word: and on this he grounds his whole reasoning. And hence too arises the obscurity and apparent paradox of several texts, That the Law is a *Law* for you; that it acts *on* the Will not *in* it; that it exercises an agency *from without*, by fear and coercion; proves the corruption of your Will, and presupposes it. Sin in this sense came by the Law: for it has its essence, as Sin, in that counterposition of the Holy Principle to the Will, which occasions this Principle to be a LAW. Exactly (as in all other points) consonant with the Pauline doctrine is the assertion of John, when speaking of the re-adoption of the redeemed to be Sons of God, and the consequent resumption (I had almost said, re-absorption) of the Law into the Will (*νομον τελειον τον της ελευθεριας*, *James* i. 25. See page 26,) he says—For the law was given by Moses; but Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ. P.S. That by the Law St. Paul meant only the *ceremonial* Law is a notion, that could originate only in utter inattention to the whole strain and gist of the Apostles' Argument.

APHORISM XVI. LEIGHTON AND ED.

Christ's Death was both voluntary and violent. There was external violence: and that was the accompaniment, or at most the occasion, of his Death. But there was internal willingness, the spiritual Will, the Will of the Spirit, and this was the proper cause. By this Spirit he was restored from Death: neither indeed “was it *possible* for him to be holden of it.” (*Acts* ii.

v. 24—27.). “ Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit,” says St. Peter. But he is likewise declared elsewhere to have died by that same Spirit, which here in opposition to the violence is said to quicken him. Thus *Hebrews* ix. 14. *Through the eternal Spirit he offered himself.* And even from Peter’s words, and without the epithet, eternal, to aid the interpretation, it is evident that *the Spirit*, here opposed to the Flesh, Body or Animal Life, is of a higher nature and power than the individual *Soul*, which cannot of itself return to re-inhabit or quicken the Body.

If these points were niceties, and an over-refining in doctrine, is it to be believed that the Apostles, John, Peter and Paul, with the Author of the Ep. to the Hebrews, would have layed so great stress on them? But the true Life of Christians is to eye Christ in every step of his life—not only as their Rule but as their Strength: looking to him as their Pattern both in doing and in suffering, and drawing power from him for going through both: being *without him* able for nothing. Take comfort then, thou that believest! *It is he that lifts up the Soul from the Gates of Death:* and he hath said, *I will raise thee up at the last day.* Thou that believest *in* him, believe him and take comfort. Yea, when thou art most sunk in thy sad apprehensions, and he far off to thy thinking, then is he nearest to raise and comfort thee: as sometimes it grows darkest immediately before day.

APHORISM XVII.

L. AND ED.

Would any of you be cured of that common disease, the fear of Death? Yet this is not the right name of the Disease, as a mere reference to our armies and navies is sufficient to prove: nor can the fear of death, either as loss of life or pain of dying, be justly held a *common* disease. But would you be cured of the fear and fearful questionings connected with the approach of death? Look this way, and you shall find more than you seek. Christ, the Word that was from the beginning, and was made flesh and dwelt among men, died. And he, who dying conquered death in his own person, conquered Sin, and Death which is the Wages of Sin, for thee. And of this thou mayest be assured, if only thou believe in him, and love him. I need not add, keep his commandments: since where Faith and Love are, Obedience in its threefold character, as Effect, Reward, and Criterion, follows by that moral necessity which is the highest form of freedom. The Grave is thy bed of rest, and no longer the *cold* bed: for thy Saviour has warmed it, and made it fragrant.

If then it be health and comfort to the Faithful that Christ descended into the grave, with especial confidence may we meditate on his return from thence, *quicken'd by the Spirit*: this being to those who are in him the certain pledge, yea, the effectual cause of that blessed resurrection, for which they themselves hope. There is that union betwixt them and their

Redeemer, that they shall rise by the communication and virtue of his rising: not simply by his *power*—for so the *wicked* likewise to their grief shall be raised; but *they by his life as their life*.

COMMENT

On the three preceding Aphorisms.

To the Reader, who has consented to submit his mind to my temporary guidance, and who permits me to regard him as my Pupil or Junior Fellow-student, I continue to address myself. Should he exist only in my imagination, let the bread float on the waters! If it be the Bread of Life, it will not have been utterly cast away.

Let us pause a moment, and review the road we have passed over since the Transit from Religious Morality to Spiritual Religion. My first attempt was to satisfy you, that there *is* a Spiritual principle in Man (p. 130—140), and to expose the sophistry of the arguments in support of the Contrary. Our next step was to clear the road of all Counterfeits, by showing what is *not* the Spirit, what is *not* Spiritual Religion (p. 142—149). And this was followed by an attempt to establish a difference in kind between religious truths and the deductions of speculative science; yet so as to prove, that the former are not only equally rational with the latter, but that they alone appeal to Reason in the fulness and living reality of the Power. This and the state of mind requisite for the formation of right

convictions respecting spiritual Truths, employed our attention from p. 158 to 188. Having then enumerated the Articles of the Christian Faith *peculiar* to Christianity, I entered on the great object of the present work: viz. the removal of all valid Objections to these articles on grounds of right Reason or Conscience. But to render this practicable it was necessary, first, to present each Article in its true scriptural purity, by exposure of the caricatures of misinterpreters; and this, again, could not be satisfactorily done till we were agreed respecting the Faculty, entitled to sit in judgment on such questions. I early foresaw, that my best chance (I will not say, of giving an *insight* into the surpassing worth and transcendent reasonableness of the Christian Scheme; but) of rendering the very question intelligible, depended on my success in determining the true nature and limits of the human UNDERSTANDING, and in evincing its *diversity* from REASON. In pursuing this momentous subject, I was tempted in two or three instances into disquisitions, that if not beyond the comprehension, were yet unsuited to the taste, of the persons for whom the Work was principally intended. These, however, I have separated from the running text, and compressed into Notes. The Reader will at worst, I hope, pass them by as a leaf or two of waste paper, willingly given by him to those, for whom it may not be paper *wasted*. Nevertheless, I cannot conceal, that the subject itself supposes, on the part of the Reader, a steadiness in *self-questioning*, a pleasure in referring to his own inward experience for the facts

asserted by the Author, that can only be expected from a person who has fairly set his heart on arriving at clear and fixed conclusions in matters of Faith. But where this interest is felt, nothing more than a common Capacity, with the ordinary advantages of education, is required for the complete comprehension both of the argument and the result. Let but one thoughtful hour be devoted to the pages 200—230. In all that follows, the Reader will find no difficulty in *understanding* the Author's meaning, whatever he may have in *adopting* it.

The two great moments of the Christian Religion are, Original Sin and Redemption; *that* the Ground, *this* the Superstructure of our faith. The former I have exhibited, first, according to the scheme of the Westminster Divines and the Synod of Dorp; then, according to the* scheme of a contemporary Arminian Divine; and lastly, in contrast with both schemes, I

* To escape the consequences of this scheme, some Arminian Divines have asserted that the penalty inflicted on Adam and continued in his posterity was simply the loss of immortality, Death as the utter extinction of personal Being: immortality being regarded by them (and not, I think, without good reason) as a super-natural attribute, and its loss therefore involved in the forfeiture of super-natural graces. This theory has *its golden side*: and as a private opinion, is said to have the countenance of more than one Dignitary of our Church, whose general orthodoxy is beyond impeachment. For here the *Penalty* resolves itself into the *Consequence*, and this the natural and (*naturally*) inevitable Consequence of Adam's Crime. For Adam, indeed, it was a *positive* punishment: a punishment of

have placed what I firmly believe to be the *Scriptural* Sense of this Article, and vindicated its entire con-

his guilt, the justice of which who could have dared arraign? While for the Offspring of Adam it was simply a *not* super-adding to their nature the privilege by which the Original Man was contra-distinguished from the brute creation—a mere negation, of which they had no more right to complain than any other species of Animals. God in this view appears only in his Attribute of Mercy, as averting by supernatural interposition a consequence naturally inevitable. This is the golden side of the Theory. But if we approach to it from the opposite direction, it first excites a just scruple from the countenance it seems to give to the doctrine of Materialism. The Supporters of this Scheme do not, I presume, contend, that Adam's Offspring would not have been born *Men*, but have formed a new species of Beasts? And if not, the notion of a rational and self-conscious Soul, perishing utterly with the dissolution of the organized Body, seems to require, nay, almost involves, the opinion that the Soul is a quality or Accident of the Body—a mere harmony resulting from Organization.

But let this pass unquestioned! Whatever else the Descendants of Adam might have been without the intercession of Christ, yet (this intercession having been effectually made) they are now endowed with Souls that are not extinguished together with the material body. Now unless these Divines teach likewise the Romish figment of Purgatory, and to an extent in which the Church of Rome herself would denounce the doctrine as an impious heresy: unless they hold, that a punishment temporary and remedial is the *worst* evil that the Impenitent have to apprehend in a Future State; and that the spiritual Death declared and foretold by Christ, “the Death Eternal where the Worm never dies,” is neither Death nor eternal, but a certain quantum of Suffering in a state of faith, hope, and progressive amendment—unless they go these lengths (and the

formity with Reason and Experience. I now proceed to the other momentous Article—from the necessitating *Occasion* of the Christian Dispensation to Christianity itself! For Christianity and REDEMPTION are equivalent terms. And here my Comment will be com-

Divines here intended are orthodox Churchmen, men who would not knowingly advance even a step on the road towards them)—then I fear, that any advantage, their theory might possess over the Calvinistic Scheme in the article of Original Sin, would be dearly purchased by increased difficulties and an ultra-Calvinistic narrowness in the article of Redemption. I at least find it impossible, with my present human feelings, not to imagine otherwise, than that even in heaven it would be a fearful thing to know, that in order to my elevation to a lot infinitely more desirable than by nature it would have been, the lot of so vast a multitude had been rendered infinitely more calamitous; and that my felicity had been purchased by the everlasting misery of the majority of my fellow-men, who, if no redemption had been provided, after inheriting the pains and pleasures of earthly existence during the numbered hours, and the few and evil—evil yet *few*—days of the years of their mortal life, would have fallen asleep to wake no more, would have sunk into the dreamless Sleep of the Grave, and have been as the murmur and the plaint and the exulting swell and the sharp scream which the unequal Gust of Yesterday snatched from the strings of a Wind-Harp!

In another place I have ventured to question the spirit and tendency of J. Taylor's Work on Repentance. But I ought to have added, that to discover and keep the true medium in expounding and applying the Efficacy of Christ's Cross and Passion, is beyond compare the most difficult and delicate point of Practical Divinity—and that which especially needs "*a guidance from above.*"

prised in a few sentences: for I confine my views to the one object of clearing this awful mystery from those too current misrepresentations of its nature and import, that have laid it open to scruples and objections, not to such as shoot forth from an unbelieving heart—(against these a sick-bed will be a more effectual Antidote than all the Argument in the world!) but to such scruples as have their birth-place in the Reason and Moral Sense. Not that it is a Mystery—not that “it passeth all *Understanding!* If the doctrine be more than an hyperbolical phrase, it *must* do so. But that it is at variance with the Law revealed in the Conscience, that it contradicts our moral instincts and intuitions—*this* is the difficulty, which alone is worthy of an answer! And what better way is there of correcting the misconceptions than by laying open the source and occasion of them? What surer way of removing the scruples and prejudices, to which these misconceptions have given rise, than by propounding the Mystery itself—namely, THE REDEMPTIVE ACT, as the transcendent *Cause* of Salvation—in the express and definite words, in which it was enunciated by the Redeemer himself?

But here, in addition to the three Aphorisms preceding, I interpose a view of redemption as appropriated by faith, coincident with Leighton’s thought for the greater part expressed in my own words. *This* I propose as the right view. Then follow a few sentences transcribed from Field (an excellent Divine of James the First’s reign, of whose work, entitled the

Church, it would be difficult to speak too highly) containing the question to be solved, and which is numbered, as an Aphorism, rather to preserve the uniformity of appearance, than as being strictly such. Then follows the Comment: as part and commencement of which the Reader will consider the two paragraphs of p. 197—200, written for this purpose and in the foresight of the present inquiry: and I entreat him therefore to begin the Comment by reperusing these.

APHORISM XVIII.

Stedfast by Faith. This is absolutely necessary for resistance to the Evil Principle. There is no standing out without some firm ground to stand on: and this Faith alone supplies. By Faith in the Love of Christ the power of God becomes ours. When the Soul is beleaguered by enemies, Weakness on the Walls, Treachery at the Gates, and Corruption in the Citadel, then by faith she says—Lamb of God, slain from the foundation of the World! thou art my Strength! I look to thee for deliverance! And thus she overcomes. The pollution (*miasma*) of Sin is precipitated by his Blood, the power of Sin is conquered by his Spirit. The Apostle says not—stedfast by your own resolutions and purposes; but—*stedfast by faith*. Nor yet stedfast in your Will, but *stedfast in the faith*. We are not to be looking to, or brooding over ourselves, either for accusation or for confidence, or (by a deep yet too frequent self-delusion) to obtain the latter by

making a *merit* to ourselves of the former. But we are to look to CHRIST and “him crucified.” The Law “that is very nigh to thee, even in thy heart;” the Law that condemneth and hath no promise; that stoppeth the guilty PAST in its swift flight, and maketh it disown its name; the Law will accuse thee enough. Linger not in the Justice-court, listening to thy indignantment! Loiter not in waiting to hear the Sentence! No! Anticipate the verdict! *Appeal to Cæsar!* Haste to the King for a Pardon! Struggle thitherward, though in fetters: and cry aloud, and collect the whole remaining strength of thy Will in the Outcry—I believe! Lord! help my unbelief! Disclaim all right of property in thy fetters! Say, that they belong to the *Old Man*, and that thou dost but carry them to the Grave, to be buried with their Owner! Fix thy thought on what *Christ* did, what *Christ* suffered, what *Christ* is—as if thou wouldst fill the hollowness of thy Soul with Christ! If he emptied himself of Glory to become Sin for thy salvation, must not thou be emptied of thy sinful Self to become Righteousness in and through his agony and the effective merits of his Cross? By what other means, in what other form, is it *possible* for thee to stand in the presence of the Holy One? With *what* mind wouldst thou come before God, if not with the Mind of Him, in whom *alone* God loveth the World? With good advice, perhaps, and a little assistance, thou wouldst rather cleanse and patch up a mind of thy own, and offer it as thy *admission-right*, thy *qualification*, to him who “charged

his angels with folly!" Oh, take counsel of thy Reason! It will show thee how impossible it is, that even a World should merit the love of Eternal Wisdom and all-sufficing Beatitude, otherwise than as it is contained in that all-perfect Idea, in which the Supreme Mind contemplateth itself and the plenitude of its infinity—the only-begotten before all Ages! the beloved Son, in whom the Father is indeed well pleased!

And as the Mind, so the Body with which it is to be clothed! as the Indweller, so the House in which is to be the Abiding-place*! There is but one Wedding-

* St. Paul blends both forms of expression, and asserts the same doctrine when speaking of the "celestial body" provided for "the New Man" in the spiritual Flesh and Blood, (*i. e.* the informing power and vivific life of the incarnate Word: for the Blood is the Life, and the Flesh the Power)—when speaking, I say, of this "celestial body," as an "house not made with hands, *eternal in the heavens,*" yet brought down to us, made appropriate by faith, and *ours*—he adds: "For in this earthly house (*i. e.* this mortal life, as the inward principle or energy of our Tabernacle, or outward and sensible Body) we groan, earnestly desiring to be *clothed upon with* our house which is from heaven: not that we would be unclothed, but *clothed upon,* that Mortality might be swallowed up of life." 2 Cor. v. 1—4.

The four last words of the first verse (*eternal in the heavens*) compared with the conclusion of v. 2 (*which is from heaven*), present a coincidence with John iii. v. 13, "And no man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." [Qy. Whether the coincidence would not be more apparent, if the words of John had been rendered word for word, even to a disregard of the English Idiom, and with what would be servile and superstitious fidelity in the translation of a common Classic? I can see no

garment, in which we can sit down at the marriage-feast of Heaven: and that is the Bride-groom's own

reason why the οὐδεις, so frequent in St. John, should not be rendered literally, *no one*; and there may be a reason why it should. I have some doubt likewise respecting the omission of the definite articles, τον, του, τῆς—and a greater, as to the ὁ ὧν, both in this place and in *John* i. v. 18, being *adequately* rendered by our “*which is.*” P. S. What sense some of the Greek Fathers attached to, or inferred from, St. Paul's “*in the Heavens,*” the Theological Student (and to Theologians is this note principally addressed) may find in WATERLAND'S Letters to a Country Clergyman—a Divine, whose Judgment and strong sound Sense are as unquestionable as his Learning and Orthodoxy. A Clergyman in full Orders, who has never read the works of Bull and Waterland, has—a duty yet to perform.]

Let it not be objected, that forgetful of my own professed aversion to allegorical interpretations (*see p. 24*) I have in this note fallen into “the fond humour of the Mystic Divines and Allegorizers of Holy Writ.” There is, believe me! a wide difference between *symbolical* and *allegorical*. If I say, that the Flesh and Blood (*Corpus noumenon*) of the Incarnate Word is Power and Life, I say likewise that this mysterious Power and Life are *verily* and *actually* the Flesh and Blood of Christ. They are the Allegorizers, who turn the 6th c. of the Gospel according to St. John—the *hard saying*—*who can hear it?* After which *time many* of (Christ's) Disciples, who had been eye-witnesses of his mighty Miracles, who had heard the sublime Morality of his Sermon on the Mount, had glorified God for the Wisdom which they had heard, and had been prepared to acknowledge, “this is indeed the Christ”—went back and walked no more with him!—the hard sayings, which even THE TWELVE were not yet competent to understand farther than that they were to be spiritually understood; and which the Chief of the Apostles was content to receive with an implicit and antici-

Gift, when he gave himself for us that we might live in him and he in us. There is but one robe of Righteousness, even the Spiritual Body, formed by the assimilative power of faith for whoever eateth the flesh of the Son of Man and drinketh his blood. Did Christ come from Heaven, did the Son of God leave the Glory which he had with his Father before the World began, only to *show* us a way to life, to *teach* truths, to *tell* us of a resurrection? Or saith he not, *I am* the way, *I am* the truth, *I am* the Resurrection and the Life!

APHORISM XIX.

FIELD.

The *Romanists* teach that sins committed after pative faith!—*they*, I repeat, are the Allegorizers who moralize these hard sayings, these high words of Mystery, into an hyperbolical Metaphor *per Catachresin*, that only means a belief of the Doctrines which Paul believed, an obedience to the Law, respecting which Paul “was blameless,” before the Voice called him on the road to Damascus! What every Parent, every humane Preceptor, would do when a Child had misunderstood a Metaphor or Apologue in a literal sense, we all know. But the meek and merciful Jesus suffered *many* of HIS Disciples to fall off from eternal life, when to retain them he had only to say—O ye Simple ones! why are ye offended? My words indeed sound strange; but I mean no more than what you have often and often heard from me before with delight and entire acquiescence!—Credat Judæus! Non ego. It is sufficient for me to know that I have used the language of Paul and John as it was understood and interpreted by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Irenæus, and (if he does not lie) by the whole Christian Church then existing.

baptism (*i. e.* for the immense majority of Christians having Christian Parents, all their sins from the Cradle to the Grave) are not so remitted for Christ's sake, but that we must suffer that extremity of punishment which they deserve: and therefore either we must afflict ourselves in such sort and degree of extremity as may answer the demerit of our Sins, or be punished by God here or in the world to come, in such degree and sort that his Justice may be satisfied. [N. B. *As the encysted venom, or poison-bag, beneath the Adder's fang, so does this doctrine lie beneath the tremendous power of the Romish Hierarchy. The demoralizing influence of this dogma, and that it curdled the very life-blood in the veins of Christendom, it was given to Luther beyond all men since Paul to see, feel, and promulgate. And yet in his large Treatise on Repentance, how near to the spirit of this doctrine—even to the very walls and gates of Babylon—was Jeremy Taylor driven, in recoiling from the fanatical extremes of the opposite error!*] But they, that are orthodox, teach that it is injustice to require the payment of one debt twice. * * * It is no less absurd to say, as the Papists do, that *our* satisfaction is required as a condition, without which *Christ's* satisfaction is not applicable unto us, than to say, Peter hath paid the debt of John, and He, to whom it was due, accepteth of the same payment on the condition that John pay it himself also. * * * The satisfaction of Christ is communicated and applied unto us without suffering the punishment that Sin deserveth, [*and essentially involveth,*

ED.] upon the condition of our Faith and Repentance. [To which the Editor would add: Without faith there is no power of repentance: without a commencing repentance no power to faith; and that it is in the power of the will either to repent or to have faith, in the Gospel Sense of the words, is itself a Consequence of the Redemption of Mankind, a free gift of the Redeemer: the guilt of its rejection, the refusing to avail ourselves of the power, being all that we can consider as exclusively attributable to our own Act.] FIELD'S CHURCH, p. 58.

COMMENT.

(Containing an application of the principles laid down in p. 197—200.)

Forgiveness of Sin, the Abolition of Guilt, through the redemptive power of Christ's Love, and of his perfect Obedience during his voluntary assumption of Humanity, is expressed, on account of the resemblance of the Consequences in both cases, by the payment of a Debt for another, which Debt the Payer had not himself incurred. Now the *impropriation* of this Metaphor—(*i. e.* the taking it *literally*) by transferring the sameness from the Consequents to the Antecedents, or inferring the identity of the causes from a resemblance in the effects—this is the point on which I am at issue: and the View or Scheme of Redemption grounded on this confusion I believe to be altogether unscriptural.

Indeed, I know not in what other instance I could better exemplify the species of sophistry noticed in

p. 215, as the Aristotelean μεταβασις εις αλλο γενος, or clandestine passing over into a diverse kind. The purpose of a Metaphor is to illustrate a something less known by a partial identification of it with some other thing better understood, or at least more familiar. Now the article of Redemption may be considered in a twofold relation—in relation to the *Antecedent*, *i. e.* the Redeemer's Act, as the efficient cause and condition of Redemption; and in relation to the *Consequent*, *i. e.* the effects in and for the Redeemed. Now it is the latter relation, in which the Subject is treated of, set forth, expanded, and enforced by St. Paul. The Mysterious Act, the Operative Cause is *transcendent*—FACTUM EST: and beyond the information contained in the enunciation of the FACT, it can be characterized only by the *Consequences*. It is the *Consequences* of the Act of Redemption, that the zealous Apostle would bring home to the minds and affections both of Jews and Gentiles. Now the Apostle's Opponents and Gainsayers were principally of the former class. They were Jews: not only Jews unconverted, but such as had partially received the Gospel, and who, sheltering their national prejudices under the pretended authority of Christ's Original Apostles and the Church in Jerusalem, set themselves up against Paul as Followers of Cephas. Add too, that Paul himself was “ a Hebrew of the Hebrews; ” intimately versed “ in the Jew's religion above many, his equals, in his own nation, and above measure zealous of the traditions of his fathers.” It might, therefore, have been anticipated, that his reasoning would

receive its outward forms and language, that it would take its predominant colours, from his own *past*, and his Opponents' present, habits of thinking; and that his figures, images, analogies, and references would be taken preferably from objects, opinions, events, and ritual observances ever uppermost in the imaginations of his own countrymen. And such we find them: yet so judiciously selected, that the prominent forms, the figures of most frequent recurrence, are drawn from points of belief and practice, from laws, rites and customs, that then prevailed through the whole Roman World, and were common to Jew and Gentile.

Now it would be difficult if not impossible to select points better suited to this purpose, as being equally familiar to all and yet having a special interest for the Jewish Converts, than those are from which the learned Apostle has drawn the four principal Metaphors, by which he illustrates the blessed *Consequences* of Christ's Redemption of Mankind. These are: 1. Sin-offerings, sacrificial expiation. 2. Reconciliation, Atonement, *Καταλλαγή* *. 3. Ransom from slavery, Redemption,

* This word occurs but once in the New Testament, viz. Romans v. 11, the marginal rendering being, reconciliation. The personal Noun, *καταλλακτης*, is still in use with the modern Greeks for a money-changer, or one who takes the debased Currency, so general in countries under despotic or other dishonest governments, in exchange for sterling Coin or Bullion; the purchaser paying the *catallage*, i. e. the difference. In the elder Greek writers the verb means *to exchange for an opposite*, as *καταλλασσεται πην εχθρην τοις στασιωταις*.—He exchanged within himself enmity for friendship (that is, he reconciled himself)

the buying back again, or being bought back, from *re* and *emo*. 4. Satisfaction of a Creditor's claims by a payment of the debt. To one or other of these four heads all the numerous forms and exponents of Christ's Mediation in St. Paul's writings may be referred. And the very number and variety of the words or periphrases used by him to express one and the same thing furnish

with his Party—or as we say, *made it up* with them, an idiom which (with whatever loss of dignity) gives the exact force of the word. He *made up the difference*. The Hebrew word of very frequent occurrence in the Pentateuch, which we render by the substantive, atonement, has its radical or visual image, in *copher*, pitch. Gen. vi. 14, *thou shalt pitch it within and without with pitch*. Hence, to unite, to fill up a breach, or leak, the word expressing both the *act*, viz. the bringing together what had been previously separated, and the *means*, or material, by which the re-union is effected, as in our English verbs, *to caulk*, *to solder*, *to poy* or *pay* (from *poix*, pitch), and the French, *suiver*. Thence, metaphorically, *expiation*, the *piacula* having the same root, and being grounded on another property or use of Gums and Rosins, the supposed *cleansing* powers of their fumigation. Numbers viii. 21: “made *atonement* for the Levites to *cleanse* them.”—Lastly (or if we are to believe the Hebrew Lexicons, *properly* and most *frequently*) *Ransom*. But if by *proper* the Interpreters mean *primary* and *radical*, the assertion does not need a confutation: all radicals belonging to one or other of three classes, 1. Interjections, or sounds expressing sensations or passions. 2. Imitations of sounds, as splash, roar, whiz, &c. 3. and principally, visual images, objects of sight. But as to *frequency*, in all the numerous (fifty, I believe) instances of the word in the Old Testament, I have not found one in which it can, or at least need, be rendered by Ransom: though beyond all doubt Ransom is used in the Epistle to Timothy, as an *equivalent* term.

the strongest presumptive proof, that all alike were used *metaphorically*. [In the following notation, let the small letters represent the *effects* or *consequences*, and the Capitals the efficient *causes* or *antecedents*. Whether by Causes we mean Acts or Agents, is indifferent. Now let X signify a *Transcendent*, i. e. a Cause beyond our Comprehension and not within the sphere of sensible experience: and on the other hand, let A, B, C, and D represent, each some one known and familiar cause in reference to some single and characteristic effect: viz. A in reference to k, B to l, C to m, and D to n. Then I say X + k l m n is in different places expressed by (or as =) A + k; B + l; C + m; D + n. And these I should call *metaphorical Exponents* of X.]

Now John, the beloved Disciple, who leant on the Lord's Bosom, the Evangelist *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, i. e. according to the *Spirit*, the inner and substantial truth of the Christian Creed—John, recording the Redeemer's own words, enunciates the Fact itself, to the full extent in which it is enunciable for the human mind, simply and *without any metaphor*, by identifying *it in kind* with a fact of hourly occurrence—*expressing* it, I say, by a familiar fact the same *in kind* with that intended, though of a far lower *dignity*;—by a fact of every man's experience, *known* to all, yet not better *understood* than the fact described by it. In the Redeemed it is a re-generation, a *birth*, a spiritual seed impregnated and evolved, the germinal principle of a higher and enduring Life, of a *spiritual* Life—that

is, a Life, the actuality of which is not dependent on the material body, or limited by the circumstances and processes indispensable to its organization and subsistence. Briefly, it is the *Differential* of Immortality, of which the assimilative power of Faith and Love is the *Integrand*, and the Life in Christ the *Integration*.

But even this would be an imperfect statement, if we omitted the awful truth, that besides that dissolution of our earthly tabernacle which we call death, there is another death, not the mere negation of life, but its positive Opposite. And as there is a mystery of Life and an assimilation to the Principle of Life, even to him who is *the* Life; so is there a mystery of Death and an assimilation to the Principle of Evil *αμφιθαλης θανατω!* a fructifying of the corrupt seed, of which Death is the germination. Thus the regeneration to spiritual life is at the same time a redemption from the spiritual death.

Respecting the redemptive act itself, and the Divine Agent, we know from revelation that he “was made a quickening (*ζωοποιούν*, *life-making*) Spirit:” and that in order to this it was necessary, that God should be manifested in the flesh, that the eternal Word, through whom and by whom the World (*κοσμος*, the Order, Beauty, and sustaining Law of visible natures) was and is, should be made flesh, assume our humanity personally, fulfil all righteousness, and so suffer and so die for us as in dying to conquer Death for as many as should receive him. More than this, the mode, the possibility, we are not competent to know. It is, as

hath been already observed concerning the primal Act of Apostacy, a mystery by the necessity of the subject—a mystery, which at all events it will be time enough for us to seek and expect to understand, when we understand the mystery of our *Natural* life, and *its* conjunction with mind and will and personal identity. Even the truths, that are given to us to know, we can know only through faith in the spirit. They are spiritual things that must be spiritually discerned. Such, however, being the means and the effects of our Redemption, well might the fervent Apostle associate it with whatever was eminently dear and precious to erring and afflicted Mortals, and (where no expression could be commensurate, no single title be other than imperfect) seek from similitude of *effect* to describe the superlative boon by successively transferring to it, as by a superior claim, the name of each several Act and Ordinance, habitually connected in the minds of *all* his Hearers with feelings of joy, confidence, and gratitude.

Do you rejoice when the Atonement made by the Priest has removed the civil stain from your name, restored you to your privileges as a Son of Abraham, and replaced you in the respect of your Brethren?—Here is an atonement which takes away a deeper, worsen stain, an eating Canker-spot in the very heart of your personal Being! This, to as many as receive it, gives the privilege to become Sons of God (John i. 12), this will admit you to the society of Angels, and ensure you the rights of Brotherhood with

Spirits made perfect! (Heb. xii. 22.) Here is a Sacrifice, a Sin-offering for the whole world: and an High Priest, who is indeed a Mediator, who not in type or shadow but in very truth and in his own right stands in the place of Man to God, and of God to Man; and who receives as a Judge what he offered as an Advocate.

Would you be grateful to one who had ransomed you from slavery under a bitter foe, or who brought you out of Captivity? Here is redemption from a far direr slavery, the slavery of Sin unto Death! and he, who gave himself for the ransom, has taken Captivity Captive!

Had you by your own fault alienated yourself from your best, your only sure Friend? Had you, like a Prodigal, cast yourself out of your Father's House? Would you not love the good Samaritan, who should reconcile you to your Friend? Would you not prize above all price the intercession, that had brought you back from Husks and the tending of Swine, and restored you to your Father's Arms, and seated you at your Father's Table?

Had you involved yourself in a heavy DEBT for certain gew-gaws, for high-seasoned meats, and intoxicating drinks, and glistening apparel, and in default of payment had made yourself over as a bondsman to a hard Creditor, who, it was foreknown, would enforce the bond of Judgement to the last tittle! With what emotions would you not receive the glad tidings, that a stranger, or a friend whom in the days of your wantonness, you

had neglected and reviled, had paid the DEBT for you, had made SATISFACTION to your Creditor? But you have incurred a debt of Death to the EVIL NATURE! you have sold yourself over to SIN! and relatively to *you*, and to all *your* means and resources, the Seal on the Bond is the Seal of Necessity! Its stamp is the *Nature* of Evil. But the Stranger has appeared, the forgiving Friend has come, even the Son of God from heaven: and to as many as have faith in his name, I say—the Debt is payed for you! The Satisfaction has been made.

Now to simplify the argument and at the same time to bring the question to the test, we will confine our attention to the figure last-mentioned, viz. the satisfaction of a Debt. Passing by our modern Alogi who find nothing but metaphors in either Apostle, let us suppose for a moment with certain Divines that our Lord's Words, recorded by John, and which in all places repeat and assert the same Analogy, are to be regarded as metaphorical; and that it is the varied expressions of St. Paul that are to be literally interpreted: *ex. gr.* that Sin is, or involves an infinite Debt, (in the proper and law-court sense of the word, debt)—a debt owing by us to the vindictive Justice of God the Father, which can only be liquidated by the everlasting misery of Adam and all his posterity, or by a sum of suffering equal to this. Likewise, that God the Father by his absolute decree, or (as some Divines teach) through the necessity of his unchangeable Justice, had determined to exact the full sum; which must, therefore,

be paid either by ourselves or by some other in our name and behalf. But besides the Debt which *all* Mankind contracted in and through Adam, as a Homo Publicus, even as a Nation is bound by the Acts of its Head or its Plenipotentiary, every man (say these Divines) is an insolvent Debtor on his own score. In this fearful predicament the Son of God took compassion on Mankind, and resolved to pay the debt for us, and to satisfy the divine Justice by a perfect equivalent. Accordingly, by a strange yet strict *consequence*, it has been held by more than one of these Divines, that the agonies suffered by Christ were equal in amount to the sum total of the torments of all Mankind here and hereafter, or to the infinite debt, which in an endless succession of installments we should have been paying to the divine Justice, had it not been paid in full by the Son of God incarnate!

It is easy to say—O but *I* do not hold this, or *we* do not make this an article of our belief! The true question is: Do you take any *part* of it: and can you reject the rest without being *inconsequent*? Are Debt, Satisfaction, Payment in full, Creditors' *Rights*, &c. *nomina propria*, by which the very nature of Redemption and its occasion is expressed? or are they, with several others, figures of speech for the purpose of illustrating the nature and extent of the consequences and effects of the redemptive Act, and to excite in the receivers a due sense of the magnitude and manifold operation of the Boon, and of the Love and gratitude due to the Redeemer? If still you reply,

the former: *then*, as your whole theory is grounded on a notion of *Justice*, I ask you—Is this *Justice* a *moral* Attribute? But *Morality* commences with, and begins in, the sacred distinction between *Thing* and *Person*: on this distinction all *Law* human and divine is grounded: consequently, the *Law of Justice*. If you attach any idea to the term *Justice*, as applied to *God*, it must be the same which you refer to when you affirm or deny it of any other personal *Agent*—save only; that in its attribution to *God*, you speak of it as unmixed and perfect. For if not, what *do* you mean? And why do you call it by the same name? I may, therefore, with all right and reason, put the case as between man and man. For should it be found irreconcilable with the *Justice*, which the *Light of Reason*, made *Law* in the *Conscience*, dictates to *Man*, how much more must it be incongruous with the all-perfect *Justice of God*!—Whatever case I should imagine would be felt by the *Reader* as below the dignity of the subject, and in some measure jarring with his feelings: and in other respects the more familiar the case, the better suited to the present purpose.

A sum of £1000 is owing from *James* to *Peter*, for which *James* had given a *Bond* in *Judgement*. He is insolvent, and the *Bond* is on the point of being carried into effect, to *James's* utter ruin. At this moment *Matthew* steps in, pays *Peter* the thousand pound and discharges the *Bond*. In this case, no man would hesitate to admit, that a complete *satisfaction* had been made to *Peter*. *Matthew's* £1000 is a perfect equi-

valent of the sum James was bound to have payed, and for the sum which Peter had lent. *It is the same thing*: and this altogether a question of *Things*. Now instead of James's being indebted to Peter for a sum of money, which (he having become insolvent) Matthew pays for him, we will put the case, that James had been guilty of the basest and most hard-hearted ingratitude to a most worthy and affectionate Mother, who had not only performed all the duties and tender offices of a mother, but whose whole heart was bound up in this her only child—who had foregone all the pleasures and amusements of life in watching over his sickly childhood, had sacrificed her health and the far greater part of her resources to rescue him from the consequences of his follies and excesses during his youth and early manhood; and to procure for him the means of his present Rank and Affluences—all which he had repayed by neglect, desertion, and open profligacy. Here the Mother stands in the relation of the creditor: and here too we will suppose the same generous Friend to interfere, and to perform with the greatest tenderness and constancy all those duties of a grateful and affectionate Son, which James ought to have performed. Will this satisfy the Mother's claims on James, or entitle him to her Esteem, Approbation, and Blessing? Or what if Matthew, the vicarious Son, should at length address her in words to this purpose: "Now, I trust, you are appeased, and will be henceforward reconciled to James. I have satisfied all your claims on him. I have payed his Debt in full: and you

are too just to require the same debt to be payed twice over. You will therefore regard him with the same complacency, and receive him into your presence with the same love, as if there had been no difference between him and you. For I have *made it up*." What other reply could the swelling heart of the Mother dictate than this? "O misery! and is it possible that *you* are in league with my unnatural child to insult me? Must not the very necessity of *your* abandonment of your proper sphere form an additional evidence of *his* guilt? Must not the sense of your goodness teach me more fully to comprehend, more vividly to feel, the evil in him? Must not the contrast of your merits magnify his Demerit in his Mother's eye, and at once recall and embitter the conviction of the canker-worm in his soul?"

If indeed by the force of Matthew's example, by persuasion or by additional and more mysterious influences, or by any inward co-agency, compatible with the idea of a personal will, James should be led to repent; if through admiration and love of this great goodness gradually assimilating his mind to the mind of his benefactor, he should in his own person become a grateful and dutiful child—*then* doubtless the mother would be wholly satisfied! But then the case is no longer a question of *Things**, or a matter of *Debt* pay-

* On a subject, concerning which we have so deep an interest in forming just and distinct conceptions, no serious Inquirer after religious truth; much less any man dedicated to its pursuit, and who ought to be able to declare with the Psalmist, it is

able by another. Nevertheless, the *Effect*,—and the reader will remember, that it is the *effects* and *conse-*

“more desirable to me than thousands of gold and silver : therefore do I hate every false way ;” will blame my solicitude to place a notion, which I regard not only as a misbelief, but as a main source of unbelief—at all events, among the most frequent and plausible pretexts of Infidelity—in all the various points of view, from which this or that Reader may more readily see, and see *into*, its falsity. I make therefore no apology for adding one other illustration of the whimsical Logic by which it is supported, in an Incident of recent occurrence, which will at the same time furnish an instance in proof of the contrariety of the Notion itself to the first and most obvious principles of morality, and how spontaneously Common Sense starts forward, as it were, to repel it.

Let it be imagined, that the late Mr. Fauntleroy had, in compliance with the numerous petitions in his behalf, received a pardon—that soon after some other Individual had been tried and convicted of forging a note for a Hundred Pound—that on application made for the extension of mercy to the culprit it should be declared that in a commercial country like this it was contrary to all Justice to grant a pardon to a man convicted of Forgery—and that in invalidation of this dictum, the Applicants having quoted, as they naturally would quote, the case of Mr. Fauntleroy, the Home Secretary should reply, Yes! but Mr. Fauntleroy forged to the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Pound!—Now it is plain, that the Logic of this reply would remain the same, if instead of comparative Criminality I had supposed a case of comparative Purity from Crime : and when the Reader has settled with himself, what he would think of such Logic, and by what name he would describe it, let him peruse the following extract :

MANSION HOUSE.

Monsieur Edmund Angelini, Professor of the Languages, and

quences of Christ's mediation, on which St. Paul is dilating—the Effect to *James* is similar in both cases, *i. e.* in the case of James, the Debtor, and of James, the undutiful Son. In both cases, James is liberated from a grievous burthen; and in both cases, he has to attri-

la morale, whose fracas with the Austrian Ambassador was reported on Wednesday, came before the Lord Mayor, and presented his Lordship with a Petition, of which the following is a translation:—

“ My Lord—He who has violated the law ought to perish by the sword of justice. Monsieur Fauntleroy ought to perish by the sword of justice. If another takes his place, I think that justice ought to be satisfied. I devote myself for him. I take upon myself his crime, and I wish to die to save him.

(Signed) EDMUND ANGELINI,
18, Ossulston-street, Somers-town. of Venice.”

The Lord Mayor expressed his surprise at the application; and Mr. Angelini was informed that it was contrary to all justice that the life of an innocent person should be taken to save that of one who was guilty, even if an innocent man chose to devote himself.

Angelini exclaimed that our Saviour died as an atonement for the sins of the guilty, and that he did not see why he should not be allowed to do so.

But in answer to this, doubts were expressed whether Monsieur Angelini was sufficiently pure to satisfy justice.

* * * * *

From *Baldwin's London Weekly Journal*,
Saturday Dec. 4, 1824.

The Reader is now, I trust, convinced, that though the *Case* put by me, introductory to this extract, was imaginary, the *Logic* was not of my invention. *It is contrary to all Justice, that an INNOCENT person should be sacrificed, &c. &c.; but a person ALTOGETHER innocent—Aye! that is a different question!*

bute his liberation to the Act and free grace of another. The only *difference* is, that in the former case (viz. the payment of the debt) the beneficial Act is, *singly* and without requiring any re-action or co-agency on the part of James, the efficient *cause* of his liberation; while in the latter case (viz. that of Redemption) the beneficial Act is, *first*, the indispensable *Condition*, and *then*, the *Co-efficient*.

The professional Student of Theology will, perhaps, understand the different positions asserted in the preceding Argument more readily if they are presented *synoptically*, i. e. brought at once within his view, in the form of Answers to four Questions, comprising the constituent parts of the Scriptural Doctrine of Redemption. And I trust that my Lay Readers of both sexes will not allow themselves to be scared from the perusal of the following short catechism by half a dozen Latin words, or rather words with Latin endings, that translate themselves into English, when I dare assure them, that they will encounter no other obstacle to their full and easy comprehension of the contents.

Synopsis of the Constituent Points in the Doctrine of Redemption, in Four Questions, with Correspondent Answers.

Questions.

- Who (or What) is the
- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| } | 1. Agens Causator ? |
| } | 2. Actus Causativus ? |
| } | 3. Effectum Causatum ? |
| } | 4. Consequentia ab Effecto ? |

Answers.

I. The Agent and Personal Cause of the Redemption of Mankind is—the co-eternal Word and only-begotten Son of the Living God, incarnate, tempted, agonizing (*Agonistes ἀγωνιζόμενος*), crucified, submitting to Death, resurgent, communicant of his Spirit, ascendent, and obtaining for his Church the Descent and Communion of the Holy Spirit, the Comforter.

II. The Causative Act is—a spiritual and transcendent Mystery, “that passeth all understanding.”

III. The Effect caused is—the being born anew: as before in the *flesh* to the World, so now born in the *spirit* to Christ.

IV. The Consequents from the Effect are—Sanctification from Sin, and Liberation from the inherent and penal consequences of Sin in the World to come, with all the means and processes of Sanctification by the Word and the Spirit: these Consequents being the same for the Sinner relatively to God and his own Soul, as the satisfaction of a debt for a Debtor relatively to his Creditor; as the sacrificial atonement made by the Priest for the Transgressor of the Mosaic Law; as the reconciliation to an alienated Parent for a Son who had estranged himself from his Father's house and presence; and as a redemptive Ransom for a Slave or Captive.

Now I complain, that this metaphorical *Naming* of the transcendent Causative Act through the medium of its proper effects from Actions and Causes of familiar occurrence connected with the former by similarity of

Result, has been mistaken for an intended designation of the essential character of the Causative Act itself; and that thus Divines have interpreted *de omni* what was spoken *de singulo*, and magnified a *partial equation* into a *total identity*.

I will merely hint, to my more *learned* readers, and to the professional Students of Theology, that the origin of this error is to be sought for in the discussions of the Greek Fathers, and (at a later period) of the Schoolmen, on the obscure and *abysmal* subject of the Divine *A-seity*, and the distinction between the $\Theta\eta\lambda\eta\mu\alpha$ and the $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta$, *i. e.* the absolute Will, as the universal *Ground* of all Being, and the Election and purpose of God in the personal Idea, as the Father. And this View would have allowed me to express (what I believe to be) the true import and scriptural idea of Redemption in terms much more nearly resembling those used ordinarily by the Calvinistic Divines, and with a conciliative *show* of coincidence. But this motive was outweighed by the reflection, that I could not rationally have expected to be understood by those, to whom I most wish to be intelligible: *et si non vis intelligi, cur vis legi?*

N. B. Not to countervene the purpose of a Synopsis, I have detached the confirmative or explanatory remarks from the Answers to Questions II. and III. and place them below as Scholia. A single glance of the eye will enable the reader to re-connect each with the sentence it is supposed to follow.

SCHOLIUM TO ANS. II.

Nevertheless, *the fact or actual truth having been assured to us by Revelation*, it is not impossible, by steadfast meditation on the idea and super-natural character of a personal WILL, for a mind spiritually disciplined to satisfy itself, that the redemptive act *supposes* (and that our redemption is even negatively *conceivable* only on the supposition of) an Agent who can at once act *on* the Will as an exciting cause, *quasi ab extra*; and *in* the Will, as the *condition* of its potential, and the *ground* of its actual, Being.

SCHOLIUM TO ANS. III.

Where two subjects, that stand to each other in the relation of *antithesis* (or *contradistinction*) are connected by a middle term common to *both*, the sense of this middle term is indifferently determinable by *either*: the preferability of the one or the other in any given case being decided by the circumstance of our more frequent experience of, or greater familiarity with, the Term in *this* connexion. Thus, if I put Hydrogen and Oxygen Gas, as opposite Poles, the term *Gas* is common to both; and it is a matter of indifference, by which of the two bodies I ascertain the sense of the Term. But if for the conjoint purposes of connexion and contrast, I oppose transparent chrystallized Alumen to opaque derb (*unchrystallized*) Alumen;—it may easily happen to be far more *convenient* for me to show the sense of the middle term, *i. e.* Alumen, by a piece of Pipe-clay

than by a Sapphire or Ruby: especially, if I should be describing the beauty and preciousness of the latter to a female Peasant, or in a District, where a Ruby was a rarity which the Fewest only had an opportunity of seeing. This is a plain rule of common Logic directed in its application by Common Sense.

Now let us apply this to the case in hand. The two opposites *here* are Flesh and Spirit, *this* in relation to *Christ*, *that* in relation to the *World*: and these two Opposites are connected by the middle term, *Birth*, which is of course common to both. But for the same reason, as in the instance last-mentioned, the interpretation of the common term is to be ascertained from its known sense, in the more familiar connexion—*Birth*, namely, in relation to our natural life and to the Organized Body, by which we belong to the present World. Whatever the word signifies in this connexion, the same *essentially* (in *kind* though not in dignity and value) must be its signification in the other. How else could it be (what yet in this text it undeniably *is*), the *punctum indifferens*, or *nota communis*, of the Thesis (Flesh: the World) and the Antithesis (Spirit: Christ)? We might therefore, supposing a writer to have been speaking of River-water in distinction from Rain-water, as rationally pretend that in the latter phrase the term, Water, was to be understood metaphorically, as that the word, Birth, is a *metaphor*, and “means only” so and so, in the Gospel according to St. John.

There is, I am aware, a numerous and powerful

Party in our church, so numerous and powerful as not seldom to be entitled *the Church*, who hold and publicly teach, that “Regeneration is only Baptism.” Nay, the Writer of the Article on the Lives of Scott and Newton in our ablest and most respectable Review is but one among many who do not hesitate to brand the contrary opinion as heterodoxy, and schismatical superstition. I trust, that I think as seriously, as most men, of the evil of Schism; but with every disposition to pay the utmost deference to an acknowledged majority including, it is said, a very large proportion of the present Dignitaries of our Church, I cannot but think it a sufficient reply, that if Regeneration means baptism, Baptism must mean regeneration: and this too, as Christ himself has declared, a regeneration in the Spirit. Now I would ask these Divines this simple question. Do they believingly suppose a spiritual regenerative power and agency inhering in or accompanying the sprinkling a few drops of water on an infant’s face? They cannot evade the question by saying that Baptism is a *type* or *sign*. For this would be to supplant their own assertion, that Regeneration means Baptism, by the contradictory admission, that Regeneration is the significatum, of which Baptism is the significant. Unless, indeed, they would incur the absurdity of saying, that regeneration is a type of regeneration, and Baptism a type of itself—or that Baptism only means Baptism! And this indeed is the plain consequence, to which they might be driven, should they answer the above question in the Negative.

But if their answer be, Yes! we do suppose and believe this efficiency in the baptismal act—I have not another word to say. Only, perhaps, I might be permitted to express a hope, that for consistency's sake they would speak less slightingly of the *insufflation*, and *extreme unction*, used in the Romish Church: notwithstanding the not easily to be answered arguments of our Christian Mercury, the all-eloquent Jeremy Taylor, respecting the latter,—“ which, since it is used when the man is above half dead, when he can exercise no act of understanding, *it must needs be nothing. For no rational man can think, that any ceremony can make a spiritual change without a spiritual act of him that is to be changed; nor that it can work by way of nature, or by charm, but morally and after the manner of reasonable creatures.*”

TAYLOR'S *Epist. Dedic. to his Holy Dying*, p. 6.

It is too obvious to require suggestion, that these words here quoted apply with yet greater force and propriety to the point in question: as the Babe is an unconscious subject, which the dying man need not be supposed to be. My avowed convictions respecting Regeneration with the spiritual baptism, as its Condition and Initiative, (Luke iii. 16; Mark i. 8; Matt. iii. 11), and of which the sacramental Rite, the Baptism of John, was appointed by Christ to remain as the Sign and Figure; and still more, perhaps, my belief respecting the Mystery of the Eucharist, (concerning which I hold the same opinions as Bucer (Strype's Life of Archb. Cranmer, Appendix), Peter Martyr,

and presumably Cranmer himself—these convictions and this belief will, I doubt not, be deemed by the Orthodox *de more Grotii*, who improve the *letter* of Arminius with the *spirit* of the Socini, sufficient data to bring me in guilty of irrational and superstitious Mysticism. But I abide by a maxim, which I learnt at an early period of my theological studies, from Benedict Spinoza. Where the Alternative lies between the Absurd and the Incomprehensible, no wise man can be at a loss which of the two to prefer. To be *called* irrational, is a trifle: to *be* so, and in matters of religion, is far otherwise: and whether the irrationality consists in men's believing (*i. e.* in having persuaded themselves that they believe) *against* reason, or *without* reason, I have been early instructed to consider it as a sad and serious evil, pregnant with mischiefs, political and moral. And by none of my numerous Instructors so impressively, as by that great and shining Light of our Church in the æra of her intellectual splendour, Bishop Jeremy Taylor: from one of whose works, and that of especial authority for the safety as well as for the importance of the principle, inasmuch as it was written expressly *ad populum*, I will now, both for its own intrinsic worth, and to relieve the attention, wearied, perhaps, by the length and argumentative character of the preceding *discussion*, interpose the following Aphorism.

APHORISM XX.

JER. TAYLOR.

Whatever is against right reason, that no faith can oblige us to believe. For though Reason is not the positive and affirmative measure of our faith, and our faith ought to be larger than our (*speculative*) Reason, (*see p. 179*) and *take* something into her heart, that Reason can never take into her eye; yet in all our creed there can be nothing *against* reason. If Reason justly contradicts an article, it is not *of the household of Faith*. In this there is no difficulty, but that in practice we take care that we do not call *that* Reason, which is not so (*see p. 161, 162; p. 216*). For although Reason is a right Judge*, yet it ought not to pass sentence in an inquiry of faith, until all the information be brought in; all that is within, and all that is without, all that is above, and all that is below; all that concerns it in experience and all that concerns it in act; whatsoever is of pertinent observation and whatsoever is revealed. For else Reason may argue very well and yet conclude falsely. It may conclude well

* Which it could not be, in respect of spiritual truths and objects super-sensuous, if it were the same with, and merely another name for "the Faculty judging according to Sense"—*i. e.* the Understanding, or (as Taylor most often calls it in distinction from Reason) *Discourse* (*Discursus seu Facultas discursiva vel discursoria*). N. B. The Reason, so instructed and so actuated as Taylor requires in the sentences immediately following, is what I have called the Spirit. *Vide p. 208, 209.*

in Logic, and yet infer a false proposition in Theology (*p.* 161, *lines* 16—28). But when our Judge is fully and truly informed in all that, whence she is to make her Judgement, we may safely follow her whithersoever she invites us.

APHORISM XXI.

JER. TAYLOR.

He that speaks against his own Reason, speaks against his own Conscience: and therefore it is certain, no man serves God with a good conscience, who serves him against his reason.

APHORISM XXII.

THE SAME.

By the eye of Reason through the telescope of Faith, *i. e.* Revelation, we may see what without this telescope we could never have known to exist. But as one that shuts the eye hard, and with violence curls the eye-lid, forces a phantastic fire from the crystalline humor, and espies a light that never shines, and sees thousands of little fires that never burn; so is he that blinds the eye of Reason, and pretends to see by an eye of Faith. He makes little images of Notions, and some atoms dance before him; but he is not guided by the light, nor instructed by the proposition, but sees like a man in his sleep. IN NO CASE CAN TRUE REASON AND A RIGHT FAITH OPPOSE EACH OTHER.

NOTE PREFATORY

TO

APHORISM XXIII.—Less on my own account, than in the hope of fore-arming my youthful friends, I add

one other Transcript from Bishop Taylor, as from a Writer to whose name no taint or suspicion of Calvinistic or schismatical tenets can attach, and for the purpose of softening the offence which, I cannot but foresee, will be taken at the positions asserted in paragraph the first of Aphorism VII. p. 189, and the documental proofs of the same in p. 193—195: and this by a formidable party composed of men ostensibly of the most dissimilar Creeds, *regular* Church-Divines, voted orthodox by a great majority of suffrages, and the so called Free-thinking Christians, and Unitarian Divines. It is the *former* class alone that I wish to conciliate: so far at least as it may be done by removing the aggravation of *novelty* from the offensive article. And surely the simple re-assertion of one of “the two great things,” which Bishop TAYLOR could assert as a fact, which, he took for granted, no Christian would think of controverting, should at least be controverted without bitterness by his successors in the Church. That which was perfectly safe and orthodox in 1657, in the judgement of a devoted Royalist and Episcopalian, must be at most but a venial heterodoxy in 1825. For the rest, I am prepared to hear in answer—what has already been so often, and with such theatrical effect dropt, as an *extinguisher*, on my arguments—the famous concluding period of one of the chapters in Paley’s Moral and Political Philosophy, declared by Dr. Parr the *finest* prose passage in English Literature. Be it so! I bow to so great an authority. But if the learned Doctor would impose it on me as

the *truest* as well as the finest, or expect me to admire the Logic equally with the Rhetoric—*ἀφισταμαι*. I start off! As I have been *unenglish* enough to find in Pope's tomb-epigram on Sir Isaac Newton nothing better than a gross and wrongful falsehood conveyed in an enormous and irreverent hyperbole; so with regard to this passage in question, free as it is from all faults of taste, I have yet the hardihood to confess, that in the sense in which the words *discover* and *prove*, are here used and intended, I am not convinced of the truth of the principle, (that he alone discovers who proves), and I question the correctness of the particular case, brought as instance and confirmation. I *doubt* the validity of the assertion as a *general* rule; and I *deny* it, as applied to matters of *faith*, to the verities of religion, in the belief of which there must always be somewhat of moral election, "an act of the *Will* in it as well as of the *Understanding*, as much *love* in it as discursive power. True Christian Faith must have in it something of in-evidence, something that must be made up by duty and by obedience."—Taylor's Worthy Communicant, p. 160. But most readily do I admit, and most fervently do I contend, that the Miracles worked by Christ, both as miracles and as fulfilments of prophecy, both as signs and as wonders, made plain discovery, and gave unquestionable proof, of his divine character and authority; that they were to the whole Jewish nation true and appropriate evidences, that HE was indeed come who had promised and declared to their Forefathers,

Behold, your God will come with vengeance, (*Matth.* x. 34, *Luke* xii. 49), even God a recompense! He will come and save you! (*Isaiah* xxxv. 4, compared with *Matth.* x. 34, and *Luke* xii. 49.) I receive them as proofs, therefore, of the truth of every word, which he taught who was himself **THE WORD**: and as sure evidences of the final victory over death and of the life to come, in that they were manifestations of **HIM**, who said: I am the Resurrection and the Life!

The obvious inference from the passage in question, if not its express import, is: *Miracula experimento crucis esse, quo solo probandum erat, Homines non, pecudum instar, omnino perituros esse.* Now this doctrine I hold to be altogether alien from the *spirit*, and without authority in the *letter*, of Scripture. I can recall nothing in the history of human Belief, that should induce me, I find nothing in my own moral Being that enables me, to understand it. I can, however, perfectly well understand, the readiness of *those* Divines in hoc **PALEH** Dictum ore pleno jurare, qui nihil aliud in toto Evangelio invenire posse profitentur. The most unqualified admiration of this superlative passage I find perfectly in character for those, who while Socinianism and Ultra-Socinianism are spreading like the roots of an Elm, on and just below the surface, through the whole land, and *here and there* at least have even dipt under the garden-fence of the Church, and blunt the edge of the Labourer's spade in the gayest *parterres* of our Baal-hamon, (*Sol. Song*, viii. 11)—who, while Heresies, to which the Framers and

Compilers of our Liturgy, Homilies and Articles would have refused the very name of Christianity, meet their eyes on the List of Religious Denominations for every City and large Town throughout the kingdom—can yet congratulate themselves with Dr. Paley (in his Evidences) that *the Rent has not reached the foundation*—i. e. that the Corruption of Man's Will; that the responsibility of man in any sense in which it is not equally predicable of Dogs and Horses; that the Divinity of our Lord, and even his pre-existence; that Sin, and Redemption through the merits of Christ; and Grace; and the especial aids of the Spirit; and the efficacy of Prayer; and the subsistency of the Holy Ghost; may all be extruded without breach or rent in the Essentials of Christian Faith!—that a Man may deny and renounce them all, and remain a *fundamental* Christian, notwithstanding! But there are many that cannot keep up with Latitudinarians of such a stride: and I trust, that the majority of serious Believers are in this predicament. Now for all these it would seem more in character to be of Bishop Taylor's opinion, that the Belief in question is *presupposed* in a convert to the Truth in Christ—but at all events not to circulate in the great whispering gallery of the Religious Public suspicions and hard thoughts of those who, like myself, *are* of this opinion! who do not dare decry the religious instincts of Humanity as a baseless dream; who hold, that to excavate the ground under the faith of all mankind, is a very questionable method of building up our faith, as Christians; who fear, that

instead of adding to, they should detract from, the honor of the Incarnate Word by disparaging the light of the Word, that was in the beginning, and which lighteth *every* man; and who, under these convictions, can tranquilly leave it to be disputed, in some new "Dialogues in the Shades," between the fathers of the Unitarian Church on one side, and Maimonides, Moses Mendelsohn, and Lessing on the other, whether the famous passage in Paley does or does not contain the three dialectic flaws, *Petitio principii*, *Argumentum in circulo*, and *Argumentum contra rem a premissis rem ipsam includente*.

Yes! fervently do I contend, that to satisfy the Understanding, that there is a Future State, was not the *specific* Object of the Christian Dispensation; and that neither the Belief of a Future State, nor the *Rationality* of this belief, is the *exclusive* Attribute of the Christian Religion. An *essential*, a *fundamental*, Article of *all* Religion it is, and therefore of the Christian; but otherwise than as in connexion with the Salvation of Mankind from the *terrors* of that State, among the essential Articles *peculiar* to the Gospel Creed (those, for instance, by which it is *contra*-distinguished from the Creed of a religious Jew) I do not place it. And before sentence is passed against me, as heterodox, on this ground, let not my Judges forget, who it was that assured us, that if a man did not believe in a state of retribution after death, previously and on other grounds, "neither would he believe, though a man should be raised from the dead."

Again, I am questioned as to my *proofs* of a future state, by men who are so far, and *only* so far, professed believers, that they admit a God, and the existence of a Law from God: I give them: and the Questioners turn from me with a scoff or incredulous smile. Now should others of a less scanty Creed infer the weakness of the reasons assigned by me from their failure in convincing *these* men; may I not remind them, WHO it was, to whom a similar question was proposed by men of the same class? But at all events it will be enough for my own support to remember it; and to know that HE held such Questioners, who could not find a sufficing proof of this great all-concerning verity in the words, “The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,” unworthy of any other answer! men not to be satisfied by *any* proof!—by any such proofs, at least, as are compatible with the ends and purposes of all religious conviction! by any proofs, that would not destroy the faith they were intended to confirm, and reverse the whole character and quality of its effects and influences! But if, notwithstanding all here offered in defence of my opinion, I must still be adjudged heterodox and in error,—what can I say, but *malo cum Platone errare*, and take refuge behind the ample shield of BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR.

APHORISM XXIII.

TAYLOR.

In order to his own glory, and for the manifestation of his goodness, and that the accidents of this world

might not overmuch trouble those good men who suffered evil things, God was pleased to do TWO GREAT THINGS. The one was: that he sent his Son into the World to take upon him our Nature, that every man might submit to a necessity, from which God's own Son was not exempt, when it behoved even *Christ to suffer*, and so to enter into glory. The other great thing was: that God did *not only by Revelation* and the Sermons of the Prophets *to his Church*; but even to ALL MANKIND *competently* teach, and *effectively* persuade, that the Soul of Man does not die; that though things were ill here, yet to the good who usually feel most of the evils of this life, they should end in honor and advantages. And therefore Cicero had reason on his side to conclude, that there is a time and place after this life, wherein the wicked shall be punished and the virtuous rewarded; when he considered, that Orpheus and Socrates, and how many others, just men and benefactors of mankind, were either slain or oppressed to death by evil men. (*Compare* Heb. ch. xi. v. 36—39.) “*And all these received not the promise.*” But when Virtue made men poor; and free speaking of brave truths made the wise to lose their liberty; when an excellent life hastened an opprobrious death, and the obeying Reason and our Conscience lost us our Lives, or at least all the means and conditions of enjoying them: it was but time to look about for *another* state of things, where Justice should rule and Virtue find her own portion. And therefore Men cast out every line, and turned every stone and tried every argument:

and sometimes proved it well, and when they did not, yet they believed strongly; and THEY WERE SURE OF THE THING, EVEN WHEN THEY WERE NOT SURE OF THE ARGUMENT.—(*Sermon at the Funeral of Sir George Dalston, 28th Sept. 1657, p. 2.*)

COMMENT.

A fact may be truly stated, and yet the Causes or Reasons assigned for it mistaken; or inadequate; or *pars pro toto*, one only or few of many that might or should have been adduced. The preceding Aphorism is an instance in point. The Phænomenon here brought forward by the Bishop, as the ground and occasion of men's belief of a future state—viz. the frequent, not to say ordinary, disproportion between moral worth and worldly prosperity—must, indeed, at all times and in all countries of the Civilized World have led the observant and reflecting Few, the men of meditative habits and strong feelings of natural equity, to a nicer consideration of the current Belief, whether instinctive or traditional. By forcing the Soul in upon herself, this Enigma of Saint and Sage from Job, David and Solomon to Claudian and Boetius, this perplexing disparity of success and desert, has, I doubt not, with such men been the occasion of a steadier and more distinct consciousness of a *Something* in man different *in kind*, and which not merely distinguishes but contra-distinguishes, him from animals—at the same time that it has brought into closer view an enigma of yet harder solution—the fact, I mean, of a *Contra-*

diction in the Human Being, of which no traces are observable elsewhere, in animated or inanimate Nature! * A struggle of jarring impulses; a mysterious diversity between the injunctions of the mind and the elections of the will; and (last not least) the utter incommensurateness and the unsatisfying qualities of the things around us, that yet are the only objects which our senses discover or our appetites require us to pursue. Hence for the finer and more contemplative spirits the ever-strengthening suspicion, that the two Phænomena must some way or other stand in close connexion with each other, and that the Riddle of Fortune and Circumstance is but a form or effluence of the Riddle of Man! And hence again, the persuasion, that the solution of both problems is to be sought for—hence the pre-sentiment, that this solution will be found—in the *contra*-distinctive Constituent of Humanity, in the *Something* of Human Nature which is exclusively human! And as the objects discoverable by the senses, as all the Bodies and Substances that we can touch, measure, and weigh, are either mere Totals, the unity

* I trust, that my *Age* will exempt me from the charge of presumption, when I avow, that the forty lines here following are retained as a specimen of *accumulative* reason, and as an *Exercise*, on which my supposed Pupil may try and practice the power of sustaining the attention up the whole ascent of a “piled Argument.” The most magnificent Example of a *Sorites* in our—perhaps in *any*—Language, the Reader may find in the FRIEND, vol. ii. p. 157, transcribed from J. Taylor’s *Dissuasive from Popery*.

of which results from the parts, often *accidental*, as that of a pebble, and always only apparent; or Substances, whose Unity of Action is owing to the nature or arrangement of the partible bodies which they actuate or set in motion; Steam, for instance, in a steam-engine, or the (so called) imponderable fluids;—as on one hand the conditions and known or conceivable properties of all the objects, that *cease* to be, and whose whole of existence is *then* a detached and completed Past, that links on to no Present; as all the properties, that we ourselves have in common with these perishable things, differ *in kind* from the acts and properties peculiar to our Humanity, so that the former cannot even be conceived, cannot without a contradiction in terms be predicated, of the proper and immediate subject of the latter—for who would not smile at an ounce of Truth, or a square foot of Honor?—and as whatever things in visible nature *have* the character of Permanence, and endure amid continual flux unchanged, like a Rainbow in a fast flying shower, (ex. gr. Beauty, Order, Harmony, Finality, Law) are all akin to the *peculia* of Humanity, are all *congeners* of Mind and Will, without which indeed they would not only exist in vain, as Pictures for Moles, but actually not *exist* at all: hence, finally, the conclusion, that the Soul of Man, as the subject of Mind and Will, must likewise possess a principle of permanence, and be destined to endure! And were these grounds lighter than they are, yet as a small weight will make a Scale descend, where there is nothing in the opposite

Scale, or *painted* Weights, that have only an illusive relief or prominence; so in the Scale of Immortality slight Reasons are in effect weighty, and sufficient to determine the Judgement, there being no counterweight, no reasons against them, and no facts in proof of the contrary, that would not prove equally well the cessation of the eye on the removal or diffraction of the Eye-glass, and the dissolution or incapacity of the Musician on the fracture of his instrument or its strings.

But though I agree with Taylor so far, as not to doubt that the misallotment of worldly goods and fortunes was one principal occasion, exciting well-disposed and spiritually awakened Natures by reflections and reasonings, such as I have here supposed, to mature the presentiment of immortality into full consciousness, into a principle of action and a well-spring of strength and consolation; I cannot concede to this circumstance any thing like the importance and *extent* of efficacy which he in this passage attributes to it. I am persuaded, that as the belief of all mankind, of all * tribes,

* I say, *all*: for the accounts of one or two travelling French *Philosophes*, professed Atheists and Partizans of Infidelity, respecting one or two African Hordes, Caffres and poor outlawed Boschmen hunted out of their humanity, ought not to be regarded as exceptions. And as to Hearne's Assertion respecting the non-existence and rejection of the Belief among the Copper-Indians, it is not only hazarded on very weak and insufficient grounds, but he himself, in another part of his work, unconsciously supplies data, from whence the contrary may safely be concluded. Hearne, perhaps, put down his friend Motannabbi's *Fort-philosophy* for the opinion of his tribe; and from his high

and nations, and languages, in all ages and in all states of social union, it must be referred to far deeper grounds, common to man as man: and that its fibres are to be traced to the *tap-root* of Humanity. I have long entertained, and do not hesitate to avow, the conviction, that the argument from Universality of Belief, urged by Barrow and others in proof of the *first* Article of the Creed, is neither in point of *fact*—for two very different objects may be intended, and two (or more) diverse and even contradictory conceptions may be expressed, by the same *Name*—nor in legitimacy of conclusion as strong and unexceptionable, as the argument from the same ground for the continuance of our personal being after death. The Bull-calf *butts* with smooth and unarmed Brow. Throughout animated Nature, of each characteristic Organ and Faculty there exists a pre-assurance, an instinctive and practical Anticipation: and no Pre-assurance common to a whole species does in any instance prove delusive. All other prophecies of Nature have their exact fulfilment—in every other “ingrafted word” of Promise Nature is found true to her Word, and is it in her noblest Creature, that she tells her first Lie?—(The Reader will, of course, understand, that I am here speaking in the assumed character of a mere Naturalist,

appreciation of the moral character of this murderous Gymnosophist it might, I fear, be inferred, that Hearne himself was not the very person one would, of all others, have chosen for the purpose of instituting the inquiry.

to whom no light of revelation had been vouchsafed ;
one, who

————— with gentle heart

Had worshipp'd Nature in the Hill and Valley,
Not knowing what he loved, but loved it all !)

Whether, however, the introductory part of the Bishop's argument is to be received with more or less qualification, the *Fact* itself, as stated in the concluding sentence of the Aphorism, remains unaffected, and is beyond exception true.

If other argument and yet higher authority were required, I might refer to St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and to the Epistle to the Hebrews, which whether written by Paul or, as Luther conjectured, by Apollos, is out of all doubt the work of an Apostolic Man filled with the Holy Spirit, and composed while the Temple and the Glories of the Temple Worship were yet in existence. Several of the Jewish and still Judaizing Converts had begun to vacillate in their faith, and to "stumble at the stumbling-stone" of the contrast between the pomp and splendor of the Old Law and the simplicity and humility of the Christian Church. To break this sensual charm, to unfascinate these bedazzled brethren, the Writer to the Hebrews institutes a comparison between the two religions, and demonstrates the superior spiritual grandeur, the greater intrinsic worth and dignity of the Religion of Christ. On the other hand, at Rome where the Jews formed a numerous, powerful, and privileged class (many of

them, too, by their proselyting zeal and frequent disputations with the Priests and Philosophers trained and exercised Polemics) the recently-founded Christian Church was, it appears, in greater danger from the reasonings of the Jewish Doctors and even of its own Judaizing Members, respecting the *use* of the new revelation. Thus the object of the Epistle to the Hebrews was to prove the *superiority* of the Christian Religion; the object of the Epistle to the Romans to prove its *necessity*. Now there was one argument extremely well calculated to stagger a faith newly transplanted and still loose at its roots, and which, if allowed, seemed to preclude the *possibility* of the Christian Religion, as an especial and immediate revelation from God—on the high grounds, at least, on which the Apostle of the Gentiles placed it, and with the exclusive rights and *superseding* character, which *he* claimed for it. You admit (said they) the divine origin and authority of the Law given to Moses, proclaimed with thunders and lightnings and the Voice of the Most High heard by all the people from Mount Sinai, and introduced, enforced, and perpetuated by a series of the most stupendous miracles! Our Religion then was given by God: and can God give a perishable, imperfect religion? If not perishable, how can it have a successor? If perfect, how can it need to be superseded? The entire argument is indeed comprised in the latter attribute of our Law. We know, from an authority which you yourselves acknowledge for divine, that our Religion is perfect. “He is the

Rock, and his *Work* is perfect." (*Deuter.* xxxii. 4.) If then the Religion revealed by God himself to our Forefathers is *perfect*, what need have we of another?—This objection, both from its importance and from its (for the persons at least, to whom it was addressed) extreme plausibility, behoved to be answered in both epistles. And accordingly, the answer is included in the one (Hebrews) and it is the especial purpose and main subject of the other. And how does the Apostle answer it? Suppose—and the case is not impossible*—a man of sense, who had studied the evidences of Priestley and Paley with Warburton's *Divine Legation*, but who should be a perfect stranger to the Writings of St. Paul: and that I put *this* ques-

* The case here supposed actually occurred in my own experience in the person of a Spanish Refugee, of English Parents, but from his tenth year resident in Spain, and bred in a family of wealthy but ignorant and bigotted Catholics. In mature manhood he returned to England, disgusted with the conduct of the Priests and Monks, which had indeed for some years produced on his mind its so common effect among the better-informed Natives of the South of Europe—a tendency to Deism. The results, however, of the infidel system in France, with his opportunities of observing the effects of irreligion on the French officers in Spain, on the one hand; and the undeniable moral and intellectual superiority of Protestant Britain on the other; had not been lost on him: and here he began to think for himself and resolved to *study* the subject. He had gone through Bishop Warburton's *Divine Legation*, and Paley's *Evidences*; but had never read the *New Testament* consecutively, and the *Epistles* not at all.

tion to him:—What, do *you* think, will St. Paul's answer be? Nothing, he would reply, can be more obvious. It is in vain, the Apostle will urge, that you bring your notions of probability and inferences from the arbitrary interpretation of a word in an absolute rather than a relative sense, to invalidate a known *fact*. It is a *fact*, that your Religion is (in *your* sense of the word) *not* perfect: for it is deficient in one of the two essential Constituents of all true Religion, the Belief of a Future State on solid and sufficient grounds. Had the doctrine indeed been revealed, the stupendous Miracles, which you most truly affirm to have accompanied and attested the first promulgation of your Religion, would have supplied the requisite proof. But the doctrine was not revealed; and your belief of a future state rests on no solid grounds. You believe it (as far as you believe it, and as many of you as profess this belief) without revelation, and without the only proper and sufficient evidence of its truth. Your Religion, therefore, though of divine Origin is, (if taken in disjunction from the new revelation, which I am commissioned to proclaim) but a Religio *dimidiata*; and the main purpose, the proper character, and the paramount object, of Christ's Mission and Miracles, is to supply the missing Half by a clear discovery of a future state; and (since "*he alone discovers who proves*") by proving the truth of the doctrine, now for the first time declared with the requisite authority, by the requisite, appropriate, and alone satisfactory *evidences*."

But *is* this the Apostle's answer to the Jewish Oppugners, and the Judaizing false brethren, of the Church of Christ? It is *not* the Answer, it does not resemble the Answer returned by the Apostle. It is neither parallel nor corradial with the line of Argument in either of the two Epistles, or with any one line; but it is a *chord* that traverses them all, and only touches where it cuts across. In the Epist. to the Hebrews the direct contrary position is repeatedly *asserted*: and in the Epist. to the Romans it is every where *supposed*. The death to which the Law sentenced all Sinners (and which even the Gentiles without the *revealed* Law had announced to them by their consciences, "the judgement of God having been made known even to them") must be the same death, from which they were saved by the faith of the Son of God, or the Apostle's reasoning would be senseless, his antithesis a mere equivoque, a play on a word, *quod idem sonat, aliud vult*. Christ "redeemed mankind from the curse of the Law" (*Galatians*, iii. 11): and we all know, that it was not from temporal death, or the penalties and afflictions of the present life, that Believers have been redeemed. The Law, of which the inspired Sage of Tarsus is speaking, from which no man can plead excuse; the Law miraculously delivered in thunders from Mount Sinai, which was inscribed on tables of stone for the *Jews*, and written in the hearts of *all* men (*Rom.* xi. 15)—the Law "holy and *spiritual*!" what was the great point, of which this Law, in its own name, offered no solution? the mystery, which it left be-

hind the veil, or in the cloudy tabernacle of types and figurative sacrifices? Whether there was a Judgement to come, and Souls to suffer the dread sentence? Or was it not far rather—what are the Means of escape? Where may Grace be found, and redemption? St. Paul says, the latter. The Law brings condemnation: but the conscience-sentenced Transgressor's question, What shall I do to be saved? Who will intercede for me? she dismisses as beyond the jurisdiction of her Court, and takes no cognizance thereof, save in prophetic murmurs or mute out-shadowings of mystic ordinances and sacrificial types. Not, therefore, *that* there is a Life to come, and a future state; but *what* each individual Soul may hope for itself therein; and on what grounds; and that this state has been rendered an object of aspiration and fervent desire, and a source of thanksgiving and exceeding great joy; and by whom, and through whom, and for whom, and by what means and under what conditions—*these* are the *peculiar* and *distinguishing* fundamentals of the Christian Faith! These are the revealed Lights and obtained Privileges of the Christian Dispensation! Not alone the knowlege of the Boon, but the precious inestimable Boon itself, is the "Grace and Truth that came by Jesus Christ!" I believe Moses, I believe Paul; but I believe *in* Christ.

APHORISM.

LEIGHTON.

ON BAPTISM.

“ In those days came John the *Baptist preaching*.”
 —It will suffice for our present purpose, if by these* words we direct the attention to the Origin, or at least first Scriptural Record, of BAPTISM, and to the combination of PREACHING therewith; their aspect each to the other, and their concurrence to one excellent end; the Word unfolding the Sacrament, and the Sacrament sealing the Word; the Word as a Light, informing and clearing the sense of the Seal, and this again, as a Seal, confirming and ratifying the truth of the word: as you see some significant Seals, or engraven Signets, have a word about them expressing their Sense.

But truly the Word is a Light and the Sacraments have in them of the same Light illuminating them. This (*sacrament*) of Baptism, the Ancients do particularly express by *Light*. Yet are they both nothing

* By certain biblical Philologists of the Teutonic School (Men distinguished by Learning, but still more characteristically by hardihood in conjecture and who suppose the Gospels to have undergone several successive *revisions and enlargements* by, or under the authority of, the Sacred Historians) these words are contended to have been, in the first delivery, the common commencement of all the Gospels *κατα σαρκι* (i. e. *according to the Flesh*,) in distinction from St. John's, or the Gospel *κατα πνευμα* (i. e. *according to the Spirit*). EDITOR.

but darkness to us, till the same light shine in our Hearts; for till then we are nothing but darkness ourselves, and therefore the most luminous things are so to us. Noonday is as midnight to a blind man. And we see these ordinances, the word and the sacrament, without profit or comfort for the most part, because we have not of that Divine Light within us. And we have it not, because we ask it not.

A born and bred Baptist, and paternally descended from the old orthodox Non-conformists, and both in his own and in his father's right a very dear Friend of mine, had married a Member of the National Church. In consequence of an anxious wish expressed by his Lady for the baptism of their first child, he solicited me to put him in possession of my Views respecting this controversy: though principally as to the degree of importance which I attached to it. For as to the point itself, his natural pre-possession in favor of the Persuasion, in which he was born, had been confirmed by a conscientious examination of the Arguments on both sides. As the Comment on the preceding Aphorism, or rather as an Expansion of its subject-matter, I will give the substance of the conversation: and amply shall I have been remunerated, should it be read with the interest and satisfaction with which it was heard. More particularly, should any of my Readers find themselves under the same or similar Circumstances.

COMMENT.

Or Aid to Reflection in the forming of a sound Judgment respecting the purport and purpose of the Baptismal Rite, and a just appreciation of its value and importance.

Our discussion is rendered shorter and more easy by our perfect agreement in certain preliminary points. We both disclaim alike every attempt to explain any thing *into* Scripture, and every attempt to explain any thing *out of* Scripture. Or if we regard either with a livelier aversion, it is the latter as being the more fashionable and prevalent. I mean the practice of both high and low *Grotian* Divines to *explain away* positive assertions of Scripture on the pretext, that the *literal sense* is not agreeable to Reason, that is, **THEIR particular Reason**. And inasmuch as (in the only right sense of the word) there is no such thing as a *particular Reason*, they must, and in fact they *do*, mean, that the literal sense is not accordant to their *Understanding*, *i. e.* to the *Notions* which *their* Understandings have been taught and accustomed to form in *their* school of philosophy. Thus a Platonist, who should become a Christian, would at once, even in texts susceptible of a different interpretation, recognize, because he would expect to find, several doctrines which the disciple of the Epicurean or Mechanic School will not receive on the most positive declarations of the Divine Word. And as we agree in the opinion, that the *Minimi-fidian* Party (p. 207) err grievously

in the latter point, so I must concede to you, that too many Pædo-baptists (*Assertors of Infant Baptism*) have erred, though less grossly, in the former. I have, I confess, no eye for these smoke-like Wreaths of Inference, this ever-widening spiral *Ergo* from the narrow aperture of perhaps a single Text: or rather an interpretation forced into it by construing an idiomatic phrase in an artless Narrative with the same absoluteness, as if it had formed part of a mathematical problem! I start back from these inverted Pyramids, where the apex is the base! If I should inform any one that I had called at a friend's house, but had found nobody at home, the Family having all gone to the Play; and if he, on the strength of this information, should take occasion to asperse my friend's wife for unmotherly conduct in taking an infant, six months old, to a crowded theatre; would you allow him to press on the words, *nobody* and *all* the family, in justification of the slander? Would you not tell him, that the words were to be interpreted by the nature of the subject, the purpose of the speaker, and their ordinary acceptation? And that he must or might have known, that Infants of that age would not be admitted into the Theatre? Exactly so, with regard to the words, "he and all his Household." Had Baptism of Infants at that early period of the Gospel been a known practice, or had this been previously demonstrated,—then indeed the argument, that in all probability there was one or more infants or young children in so large a family, would be no otherwise objectionable than as

being superfluous, and a sort of anticlimax in Logic. But if the words are cited as *the* proof, it would be a clear *petitio principii*, though there had been nothing else against it. But when we turn back to the Scriptures preceding the narrative, and find Repentance and Belief demanded as the terms and indispensable Conditions of Baptism—*then* the case above imagined applies in its full force. Equally vain is the pretended analogy from circumcision, which was no sacrament at all; but the means and mark of national distinction. In the first instance it was, doubtless, a privilege or mark of superior rank conferred on the Descendants of Abraham. In the patriarchal times this rite was confined (the first Governments being Theocracies) to the Priesthood, who were set apart to that office from their Birth. At a later period this Token of the *premier class* was extended to Kings. And thus, when it was re-ordained by Moses for the whole Jewish Nation, it was at the same time said—Ye are *all* Priests and Kings—Ye are a consecrated People. In addition to this, or rather in aid of this, Circumcision was intended to distinguish the Jews by some indelible sign: and it was no less necessary that Jewish children should be recognizable as Jews, than Jewish Adults—not to mention the greater safety of the rite in infancy. Nor was it ever pretended that any Grace was conferred with it, or that the Rite was significant of any inward or spiritual Operation. In short, an unprejudiced and competent Reader need only peruse the first 33 Paragraphs of the 18th Section of Taylor's Liberty of

Propheying; and then compare with these the remainder of the Section added by him after the Restoration: those, namely, in which he *attempts* to overthrow his own arguments. I had almost said, *affects*: for such is the feebleness, and so palpable the sophistry, of his Answers, that I find it difficult to imagine, that Taylor himself could have been satisfied with them. The only plausible arguments apply with equal force to Baptist and Pædo-baptist; and would prove, if they proved any thing, that both were wrong and the Quakers only in the right.

Now, in the first place, it is obvious, that nothing conclusive can be drawn from the silence of the New Testament respecting a practice, which, *supposing* it already in use, must yet from the character of the first Converts, have been of comparatively rare occurrence; and which from the predominant, and more concerning, Objects and Functions of the Apostolic Writers (1 *Corinth.* i. 17) was not likely to have been mentioned otherwise than incidentally, and very probably therefore might not have occurred to them to mention at all. But, secondly, admitting that the practice was introduced at a later period than that in which the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles were composed: I should yet be fully satisfied, that the Church exercised herein a sound * discretion. On either sup-

* That every the least *permissible* form and ordinance, which at different times it might be expedient for the Church to enact, are pre-enacted in the New Testament; and that whatever is not to be found *there*, ought to be allowed *no where*—this has

position, therefore, it is never without regret that I see a Divine of our Church attempting to erect forts on a position so evidently commanded by the strong-hold of his Antagonists. I dread the use which the Socinians may make of their example, and the Papists of their failure. Let me not, however, deceive you. (*The Reader understands, that I suppose myself conversing with a Baptist.*) I am of opinion, that the Divines on your side are chargeable with a far more grievous mistake, that of giving a carnal and *Judaizing* interpretation to the various Gospel Texts in which the terms, baptism and baptize, occur, contrary to the express and earnest admonitions of the Apostle Paul. And this I say without in the least retracting my former concession, that the Texts appealed to, as commanding or authorizing Infant Baptism, are all without exception made to bear a sense

been asserted. But that it has been *proved*; or even rendered plausible; or that the Tenet is not to be placed among the *revolutionary* Results of the scripture-slighting Will-worship of the Romish Church; it will be more sincere to say, I disbelieve, than that I doubt. It was chiefly if not exclusively in reference to the extravagances built on this tenet, that the great SELDEN ventured to declare, that the words, *Scrutamini SCRIPTURAS*, had set the world in an uproar.

N. B. Extremes *appear* to generate each other; but if we look steadily, there will most often be found some common error, that produces both as its Positive and Negative Poles. Thus Superstitions go *by Pairs*, like the two Hungarian Sisters, always quarreling and *inveterately averse*, but yet joined at the Trunk.

neither contained nor deducible: and likewise that (historically considered) there exists no sufficient *positive* evidence, that the Baptism of Infants was instituted by the Apostles in the practice of the Apostolic Age*.

Lastly, we both co-incide in the full conviction, that it is neither the outward ceremony of Baptism, under any form or circumstance, nor any other ceremony; but such a faith in Christ as tends to produce a conformity to his holy doctrines and example in heart and life, and which faith is itself a declared mean and condition of our partaking of his spiritual Body, and of being “cloathed upon” with his righteousness; that properly makes us Christians, and can alone be enjoined as an Article of Faith necessary to Salvation,

* More than this we do not consider as necessary for our argument. And as to Robinson’s assertions in his History of Baptism, that Infant Baptism did not commence till the time of Cyprian, who condemning it as a general practice, allowed it in particular cases by a dispensation of Charity; and that it did not actually become the ordinary rule of the Church, till Augustin in the fever of his anti-pelagian Dispute had introduced the Calvinistic interpretation of Original Sin, and the dire state of Infants dying unbaptized—I am so far from acceding to them, that I reject the whole statement as rash, and not only unwarranted by the Authorities he cites, but unanswerably confuted by Baxter, Wall, and many other learned Pædo-baptists before and since the publication of his Work. I confine myself to the assertion—not that Infant Baptism was *not*; but—that there exist no sufficient proofs that it *was*, the practice of the Apostolic Age.

so that the denial thereof may be denounced as “ a damnable heresy.” In the strictest sense of essential, this alone is the essential in Christianity, that the same spirit should be growing in us which was in the fullness of all perfection in Christ Jesus. Whatever else is named essential is such because, and only as far as, it is instrumental to this or evidently implied herein. If the Baptists hold the *visible Rite* indispensable to Salvation, with what terror must they not regard every disease that befel their children between Youth and Infancy ! But if they are saved by the faith of the Parent, then the outward rite is not essential to Salvation, otherwise than as the omission should arise from a spirit of disobedience : and in this case it is the cause, not the effect, the wilful and unbaptized Heart, not the unbaptizing Hand, that perils it. And surely it looks very like an *inconsistency* to admit the vicarious faith of the Parents and the therein implied promise, that the child shall be christianly bred up, and as much as in them lies prepared for the communion of saints—to admit this, as safe and sufficient in their own instance, and yet to denounce the same belief and practice as hazardous and unavailing in the Established Church—the same, I say, essentially, and only differing from their own by the presence of two or three Christian Friends as additional Securities, and by the promise being expressed !

But you, my filial Friend ! have studied Christ under a better Teacher—the Spirit of Adoption, even the spirit that was in Paul, and which still speaks to

us out of his writings. You remember and admire the saying of an old Divine, that a ceremony duly instituted was a Chain of Gold around the Neck of Faith; but if in the wish to make it co-essential and consubstantial, you draw it closer and closer, it may strangle the Faith, it was meant to deck and designate. You are not so unretentive a Scholar as to have forgotten the “*pateris et auro*” of your Virgil: or if you were, you are not so inconsistent a reasoner, as to translate the Hebraism, Spirit and Fire, in one place by spiritual fire, and yet refuse to translate Water and Spirit by Spiritual Water in another place: or if, as I myself think, the different position marks a different sense, yet that the former must be *ejusdem generis* with the latter—the Water of Repentance, reformation in *conduct*; and the Spirit that which purifies the inmost *principle* of action, as Fire purges the metal substantially and not cleansing the surface only! (See Aph. xxiii. p. 15—17.)

But in this instance, it will be said, the ceremony, the outward and visible sign, is a Scripture Ordinance. I will not reply, that the Romish Priest says the same of the anointing the sick with oil and the imposition of hands. No! my answer is: that this is a very sufficient reason for the continued observance of a ceremonial Rite so derived and sanctioned, even though its own beauty, simplicity, and natural significancy had pleaded less strongly in its behalf! But it is no reason why the Church should forget, that the perpetuation of a thing does not alter the nature of the thing, and

that a ceremony to be perpetuated is to be perpetuated as a *Ceremony*. It is no reason why, knowing and experiencing even in the majority of her own Members the proneness of the human mind to* Superstition, the Church might not rightfully and piously adopt the measures best calculated to check this tendency, and to correct the abuse, to which it had led in any particular Rite. But of superstitious notions respecting the baptismal ceremony, and of abuse resulting, the instances were flagrant and notorious. Such, for instance, was the frequent deferring of the baptismal rite to a late period of Life, and even to the death-bed, in the belief that the mystic water would cleanse the baptized person from all sin and (if he died immediately after the performance of the ceremony) send him pure and spotless into the other World.

Nor is this all. The preventive remedy applied by the church is legitimated as well as additionally recommended by the following consideration. Where a ceremony answered and was intended to answer several purposes, which purposes at its first institution were blended in respect of *the time*, but which afterwards by change of circumstances (as when, for instance, a large and ever-increasing proportion of the members of the Church, or those who at least bore the Christian name, were of Christian Parents) were necessarily dis-

* Let me be permitted to repeat and apply the *Note* in page 194. Superstition may be defined as *Superstantium* (cujusmodi sunt Cærimoniæ et Signa externa quæ, nisi in significando, nihili sunt et pæne nihil) *Substantiatio*.

united—*then* either the Church has no power or authority delegated to her (which is shifting the ground of controversy)—or she must be authorized to choose and determine, to which of the several purposes the ceremony should be attached. Now one of the purposes of Baptism was—the making it *publicly manifest*, first, what Individuals were to be regarded by the *World* (*Phil.* ii. 15) as belonging to the visible Community of Christians: inasmuch as by their demeanour and apparent condition the general estimation of “the City set on a hill and not to be hid” (*Matth.* v. 14) could not but be affected—the City that even “in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation” was bound not only to give no cause, but by all innocent means to prevent every occasion, of “Rebuke.” Secondly, to mark out those that were entitled to that *especial* Dearness, that watchful and disciplinary Love and Loving-kindness, which *over and above* the affections and duties of Philanthropy and Universal Charity, Christ himself had enjoined, and with an emphasis and in a form significant of its great and especial importance. A NEW COMMANDMENT I give unto you, that ye love *one another*. By the former the Body of Christians was to be placed in contrast with the notorious misanthropy and bigotry of the Jewish Church and People: and thus without *draw-back*, and precluding the objection so commonly made to Sectarian Benevolence, to be distinguished and known to all men by their fervid fulfilment of the latter. How kind these Chris-

tians are to the poor and afflicted, without distinction of religion or country! But how they love *each other*!

Now combine with this the consideration before urged—the duty, I mean, and necessity of checking the superstitious abuse of the baptismal rite: and I then ask, with confidence, in what way could the Church have exercised a sound discretion more wisely, piously, or effectively, than by affixing, from among the several ends and purposes of Baptism, the outward ceremony to the purposes here mentioned? How could the great Body of Christians be more plainly instructed as to the true nature of all outward ordinances? What can be conceived better calculated to prevent the ceremony from being regarded as other and more than a ceremony, if not the administration of the same on an *object*, (yea, a dear and precious *object*) of spiritual duties, but a *subject* of spiritual operations and graces only by anticipation and in hope;—a subject, unconscious as a Flower of the dew falling on it or the early rain, and thus emblematic of the myriads who (as in our Indian Empire, and henceforward, we trust, in Africa) are temporally and even morally benefited by the outward existence of Christianity, though as yet ignorant of its saving truth! And yet, on the other hand, what more reverential than the application of this, the common initiatory rite of the East sanctioned and appropriated by Christ—its application, I say, to the very subjects, whom he himself commanded to be *brought* to him—the children *in arms*, respecting whom “Jesus

was much displeased with his disciples, who had rebuked those that brought them!" What more expressive of the true character of that originant and *generic* Stain, from which the Son of God, by his mysterious incarnation and agony and death and resurrection, and by the baptism of the Spirit, came to cleanse the Children of Adam, than the exhibition of the outward element to Infants free from and incapable of *crime*, in whom the evil principle was present only as *potential* being, and whose outward semblance represented the Kingdom of Heaven? And can it—to a man, who would hold himself deserving of *Anathema Maranatha* (1 *Cor.* xvi. 22,) if he did not "*love* the Lord Jesus"—can it be nothing to such a man, that the introduction and commendation of a new Inmate, a new spiritual Ward, to the assembled Brethren in Christ (—and this, as I have shown above, was *one* purpose of the baptismal Ceremony) does in the baptism of an Infant recall our Lord's own presentation in the temple on the eighth day after his birth? Add to all these considerations the known fact of the frequent exposure and the general light regard of Infants, at the time when Infant Baptism is by the Baptists supposed to have been first *ruled* by the Catholic Church, not overlooking the humane and charitable motives, that influenced Cyprian's decision in its favor! And then make present to your imagination, and meditatively contemplate the still continuing tendency, the profitable, the *beautiful* effects, of this ordinance *now* and for so many centuries back, on the great Mass of the

Population throughout Christendom—the softening, elevating exercise of Faith and the Conquest over the senses, while in the form of a helpless crying Babe the Presence, and the unutterable Worth and Value, of an Immortal Being made capable of everlasting bliss are solemnly proclaimed and carried home to the mind and heart of the Hearers and Beholders! Nor will you forget the probable influence on the future Education of the Child, the opportunity of instructing and impressing the friends, relatives, and parents in their best and most docile mood! These are, indeed, the *mollia tempora fandi*.

It is true, that by an unforeseen accident, and through the propensity of all Zealots to caricature partial truth into total falsehood—it is too true, that a Tree the very contrary in quality of that shown to Moses (*Exod. xv. 25*) was afterwards “cast into the sweet waters from this fountain,” and made them like “the waters of Marah,” too bitter to be drunk. I allude to the Pelagian Controversy, the perversion of the Article of Original Sin by Augustine, and the frightful conclusions which this *durus pater infantum* drew from the Article thus perverted. It is not, however, to the predecessors of this African, whoever they were that authorized Pædo-baptism, and at whatever period it first became general—it is not to the Church at the time being, that these consequences are justly imputable. She had done her best to preclude every superstition, by allowing in urgent cases any and every Adult, Man, and Woman, to administer the ceremonial part,

the outward rite, of baptism; but reserving to the highest Functionary of the Church (even to the exclusion of the Co-presbyters) the most proper and spiritual purpose, viz. the declaration of Repentance and Belief, the free Choice of Christ, as his Lord, and the open profession of the Christian Title by an individual in his own name and by his own deliberate act. The admission, and public reception of the Believer into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—*this* office of Religion, the essentially moral and spiritual nature of which could not be mistaken, this most *solemn* office the Bishop alone was to perform. Thus—as soon as the *purposes* of the ceremonial Rite were by change of circumstances divided, that is, took place at different periods of the Believer's Life—to the *outward* purposes, where the effect was to be produced on the minds of others, the Church continued to affix the *outward rite*; while to the substantial and spiritual purpose, where the effect was to be produced on the Individual's own mind, she gave its befitting dignity by an ordinance not figurative, but standing in the direct cause and relation of *means* to the *end*.

In fine, there are two great Purposes to be answered, each having its own subordinate purposes, and desirable consequences. The Church answers both, the Baptists one only. If, nevertheless, you would still prefer the union of the baptismal rite with the Confirmation, and that the Presentation of Infants to the assembled Church had formed a separate institution, avowedly prospective—I answer: first, that such for a long time

and to a late period was my own Judgement. But even then it seemed to me a point, as to which an indifference would be less inconsistent in a lover of Truth, than a zeal to separation in a professed lover of Peace. And secondly, I would revert to the History of the Reformation, and the calamitous accident of the Peasants' War: when the poor ignorant multitude, driven frantic by the intolerable oppressions of their feudal Lords, rehearsed all the outrages that were acted in our own times by the Parisian Populace headed by Danton, Marat, and Robespierre; and on the same outrageous Principles, and in assertion of the same RIGHTS OF BRUTES to the subversion of all the DUTIES OF MEN. In our times, most fortunately for the interests of Religion and Morality, or of their prudential Substitutes at least, the Name of Jacobin was every where associated with that of Atheist and Infidel. Or rather, Jacobinism and Infidelity were the two Heads of the Revolutionary Geryon—connatural misgrowths of the same Monster-trunk. In the German Convulsion, on the contrary, by a mere but most unfortunate *accident*, the same Code of *Caliban* Jurisprudence, the same sensual and murderous Excesses, were connected with the name of Anabaptist. The Abolition of Magistracy, Community of Goods, the Right of Plunder, Polygamy, and whatever else was fanatical, were comprised in the word, Anabaptism! It is not to be imagined, that the Fathers of the Reformation could, without a miraculous influence, have taken up the question of Infant Baptism with the requisite calmness and

freedom of Spirit. It is not to be wished, that they should have entered on the discussion. Nay, I will go farther. Unless the Abolition of Infant Baptism can be shown to be involved in some fundamental article of Faith, unless the Practice could be proved fatal or imminently perilous to Salvation, the Reformers would not have been justified in exposing the yet tender and struggling cause of Protestantism to such certain and violent prejudices as this Innovation would have excited. Nothing less than the whole substance and efficacy of the Gospel Faith was the prize, which they had wrestled for and won; but won from enemies still in the field, and on the watch to re-take, at all costs, the sacred Treasure, and consign it once again to darkness and oblivion. If there be a time for all things, this was not the time for an innovation, that would and must have been followed by the triumph of the enemies of scriptural Christianity, and the alienation of the Governments, that had espoused and protected it.

Remember, I say this on the supposition of the question's not being what you do not pretend it to be, an Essential of the Faith, by which we are saved. But should it likewise be conceded, that it is a *disputable* point—and that in point of fact it is and has been disputed by Divines, whom no pious Protestant of any denomination will deny to have been faithful and eminent servants of Christ—should it, I say, be likewise conceded that the question of Infant Baptism is a point, on which two Christians, who perhaps differ on this point only, may differ without giving just ground for

impeaching the piety or competence of either—in this case I am obliged to infer, that the Person who *at any time* can regard this difference as *singly* warranting a separation from a religious Community, must think of Schism under another point of View, than I have been taught to contemplate it by St. Paul in his epistles to the Corinthians.

Let me add a few words on a diversity of doctrine closely connected with this: the opinions of Doctors Mant and D'Oyley as opposed to those of the (so called) Evangelical Clergy. “The Church of England (says WALL*) does not require assent and con-

* Conference between Two Men that had Doubts about Infant Baptism. By W. Wall, Author of the Hist. of Inf. Bapt. and Vicar of Shoreham in Kent. A very sensible little Tract, and written in an excellent spirit: though it failed, I confess, in satisfying my mind as to the existence of any decisive proofs or documents of Infant Baptism having been an Apostolic Usage, or specially intended in any part of the New Testament: though deducible *generally* from many passages, and in perfect according with the *spirit* of the whole.

P. S. A mighty Wrestler in the cause of Spiritual Religion and Gospel Morality, in whom more than in any other Contemporary I seem to see the Spirit of LUTHER revived, expressed to me his doubts whether we have a right to deny that an infant is capable of a spiritual influence. To such a man I could not feel justified in returning an answer *ex tempore*, or without having first submitted my convictions to a fresh revisal. I owe him, however, a deliberate answer; and take this opportunity of discharging the debt.

The Objection supposes and assumes the very point which is denied, or at least disputed—viz. that Infant-baptism is specially

sent" to either opinion "in order to *lay* communion." But I will suppose the person a *Minister*; but Minister of a Church which has expressly disclaimed all pretence to infallibility, a Church which in the construction of

injoined in the Scriptures. *If* an express passage to this purport *had* existed in the New Testament, the other passages, which evidently imply a spiritual operation under the condition of a preceding spiritual act on the part of the person baptized, remaining as now—*then* indeed, as the only way of removing the apparent contradiction, it *might* be allowable to call on the Anti-pædobaptist to prove the negative—namely, that an Infant a week old is not a Subject capable or susceptible of spiritual agency.—And vice versâ, should it be made known to us, that Infants are not without reflection and self-consciousness—*then*, doubtless, we should be entitled to infer that they were capable of a spiritual operation, and consequently of that which is signified in the baptismal rite administered to Adults. But what does this prove for those, who (as DD. Mant and D'Oyley) not only cannot show, but who do not themselves profess to believe, the self-consciousness of a New-born Babe; but who rest the defence of Infant-baptism on the *assertion*, that God was pleased to affix the performance of this rite to his offer of Salvation, as the indispensable, though arbitrary, condition of the Infant's salvability?—As Kings in former ages, when they conferred Lands in perpetuity, would sometimes, as the condition of the Tenure, exact from the Beneficiary a hawk, or some trifling ceremony, as the putting on or off of their Sandals, or whatever else royal caprice or the whim of the moment might suggest. But *you*, honored IRVING, are as little disposed, as myself, to favor *such* doctrine!

Friend pure of heart and fervent! we have learnt
 A different lore! We may not thus profane
 The Idea and Name of Him whose absolute Will
 Is Reason—Truth Supreme!—Essential Order!

its liturgy and articles is known to have worded certain passages for the purpose of rendering them subscribable by both A and Z—*i. e.* the opposite parties as to the points in controversy. I suppose this person's convictions those of Z, and that out of five passages there are three, the more natural and obvious sense of which is in his favor; and two, of which though not absolutely *precluding* a different sense, yet the more probable interpretation is in favor of A *i. e.* of those who do not consider the Baptism of an Infant as *prospective*, but hold it to be an *Opus Operans et in præsenti*. Then I say, that if such a person regards these two sentences or single passages as obliging or warranting him to abandon the Flock entrusted to his charge, and either to join such, as are the avowed Enemies of the Church on the double ground of its particular Constitution and of its being an Establishment, or to set up a separate Church for himself—I cannot avoid the conclusion, that either his Conscience is morbidly sensitive in one speck to the exhaustion of the sensibility in a far larger portion; or that he must have discovered some mode, beyond the reach of my conjectural powers, of interpreting the scriptures enumerated in the following Excerpt from the popular Tract before cited, in which the writer expresses an opinion, to which I assent with my whole heart: *viz.*

“ That all Christians in the world that hold the same fundamentals ought to make one church, though differing in lesser opinions; and that the sin, the mischief, and danger to the souls of men, that divide into

those many sects and parties among us, does (for the most of them) consist not so much in the opinions themselves, as in their dividing and separating for them. And in support of this tenet, I will refer you to some plain places of Scripture, which if you please now to peruse, I will be silent the while. See what our Saviour himself says, *John* x. 16. *John* xvi. 11. And what the primitive Christians practised, *Acts* ii. 46, and iv. 32. And what St. Paul says, *1 Cor.* i. 10, 11, 12, and 2, 3, 4, also the whole 12th chapter: *Eph.* ii. 18, &c. to the end. Where the Jewish and Gentile Christians are showed to be *one body, one household, one temple fitly framed together*: and yet these were of different opinions in several matters. Likewise chap. iii. 6, iv. 1. to 13, *Phil.* ii. 1, 2. where he uses the most solemn adjurations to this purpose. But I would more especially recommend to you the reading of *Gal.* v. 20, 21, *Phil.* iii. 15, 16. The 14th chapter to the Romans, and part of the 15th, to ver. 7, and also *Rom.* xv. 17.

Are not these passages plain, full, and earnest? Do you find any of the controverted points to be determined by scripture in words nigh so plain or pathetic?

Marginal Note written (in 1816) by the Editor in his own Copy of Wall's work.

This and the two following pages are excellent. If I addressed the ministers recently seceded, I would first prove from Scripture and Reason the justness of their doctrines concerning Baptism and Conversion. 2. I would show, that even in respect

of the Prayer-book, Homilies, &c. of the Church of England, taken as a whole, their opponents were comparatively as ill off as themselves, if not worse. 3. That the few mistakes or inconvenient phrases of the Baptismal Service did not impose on the conscience the necessity of resigning the pastoral office. 4. That even if they did, this would by no means justify schism from Lay-membership: or else there could be no schism except from an immaculate and infallible Church. Now, as our Articles have declared that no Church is or ever was such, it would follow that there is no such sin as that of Schism—*i. e.* that St. Paul wrote falsely or idly. 5. That the Escape through the Channel of Dissent is from the Frying Pan to the Fire—or to use a less worn and vulgar simile, the Escape of a Leech from a glass-jar of Water into the naked and open Air. But never, never, would I in one breath allow my Church to be fallible, and in the next contend for her absolute freedom from all error—never confine inspiration and perfect truth to the Scriptures, and then scold for the perfect Truth of each and every word in the Prayer-book. Enough for me, if in my Heart of Hearts, free from all fear of man and all lust of preferment, I believe (as I do) the Church of England to be the *most* Apostolic Church; that its doctrines and ceremonies contain nothing dangerous to Righteousness or Salvation; and that the imperfections in its Liturgy are spots indeed, but spots on the sun, which impede neither its Light nor its Heat, so as to prevent the good seed from growing in a good soil and producing fruits of Redemption.

* * * The author had written and intended to insert a similar exposition on the Eucharist. But as the leading view has been given in the Comment on Redemption, its length induces him to defer it, together with the articles on Faith and the philosophy of Prayer, to a small supplementary Volume.

CONCLUSION.

I AM not so ignorant of the temper and tendency of the age in which I live, as either to be unprepared for the *sort* of remarks which the literal interpretation of the Evangelist will call forth, or to attempt an answer to them. Visionary Ravings, Obsolete Whimsies, Transcendental Trash, &c. &c. I leave to pass at the price current, among those who are willing to receive abusive phrases as substitutes for argument. Should any Suborner of anonymous Criticism have engaged some literary Bravo or Buffoon beforehand, to vilify this work, as in former instances, I would give a friendly hint to the operative Critic that he may compile an excellent article for the occasion, and with very little trouble, out of Warburton's Brochure on Grace and the Spirit, and the Preface to the same.—There is, however, one—objection, shall I say? or accusation? which will so often be heard from men, whose talents and reputed moderation must give a weight to their words, that I owe it both to my own character and to the interests of my readers, not to leave it unnoticed. The charge will probably be worded in this way:—There is nothing new in all this! (*as if novelty were any merit in questions of Revealed Religion!*) It is *Mysticism*, all taken out of WILLIAM LAW, after he had lost his senses, poor Man! in brooding over the Visions of a delirious German Cobbler, Jacob Behmen.

Of poor Jacob Behmen I have delivered my senti-

ments at large in another work. Those who have condescended to look into his writings must know, that his characteristic errors are: first, the mistaking the accidents and peculiarities of his own over-wrought mind for realities and modes of thinking common to all minds: and secondly, the confusion of Nature, *i. e.* the active powers communicated to matter, with God, the Creator. And if the same persons have done more than merely looked into the present volume, they must have seen, that to eradicate, and, if possible, to preclude, both the one and the other stands prominent among its avowed objects. (See p. 139—149: 170—176).

Of William Law's Works I am acquainted with the **SERIOUS CALL**; and besides this I remember to have read a small tract, on Prayer, if I mistake not, as I easily may, it being at least six-and-twenty years since I saw it. He may in this or in other tracts have quoted the same passages from the fourth Gospel as I have done. But surely this affords no presumption that my conclusions are the same with his; still less, that they are drawn from the same premises; and least of all, that they were adopted from his Writings. Whether Law has used the phrase, assimilation by faith, I know not; but I know that I should expose myself to a just charge of an idle parade of my Reading if I recapitulated the tenth part of the Authors Ancient and Modern, Romish and Reformed, from Law to Clemens Alexandrinus and Irenæus, in whose works the same phrase occurs in the same sense. And after all, on

such a subject how worse than childish is the whole dispute!

Is the fourth Gospel authentic? And is the interpretation, I have given, true or false? These are the only questions which a wise man would put, or a Christian be anxious to answer. I not only believe it to be the true sense of the texts; but I assert that it is the only true, rational, and even *tolerable* sense. And this position alone I conceive myself interested in defending. I have studied with an open and fearless spirit the attempts of sundry learned Critics of the Continent, to invalidate the authenticity of this Gospel, before and since Eichhorn's Vindication. The result has been a clearer assurance, and (as far as this was possible) a yet deeper conviction of the genuineness of *all* the writings, which the Church has attributed to this Apostle. That those, who have formed an opposite conclusion, should object to the use of expressions which they had ranked among the most obvious marks of spuriousness, follows as a matter of course. But that men, who with a clear and cloudless assent receive the sixth chapter of this Gospel as a faithful, nay, *inspired* Record of an actual discourse, should take offence at the repetition of words which the Redeemer himself, in the perfect foreknowledge that they would confirm the disbelieving, alienate the unsteadfast, and transcend the present capacity even of his own Elect, had chosen as the *most* appropriate; and which after the most decisive proofs, that they *were* misinterpreted by the greater number of his Hearers, and

not understood by any, he nevertheless repeated with stronger emphasis and *without comment*, as the *only* appropriate symbols of the great truth he was declaring, and to realize which *εγέμετο σαρκί*;*—that in their own discourses these men should hang back from all express reference to these words, as if they were afraid or ashamed of them, though the earliest recorded ceremonies and liturgical forms of the primitive Church are absolutely inexplicable, except in connexion with this discourse, and with the *mysterious* and *spiritual*, not allegorical and merely ethical, import of the same; and though this import is solemnly and in the most unequivocal terms asserted and taught by their own Church, even in her Catechism, or compendium of doctrines necessary for all her Members; *this* I may, perhaps, *understand*; but *this* I am not able to vindicate or excuse!

There is, however, one opprobrious phrase which

* Of which our *he was made flesh*, is perhaps the best, that our language admits, but is still an inadequate translation. See the Note to p. 16 of this Volume. The Church of England in this as in other doctrinal points, has preserved the golden mean between the superstitious reverence of the Romanists, and the avowed contempt of the Sectarians, for the Writings of the Fathers, and the authority and unimpeached traditions of the Church during the first three or four Centuries. And how, consistently with this honorable characteristic of our Church, a Minister of the same could, on the sacramentary scheme now in fashion, return even a plausible answer to Arnauld's great Work on Transubstantiation, (not without reason the Boast of Catholicism) exceeds my powers of conjecture!

it may be profitable for my younger Readers that I should explain, viz. Mysticism. And for this purpose I will quote a sentence or two from a Dialogue which, had my prescribed limits permitted, I should have attached to the present Work; but which with an Essay on the Church, as instituted by Christ, and as an Establishment of the State, and a series of Letters on the right and the superstitious use and estimation of the Bible, will appear in a small volume by themselves, should the reception given to the present volume encourage or permit the publication.

MYSTICS AND MYSTICISM.

“*Antinöus*.—What do you call Mysticism? And do you use the word in a good or in a bad sense?”

“*Nöus*.—In the latter only: as far, at least, as we are now concerned with it. When a Man refers to *inward feelings* and *experiences*, of which Mankind at large are not conscious, as evidences of the truth of any opinion—such a Man I call A MYSTIC: and the grounding of any theory or belief on accidents and anomalies of individual sensations or fancies, and the use of peculiar terms invented or perverted from their ordinary significations, for the purpose of expressing these *idiosyncracies*, and pretended facts of interior consciousness, I name MYSTICISM. Where the error consists simply in the Mystic’s attaching to these anomalies of his individual temperament the character of *Reality*, and in receiving them as permanent Truths, having a subsistence in the Divine Mind, though re-

vealed to himself alone ; but entertains this persuasion without demanding or expecting the same faith in his neighbours—I should regard it as a species of ENTHUSIASM, always indeed to be deprecated but yet capable of co-existing with many excellent qualities both of Head and Heart. But when the Mystic by ambition or still meaner passions, or (as sometimes is the case) by an uneasy and self-doubting state of mind that seeks confirmation in outward sympathy, is led to impose his faith, as a duty, on mankind generally : and when with such views he asserts, that the same experiences would be vouchsafed, the same truths revealed, to *every man* but for his secret wickedness and unholy will—such a Mystic is a FANATIC, and in certain states of the public mind a dangerous Member of Society. And most so in those ages and countries in which Fanatics of elder standing are allowed to persecute the fresh competitor. For under these predicaments, Mysticism, though originating in the singularities of an individual Nature, and therefore essentially anomalous, is nevertheless highly *contagious*. It is apt to collect a swarm and cluster *circum fana*, around the new *Fane* : and therefore merits the name of FANATICISM, or as the Germans say, Schwärmerey, i. e. *Swarm-making*.”

We will return to the harmless species—the enthusiastic Mystics : a species that may again be subdivided into two ranks. And it will not be other than germane to the subject, if I endeavour to describe them

in a sort of allegory, or parable. Let us imagine a poor Pilgrim benighted in a wilderness or desert, and pursuing his way in the starless dark with a lanthorn in his hand. Chance or his happy genius leads him to an Oasis or natural Garden, such as in the creations of my youthful fancy I supposed Enos * the Child of Cain to have found. And here, hungry and thirsty, the way-wearied Man rests at a fountain; and the

* Will the Reader forgive me if I attempt at once to illustrate and relieve the subject by annexing the first stanza of the Poem, composed in the same year in which I wrote the Ancient Mariner and the first Book of Christabel?

“ Encinctur’d with a twine of Leaves,
 That leafy twine his only Dress!
 A lovely Boy was plucking fruits
 In a moonlight wilderness.
 The Moon was bright, the air was free,
 And Fruits and Flowers together grew
 On many a Shrub and many a Tree:
 And all put on a gentle hue,
 Hanging in the shadowy air
 Like a Picture rich and rare.
 It was a Climate where, they say,
 The Night is more beloved than Day.
 But who that beauteous Boy beguil’d,
 That beauteous Boy! to linger here?
 Alone, by night, a little child,
 In place so silent and so wild—
 Has he no friend, no loving mother near?”

WANDERINGS OF CAIN, a *MS. Poem*.

Taper of his Lanthorn throws its Light on an overshadowing Tree, a Boss of snow-white Blossoms, through which the green and growing Fruits peeped, and the ripe golden Fruitage glowed. Deep, vivid, and faithful are the impressions, which the lovely Imagery comprised within the scanty Circle of Light, makes and leaves on his Memory! But scarcely has he eaten of the fruits and drank of the fountain, ere scared by the roar and howl from the desert he hurries forward: and as he passes with hasty steps through grove and glade, shadows and imperfect beholdings and vivid fragments of things distinctly seen blend with the past and present shapings of his Brain. Fancy modifies Sight. His Dreams transfer their forms to real Objects; and these lend a substance and an *outness* to his Dreams. Apparitions greet him; and when at a distance from this enchanted land, and on a different track, the Dawn of Day discloses to him a Caravan, a troop of his fellow-men, his memory, which is itself half fancy, is interpolated afresh by every attempt to recall, connect, and *piece out* his recollections. His narration is received as a Madman's Tale. He shrinks from the rude Laugh and contemptuous Sneer, and retires into himself. Yet the craving for Sympathy, strong in proportion to the intensity of his Convictions, impels him to unbosom himself to abstract Auditors; and the poor Quietist becomes a Penman, and, all too poorly stocked for the Writer's trade, he borrows his phrases and figures from the only Writings to which

he has had access, the sacred Books of his Religion. And thus I shadow out the enthusiast Mystic of the first sort ; at the head of which stands the illuminated Teutonic Theosopher and Shoemaker, honest JACOB BEHMEN, born near Gorlitz, in Upper Lusatia, in the 17th of our Elizabeth's Reign, and who died in the 22d of her Successor's.

To delineate a Mystic of the second and higher order, we need only endow our Pilgrim with equal gifts of Nature, but these developed and displayed by all the aids and arts of Education and favorable Fortune. *He* is on his way to the Mecca of his ancestral and national Faith, with a well-guarded and numerous Procession of Merchants and Fellow-pilgrims, on the established Track. At the close of Day the Caravan has halted : the full moon rises on the Desart : and he strays forth alone, out of sight, but to no unsafe distance ; and Chance leads *him* too to the same Oasis or Islet of Verdure on the Sea of Sand. He wanders at leisure in its maze of Beauty and Sweetness, and thrids his way through the odorous and flowering Thickets into open " Spots of Greenery," and discovers statues and memorial characters, grottos, and refreshing Caves. But the Moonshine, the imaginative Poesy of Nature, spreads its soft shadowy charm over all, conceals distances, and magnifies heights, and modifies relations ; and fills up vacuities with its own whiteness, counterfeiting substance ; and where the dense shadows lie, makes solidity imitate Hollowness ; and gives to all objects a tender visionary hue and

softening. Interpret the Moonlight and the Shadows as the peculiar genius and sensibility of the Individual's own Spirit: and here you have the other sort: a Mystic, an Enthusiast of a nobler Breed—a FENELON. But the residentiary, or the frequent visitor of the favored spot, who has scanned its beauties by steady Day-light, and mastered its true proportions and lineaments, he will discover that both Pilgrims have indeed been there! *He* will know, that the delightful Dream, which the latter tells, is a Dream of Truth; and that even in the bewildered Tale of the former there is Truth mingled with the Dream.

But the Source, the Spring-head, of the Charges which I anticipate, lies deep. Materialism, conscious and avowed Materialism, is in ill-repute: and a confessed Materialist therefore a rare character. But if the faith be ascertained by the fruits; if the predominant, though most often unsuspected, persuasion is to be learnt from the influences, under which the thoughts and affections of the Man move and take their direction; I must reverse the position. ONLY NOT ALL ARE MATERIALISTS. Except a few individuals, and those for the most part of a single Sect: and every one, who calls himself a Christian, holds himself to have a Soul as well as a Body. He distinguishes Mind from Matter, the *Subject* of his consciousness from the *Objects* of the same. The former is his MIND: and he says, it is immaterial. But though *Subject* and *Substance* are words of kindred roots, nay, little less than equivalent terms, yet nevertheless it is

exclusively to sensible OBJECTS, to Bodies, to modifications of Matter, that he habitually attaches the attributes of reality, of substance. Real and Tangible, Substantial and Material, are Synonimes for him. He never indeed asks himself, what he means by MIND? But if he did, and tasked himself to return an honest answer—as to what, at least, he had hitherto meant by it—he would find, that he had described it by negatives, as the opposite of Bodies, *ex. gr.* as a somewhat opposed to solidity, to visibility, &c. as if you could abstract the capacity of a vessel, and conceive of it as a somewhat by itself, and then give to the emptiness the properties of containing, holding, being entered, and so forth. In short, though the proposition would perhaps be angrily denied in words, yet *in fact* he thinks of his *Mind*, as a *property*, or *accident* of a something else, that he calls a *Soul* or *Spirit*: though the very same difficulties must recur, the moment he should attempt to establish the difference. For either this Soul or Spirit is nothing but a thinner Body, a finer Mass of Matter: or the attribute of Self-subsistency vanishes from the Soul on the same grounds, on which it is refused to the Mind.

I am persuaded, however, that the dogmatism of the Corpuscular School, though it still exerts an influence on men's notions and phrases, has received a mortal blow from the increasingly *dynamic* spirit of the physical Sciences now highest in public estimation. And it may safely be predicted, that the results will extend beyond the intention of those, who are gradu-

ally effecting this revolution. It is not Chemistry alone that will be indebted to the Genius of Davy, Oersted, and their compeers: and not as the Founder of Physiology and philosophic Anatomy alone, will Mankind love and revere the name of John Hunter. These men have not only *taught*, they have compelled us to admit, that the immediate objects of our *senses*, or rather the grounds of the visibility and tangibility of all Objects of Sense, bear the same *relation* and similar proportion to the *intelligible* object—*i. e.* to the Object, which we actually *mean* when we say, “*It is such or such a thing,*” or “*I have seen this or that,*”—as the paper, ink, and differently combined straight and curved lines of an Edition of Homer bear to what we understand by the words, Iliad and Odyssey. Nay, nothing would be more easy than so to construct the paper, ink, painted Capitals, &c. of a printed disquisition on the Eye, or the Muscles and Cellular Texture (*i. e.* the Flesh) of the human Body, as to bring together every one of the sensible and ponderable *Stuffs* or Elements, that are *sensuously* perceived in the Eye itself, or in the Flesh itself. Carbon and Nitrogen, Oxygen and Hydrogen, Sulphur, Phosphorus, and one or two Metals and Metallic Bases, constitute the whole. It cannot be these, therefore, that we mean by an *Eye*, by our *Body*. But perhaps it may be a particular *Combination* of these? But here comes a question: In this term do you or do you not include the *Principle*, the *Operating Cause*, of the *Combination*? If *not*, then detach this Eye from the Body!

Look steadily at it—as it might lie on the Marble Slab of a dissecting Room. Say it were the Eye of a Murderer, a Bellingham : or the eye of a murdered Patriot, a Sidney !—Behold it, handle it, with its various accompaniments or constituent parts, of Tendon, Ligament, Membrane, Blood-vessel, Gland, Humors ; its Nerves of Sense, of Sensation, and of Motion. Alas ! all these names, like that of the Organ itself, are so many Anachronisms, figures of Speech, to express that which has been : as when the Guide points with his finger to a heap of Stones, and tells the Traveller, “That is Babylon, or Persepolis.”—Is this cold Jelly “the Light of the Body ?” Is this the Micranthropos in the marvellous Microcosm ? Is this what you *mean* when you well define the Eye as the Telescope and the Mirror of the Soul, the Seat and Agent of an almost magical power ?

Pursue the same inquisition with every other part of the Body, whether integral or simply ingredient ; and let a *Berzelius* or a *Hatchett* be your interpreter, and demonstrate to you what it is that in each actually meets your Senses. And when you have heard the scanty catalogue, ask yourself if *these* are indeed the living *Flesh*, the *Blood* of Life ? Or not far rather—I speak of what, as a Man of Common Sense, you really *do*, not what, as a philosopher, you *ought* to believe—is it not, I say, far rather the distinct and individualized Agency that by the given combinations utters and bespeaks its Presence ? Justly and with strictest propriety of language may I say, *Speaks*.

It is to the coarseness of our Senses, or rather to the defect and limitation of our percipient faculty, that the *visible* Object appears the same even for a moment. The characters, which I am now shaping on this paper, abide. Not only the forms remain the same, but the particles of the coloring stuff are fixed, and, for an indefinite period at least, remain the same. But the particles that constitute the *size*, the visibility of an organic structure (see p. 68) are in perpetual flux. They are to the combining and constitutive Power as the pulses of air to the Voice of a Discourser; or of one who sings a roundelay. The same words may be repeated; but in each second of time the articulated air hath passed away, and each act of articulation appropriates and gives momentary form to a new and other portion. As the column of blue smoke from a cottage chimney in the breathless Summer Noon, or the steadfast-seeming Cloud on the edge-point of a Hill in the driving air-current, which momentarily condensed and recomposed is the common phantom of a thousand successors;—such is the flesh, which our *bodily* eyes transmit to us; which our *Palates* taste; which our Hands touch.

But perhaps the material particles possess this combining power by inherent reciprocal attractions, repulsions, and elective affinities; and are themselves the joint Artists of their own combinations? I will not reply, though well I might, that this would be to solve one problem by another, and merely to shift the mystery. It will be sufficient to remind the thoughtful

Querist, that even herein consists the essential difference, the contra-distinction, of an Organ from a Machine; that not only the characteristic Shape is evolved from the invisible central power, but the material Mass itself is acquired by assimilation. The germinal power of the Plant transmutes the fixed air and the elementary Base of Water into Grass or Leaves; and on these the Organific Principle in the Ox or the Elephant exercises an Alchemy still more stupendous. As the unseen Agency weaves its magic eddies, the foliage becomes indifferently the Bone and its Marrow, the pulpy Brain, or the solid Ivory. That what you see *is* blood, *is* flesh, is itself the work, or shall I say, the translucence, of the invisible Energy, which soon surrenders or abandons them to inferior Powers, (for there is no pause nor chasm in the activities of Nature) which repeat a similar metamorphosis according to *their* kind. These are not fancies, conjectures, or even hypotheses, but *facts*; to deny which is impossible, not to reflect on which is ignominious. And we need only reflect on them with a calm and silent spirit to learn the utter emptiness and unmeaningness of the vaunted Mechanico-corpuscular Philosophy, with both its twins, Materialism on the one hand, and Idealism, rightlier named *Subjective Idolism*, on the other: the one obtruding on us a World of Spectres and Apparitions; the other a mazy Dream!

Let the Mechanic or corpuscular Scheme, which in its absoluteness and strict consistency was first intro-

duced by DES CARTES, be judged by the results. *By its fruits shall it be known.*

In order to submit the various phænomena of moving bodies to geometrical construction, we are under the necessity of abstracting from corporeal substance all its *positive* properties, and obliged to consider Bodies as differing from equal portions of Space* only by

* Such is the conception of Body in Des Cartes' own system. *Body* is everywhere confounded with *Matter*, and might in the Cartesian sense be defined, Space or Extension with the attribute of Visibility. As Des Cartes at the same time zealously asserted the existence of intelligential Beings, the reality and independent Self-subsistence of the Soul, Berkleianism or Spinosism was the immediate and necessary Consequence. Assume a *plurality* of self-subsisting Souls, and we have Berkleianism; assume one only, (unam et unicum Substantiam), and you have Spinosism, i. e. the Assertion of one infinite Self-subsistent, with the two Attributes of Thinking and Appearing. "Cogitatio infinita sine centro, et omniformis Apparitio." How far the Newtonian *Vis inertię* (interpreted any otherwise than as an arbitrary term = $x y z$, to represent the unknown but necessary supplement or integration of the Cartesian Notion of Body) has patched up the Flaw, I leave for more competent Judges to decide. But should any one of my Readers feel an interest in the speculative principles of Natural Philosophy, and should be master of the German Language, I warmly recommend for his perusal the earliest known publication of the Great Founder of the Critical Philosophy, (written in the twenty-second Year of his Age!) on the then eager controversy between the Leibnitzian and the French and English Mathematicians, respecting the Living Forces—"Gedanken von der wahren Schätzung der lebendigen Kräfte: 1747"—in which Kant demonstrates the *right*

figure and mobility. And as a *Fiction of Science*, it would be difficult to overvalue this invention. It possesses the same merits in relation to Geometry that the atomic theory has in relation to Algebraic Calculus. But in contempt of Common Sense, and in direct opposition to the express declarations of the inspired Historian (Genesis I.), and to the tone and spirit of the Scriptures throughout, Des Cartes propounded it as *truth of fact*: and instead of a World *created* and filled with productive forces by the Almighty Fiat, left a lifeless Machine whirled about by the dust of its own Grinding: as if Death could come from the living Fountain of Life; Nothingness and Phantom from the Plenitude of Reality! the Absoluteness of Creative Will!

Holy! Holy! Holy! let me be deemed mad by all men, if such be thy ordinance: but, O! from *such* Madness save and preserve me, my God!

When, however, after a short interval, the Genius

reasoning to be with the latter; but the Truth of *Fact*, the evidence of *experience*, with the former; and gives the explanation, namely: Body, or Corporeal Nature, is something else and more than geometrical extension, even with the addition of a *Vis inertiae*. And Leibnitz, with the Bernouillis, erred in the attempt to demonstrate geometrically a problem not susceptible of geometrical construction.—This Tract, with the succeeding Himmels-system, may with propriety be placed, after the Principia of Newton, among the striking instances of early Genius; and as the first product of the Dynamic Philosophy in the Physical Sciences, from the time, at least, of Giordano Bruno, whom the Idolaters burnt for an Atheist, at Rome, in the year 1600.—See the FRIEND, Vol. I. p. 193---197.

of Kepler, expanded and organized in the soul of Newton, and there (if I may hazard so bold an expression) refining itself into an almost celestial Clearness, had expelled the Cartesian Vortices *; then the necessity of an active power, of positive forces present in the Material Universe, forced itself on the conviction. For as a Law without a Law-giver is a mere abstraction; so a *Law* without an Agent to realize it, a *Constitution* without an abiding Executive, is, in fact, not a Law but *an Idea!* In the profound Emblem of the Great Tragic Poet, it is the powerless Prometheus fixed on a barren Rock. And what was the result? How was this necessity provided for? God himself—my hand trembles as I write! Rather, then, let me employ the word, which the religious Feeling, in its perplexity, suggested as the substitute—the *Deity itself* was declared to be the real Agent, the actual

* For Newton's own doubtfully suggested Ether, or *most* subtle Fluid, as the ground and immediate Agent in the phenomena of universal Gravitation, was either not adopted or soon abandoned by his Disciples; not only as introducing, against his own Canons of Right Reasoning, an *Ens imaginarium* into physical Science, a *Suffiction* in the place of a legitimate *Supposition*; but because the Substance (assuming it to exist) must itself form part of the Problem, it was meant to solve. Meantime Leibnitz's Pre-established Harmony, which originated in Spinoza, found no acceptance; and, lastly, the Notion of a corpuscular Substance, with Properties *put* into it, like a Pin-cushion hidden by the Pins, could pass with the unthinking only for any thing more than a Confession of ignorance, or technical terms expressing an hiatus of scientific insight.

Gravitating Power ! The Law and the Law-giver were identified. God (says Dr. Priestley) not only does, but *is* every thing. Jupiter est quodcunque vides. And thus a system, which commenced by excluding all life and immanent activity from the visible Universe and evacuating the natural World of all Nature, ended by substituting the Deity, and reducing the Creator to a mere Anima Mundi : a scheme that has no advantage over Spinosism but its inconsistency, which does indeed make it suit a certain Order of Intellectuals, who, like the Pleuronectæ (or Flat Fish) in Ichthyology that have both eyes on the same side, never see but half of a subject at one time, and forgetting the one before they get to the other are sure not to detect any inconsistency between them.

And what has been the consequence ? An increasing unwillingness to contemplate the Supreme Being in his *personal* Attributes : and thence a Distaste to all the peculiar Doctrines of the Christian Faith, the Trinity, the Incarnation of the Son of God, and Redemption. The young and ardent, ever too apt to mistake the inward triumph in the detection of error for a positive love of truth, are among the first and most frequent victims to this epidemic *fastidium*. Alas ! even the sincerest seekers after light are not safe from the contagion. Some have I known, constitutionally religious—I speak feelingly ; for I speak of that which for a brief period was my own state—who under this unhealthful influence have been so estranged from the Heavenly *Father*, the *Living* God, as even to shrink from the personal

pronouns as applied to the Deity. But many do I know, and yearly meet with, in whom a false and sickly *Taste* co-operates with the prevailing fashion: many, who find the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, far too *real*, too substantial; who feel it more in harmony with their indefinite sensations

“To worship NATURE in the hill and valley,
Not knowing what they love:—”

and (to use the language, but not the sense or purpose, of the great Poet of our Age) would fain substitute for the Jehovah of their Bible

“A sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the Light of setting suns,
And the round Ocean and the living Air;
A Motion and a Spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things!”

WORDSWORTH.

And this from having been educated to understand the Divine Omnipresence in any sense rather than the alone safe and legitimate one, the presence of all things to God!

Be it, however, that the number of such men is *comparatively* small! And be it (as in fact it often *is*) but a brief stage, a transitional state, in the process of intellectual Growth! Yet among a numerous and increasing class of the higher and middle Ranks, there

is an inward withdrawing from the Life and Personal Being of God, a turning of the Thoughts exclusively to the so called physical Attributes, to the Omnipresence in the counterfeit form of Ubiquity, to the Immensity, the Infinity, the Immutability!—the attributes of Space with a notion of Power as their Substratum!—a FATE, in short, not a Moral Creator and Governor! Let intelligence be imagined, and wherein does the conception of God differ essentially from that of Gravitation (conceived as the Cause of Gravity) in the understanding of those, who represent the Deity not only as a necessary but as a *necessitated* Being? those, for whom Justice is but a scheme of General Laws; and Holiness, and the divine Hatred of Sin, yea and Sin itself, are words without meaning or accommodations to a rude and barbarous race! Hence, I more than fear, the prevailing taste for Books of Natural Theology, Physico-theology, Demonstrations of God from Nature, Evidences of Christianity, &c. &c. *Evidences of Christianity!* I am weary of the Word. Make a man feel the *want* of it; rouse him, if you can, to the self-knowledge of his *need* of it; and you may safely trust it to its own Evidence,—remembering only the express declaration of Christ himself: No man cometh to me, unless the Father leadeth him! Whatever more is desirable—I speak now with reference to Christians generally, and not to profest Students of Theology—may, in my judgment, be far more safely and profitably taught, without controversy or the supposition

of infidel antagonists, in the form of Ecclesiastical History.

The last fruit of the Mechanico-corpuscular Philosophy, say rather of the mode and direction of feeling and thinking produced by it on the educated class of society; or that result, which as more immediately connected with my present theme I have reserved for the last—is the habit of attaching all our conceptions and feelings, and of applying all the words and phrases expressing reality, to the objects of the Senses; more accurately speaking, to the images and sensations by which their presence is made known to us. Now I do not hesitate to assert, that it was one of the great purposes of Christianity, and included in the process of our Redemption, to rouse and emancipate the Soul from this debasing Slavery to the outward Senses, to awaken the mind to the true Criteria of Reality, viz. Permanence, Power, Will manifested in Act, and Truth operating as Life. “My words,” said Christ, “are Spirit; and they (*i. e.* the spiritual powers expressed by them) are Truth;”—*i. e.* *very* Being. For this end our Lord, who came from Heaven to “take Captivity captive,” chose the words and names, that designate the familiar yet most important Objects of Sense, the nearest and most concerning Things and Incidents of corporeal nature:—Water, Flesh, Blood, Birth, Bread! But he used them in senses, that could not without absurdity be supposed to respect the mere *phænomena*, Water, Flesh, &c.,

in senses that by no possibility could apply to the color, figure, specific mode of Touch or Taste produced on ourselves, and by which we are made aware of the presence of the Things, and *understand* them—*Res, quæ sub apparitionibus istis statuenda sunt.* And this awful Recalling of the drowsed soul from the dreams and phantom-world of sensuality to *actual* Reality,—how has it been evaded! These words, that were Spirit! these Mysteries, which even the Apostles must wait for the Paraclete, (*i. e.* the Helper, the Strengthened) in order to comprehend! these spiritual things which can only be *spiritually* discerned,—were mere Metaphors, Figures of Speech, Oriental Hyperboles. “All this means *only* MORALITY!” Ah! how far nearer to the truth would these men have been, had they said that Morality means all this!

The effect, however, has been most injurious to the best interests of our Universities, to our incomparably constituted Church, and even to our National Character. The few who have read my two Lay-Sermons are no strangers to my opinions on this head; and in my Treatise on the Church and Churches, I shall, if Providence vouchsafe, submit them to the Public, with their grounds and historic evidences in a more systematic form.

I have, I am aware, in this present work furnished occasion for a charge of having expressed myself with slight and irreverence of celebrated Names, especially of the late Dr. Paley. O, if I were fond and ambitious of literary Honor, of public Applause, how well content

should I be to excite but one third of the admiration which, in my inmost Being, I feel for the head and heart of PALEY ! And how gladly would I surrender all hope of contemporary praise, could I even approach to the incomparable grace, propriety, and persuasive facility of his writings ! But on this very account I believed myself bound in conscience to throw the whole force of my intellect in the way of this triumphal Car, on which the tutelary Genius of modern Idolatry is borne, even at the risk of being crushed under the wheels ! I have at this moment before my eyes the 343d—344th pages of his Posthumous Discourses : the amount of which is briefly this,—that all the words and passages in the New Testament which express and contain the *peculiar* doctrines of Christianity, the paramount objects of the Christian Revelation, “all those which speak so strongly of the value, benefit, and efficacy, of the Death of Christ,” assuredly mean *something*; but *what* they mean, nobody, it seems, can tell ! But doubtless we shall discover it, and be convinced that there is a substantial sense belonging to these words—in a future state ! Is there an enigma, or an absurdity, in the Koran or the Vedas which might not be defended on the same pretence ? A similar impression, I confess, was left on my mind by Dr. Magee’s statement or exposition (*ad normam Grotianam*) of the doctrine of Redemption ; and deeply did it disappoint the high expectations, sadly did it chill the fervid sympathy, which his introductory chapter, his manly and masterly

disquisition on the sacrificial rites of Paganism, had raised in my mind.

And yet I cannot read the pages of Paley, here referred to, aloud, without the liveliest sense: how plausible and popular they will sound to the great majority of Readers! Thousands of sober, and in their way pious, Christians, will echo the words, together with Magee's kindred interpretation of the Death of Christ, and adopt the doctrine for their *Make-faith!* And why? It is feeble. And whatever is feeble is always plausible: for it favours mental indolence. It is feeble: and feebleness in the disguise of confessing and condescending Strength is always popular. It flatters the Reader, by removing the apprehended distance between him and the superior Author; and it flatters him still more by enabling him to transfer to himself, and to appropriate, this superiority: and thus to make his very weakness the mark and evidence of his strength. Ay, quoth the *rational* Christian—or with a sighing, self-soothing sound between an Ay and an Ah!—*I am content to think, with the Great Dr. Paley, and the learned Archbishop of Dublin—*

Man of Sense! Dr. Paley *was* a great Man, and Dr. Magee *is* a learned and exemplary Prelate; but You do not *think* at all!

With regard to the convictions avowed and enforced in my own work, I will continue my address to the Man of Sense in the words of an old Philosopher:—
 “Tu verò crassis auribus et obstinato corde respuis quæ forsitan verè perhibeantur. Minus herculè calles,

pravissimis opinionibus ea putari mendacia, quæ vel auditu nova, vel visu rudia, vel certè supra captum cogitationis extemporaneæ tuæ ardua videantur: quæ si paulo accuratius explorâris, non modo compertu evidèntia, sed etiam factu facilia, senties." APUL: l. 1.

S. T. COLERIDGE.

In compliance with the suggestion of a judicious friend, the celebrated conclusion of the fourth Book of Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy, cited in p. 336 of this Volume, is here transcribed for the convenience of the Reader:—

“Had Jesus Christ delivered no other declaration than the following—‘The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the grave shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation;’—he had pronounced a message of inestimable importance, and well worthy of that splendid apparatus of prophecy and miracles with which his mission was introduced, and attested: a message in which the wisest of mankind would rejoice to find an answer to their doubts, and rest to their inquiries. It is idle to say, that a future state had been discovered already:—it had been discovered as the Copernican System was;—it was one guess among many. He alone discovers, who *proves*; and no man can prove this point, but the teacher who testifies by miracles that his doctrine comes from God.”

Pædianus says of Virgil,—“Usque adeo expers invidiæ, ut siquid eruditè dictum inspiceret alterius, non minus gauderet ac si suum esset.” My own heart assures me, that this is less than the truth: that Virgil

would have read a beautiful passage in the work of another with a higher and purer delight than in a work of his own, because free from the apprehension of his judgment being warped by self-love, and without that repressive modesty akin to shame, which in a delicate mind holds in check a man's own secret thoughts and feelings, when they respect himself. The cordial admiration with which I peruse the preceding passage as *a master-piece of Composition* would, could I convey it, serve as a measure of the vital importance I attach to the convictions which impelled me to animadvert on the same passage as *doctrine*.

S. T. C.

THE END.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY THOMAS DAVISON, WHITEFRIARS.





C/x

