

THE  
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

MAY—AUGUST 1851.

VOL. XV.

EDINBURGH:

W. P. KENNEDY, SOUTH ST. ANDREW STREET;  
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.;  
DUBLIN: JAMES M'GLASHAN.

MDCCCLI.

THE  
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

---

AUGUST, 1851.

---

- ART. I.—1. *Principes de la Philosophie de l'Histoire, traduits de la Scienza Nuova de J. B. Vico.* Par JULES MICHELET. 2 tom. Paris, 1835.
2. *Système de Philosophie Positive.* Par AUGUSTE COMTE. 6 tom. Paris, 1830-42.
3. *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive.* By JOHN STUART MILL. Book VI. "On the Logic of the Moral Sciences." 3d Edition. London, 1851.
4. *The Characteristics of the Present Age.* By JOHANN GOTTLIEB FICHTE. Translated by WILLIAM SMITH. London, 1849.
5. *Social Statics ; or, The Conditions essential to Human Happiness specified, and the first of them developed.* By HERBERT SPENCER. London, 1851.
6. *Lectures on Political Economy.* By FRANCIS WILLIAM NEWMAN, formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. London, 1851.

AMONG the many lucid and valuable conceptions that have been given to the world by the French thinker Auguste Comte, whose name, we believe, is now tolerably familiar to most British readers, one of the most serviceable is his classification of the Sciences. Taking for his principle of arrangement that of proceeding from the more general and simple onward to the more special and complex, M. Comte classifies the sciences or possible departments of human knowledge in the following order :—Mathematics ; Astronomy ; General Physics ; Chemistry ; Biology, or the science of individual organized beings, (subdivided into the two branches of Vegetable and Animal Physiology, of the latter of which the whole science of the human mind constitutes, in M. Comte's scheme, only a prolongation or ap-

ART. II.—DÉMONSTRATIONS ÉVANGÉLIQUES ;—de Tertullien, Origène, Eusèbe, S. Augustin, Montaigne, Bacon, Grotius, Descartes, Richelieu, Arnaud, De Choiseul-du-Plessis-Praslin, Pascal, Pelisson, Nicole, Boyle, Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Locke, Lami, Burnet, Malebranche, Lesley, Leibnitz, La Bruyère, Fénelon, Huet, Clarke, Duguet, Stanhope, Bayle, Le-Clerc, Du-Pin, Jacquelot, Tillotson, De Haller, Sherlock, Le Moine, Pope, Leland, Raciné, Massillon, Ditton, Derham, D'Aguesseau, De Polignac, Saurin, Buffier, Warburton, Tournemine, Bentley, Littleton, Fabricius, Addison, De Bernis, J. J. Rousseau, Para du Phanhas, Stanislas I., Turgot, Statler, West, Beauzée, Bergier, Carraccioli, Jennings, Duhamel, Liguori, Butler, Bullet, Vauvenargues, Guénard, Blair, De Pompignan, Deluc, Porteous, Gerard, Diessbach, Jacques, Lamourette, La Harpe, Le Coz, Duvoisin, De la Luzerne, Schmitt, Poynter, Moore, Silvio Pellico, Lingard, Brunati, Manzoni, Paley, Perrone, D'Orleans, Campien, Perennes, Wiseman, Buckland, Marcel-de-Serres, Keith, Chalmers, Dupin Aîné, S.S. Gregoire XVI. Traduites, pour la plupart, des diverses langues dans lesquelles elles avaient été écrites ; reproduites INTÉGRALEMENT, non par extraits ; annotées et publiées par M. L'ABBÉ M(IGNE,) éditeur des Cours Complets. Petit Montrouge. Paris, 1843.

SUCH is the title-page of this elaborate work, and we give it in full as a brief but comprehensive table of its contents. It is recommended in the "advertisement" as the best work on the truth of Christianity in general, and of Catholicism in particular, in the whole world ; and it is said to be specially distinguished by this, that the authors of the treatises included in it are not mere commentators or theologians, but writers of European reputation, (*des célébrités Européennes,*) who are esteemed alike by the men of the world and of the cloister, by the Protestant and the Catholic, by the Infidel and the Believer, as those who have been foremost in point of intelligence in their several ages and countries. But while it is designed for the general defence of Christianity, it is designed also for the special vindication of Catholicism ; and is directed not only against Infidels, who deny or doubt the truth of the one, but also against Heretics and Schismatics, who question the authority of the other. Every objection which has been urged against Christianity, as it is professed in the Church of Rome, is here refuted ; the objections of Pagan philosophy, by Origen, Eusebius, and Augustine ; those of the middle age and of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, by Bacon, Montaigne, and Descartes ; those

of the seventeenth century, by Bossuet, Pascal, and Nicole; those of the eighteenth, by Gerdil, La Harpe, and Milner; and those of the nineteenth, by Poynter, Keith, and Chalmers. And the value of the whole collection is said to consist in this, that each work is given ENTIRE, and that the series contains more than 150 volumes, translated from various languages into French, and constituting a complete body of Apologetic Theology. Its value is supposed to be greatly enhanced by the fact that the whole works of CARDINAL WISEMAN are incorporated in it, who is characterized as one of the most illustrious members of the Episcopate, and who is said to have furnished to the editor a copy of *all* his productions, revised and annotated by his own hand. The work is arranged in *chronological order*, and exhibits the various defences which have appeared from age to age in reply to the successive phases of unbelief, as the best method of exhibiting the progress of human thought, and the filiation and revolution of the various systems of opinion. The title-page of the first volume, however, was adopted provisionally, and every competent reader of the original *Avis* was invited to send in such suggestions as might occur to him, with the view of completing, by means of additional treatises, the outline of the plan which the editor had sketched. Accordingly, in the course of publication, a considerable change was made in the contents, as originally announced; *five* names which appeared in the title-page have been entirely omitted,—viz., Newton, Necker, Milner, Moehler, and Riambourg; partly because the translations of Milner and Moehler had not been completed in time, partly, also, because Riambourg's writings had not yet become public property, and those of Newton and Necker were found to contain, the one too much of the fanaticism of the Protestant, the other of the spirit of philosophy. But for these several other treatises have been substituted; and we are led to expect that in another work, of an analogous character, under the title of "*Nouvelles Démonstrations*," we shall be presented with a *hundred* additional apologists, both ancient and modern, Frenchmen and foreigners. From Italy we are to have Rosmini, Peraltì, Tassoni, Trombelli, and Valsecchi; from England—Lardner, Milman, Anderson, Beattie, Erschine, and Sumner; from Germany—Kühn, Goerres, Doellinger, Tholuck, Müller, Hengstengberg, Klee, Günther, Schlegel, and Drey; from France—Gauchat, Houteville, Lefebvre, François, Papin, Barruel, Regnier, Pontbriant, Beurrier, and Bonhours. From the earlier ages of the Church we are to have Minucius Felix, Arnobius, Lactantius, and Theodoret; from the middle age—Anselm, Thomas, and Raymond Lulle; from the more modern era, Marsilius Ficinus, Savonarola, Du Perron, Vivès, De Mornay, Eckius, Cotton, and Morus.

We know few studies more interesting or more instructive than that of the History of Apologetics. As Christianity has come into collision with every successive system of error through the long tract of eighteen hundred years; with the Pharisaism and Sadducism of the Jews; with the popular paganism of Greece and Rome; with the philosophical systems of Epicurus, Plato, and Zeno; with the mythical theories of Porphyry, Jamblichus, and Julian; with Mahomedanism in the East, and Infidelity and Rationalism in the West, it is impossible to conceive a more extensive or more inviting field of inquiry than that in which we trace the progress of its trials and triumphs when brought into conflict, at successive epochs, with so many and such formidable antagonists. But in this, as in every other department of theological science, the subject admits of being viewed from different stand-points, and of being treated in different ways. The method that has been most generally followed in this country, is that which is naturally suggested by *the different kinds of evidence* to which an appeal is made in defence or confirmation of our faith; such as—the *presumptive* evidence, including the argument from Analogy, which is directed to the object partly of neutralizing preliminary objections, so as to relieve the subject of the weight of any adverse prejudice, and partly, also, of imparting to it such a character of verisimilitude, as may serve to awaken a sense of obligation to further inquiry;—the *direct* evidence, including the *external*, the *internal* and the *experimental* evidence, and exhibiting the argument from the miracles, prophecies, and types of Scripture, with their historical verifications; the argument from the characters of divinity, which are stamped on its whole contents, and from the confirmatory attestations of Christian experience;—and finally, the *collateral* or subsidiary evidence, arising from tradition, monumental remains, and other similar sources, which shew that profane history itself is in accordance with the supposition that the Christian religion is true. Another method might be adopted in the treatment of the evidences of revealed religion;—a method less scientific, indeed, in point of arrangement, but not, perhaps, less interesting or less impressive than the former—the method of exhibiting, in their proper historical order, a continuous series, or at least, a sufficient specimen, of the various defences and apologies which have appeared since the Apostolic age down to the present time. This is the method which has been preferred and adopted by the Abbé Migne and his associates. But even when the historical plan is pursued, there is still room, we think, for a *classification of the topics*, and there might be great advantage in availing ourselves of the aid of system which, in every other branch of inquiry, is found to be so useful and indispensable.

Were the subject treated, not chronologically, as in the present work, but in the order of *its relation to the various parties* with whom Christianity has had to contend, it might be conveniently divided into *four* parts: the *first* exhibiting an historical view of the JEWISH controversy, or of the arguments for and against Christianity, as stated by the advocates of Judaism on the one hand, and the apologists for Christianity on the other; the *second* exhibiting an historical view of the PAGAN controversy, or of the argument maintained by the primitive Christians against ancient heathenism, both in its popular and philosophical form; the *third* exhibiting an outline of the MAHOMMEDAN controversy, or of the argument maintained by the Church against the adherents of the false prophet; and the *fourth* exhibiting a view of the MODERN INFIDEL controversy, including both the argument against the DEISTS of the former, and the RATIONALISTS of the present age. In reviewing the history of these several branches of the great controversy, we shall find that, while there are both arguments and objections which belong peculiarly to each of them, and which impart to them their distinctive character, or constitute their more prominent features, there is also in all of them an evidence of a general kind, applicable at all times and in all circumstances, and available for the benefit of the Universal Church. The Christian apologists reasoned differently, in some respects, with Jews and with Pagans, with Mahommedans, with Deists, and with Neologians; for the principles assumed, or the facts admitted by these several parties, were not the same, and it was necessary to adapt their mode of argument, whether in the way of attack or of defence, to the peculiar opinions of those with whom they were immediately engaged; but notwithstanding this specific diversity, there is a body of positive evidence which is common to them all, and which constitutes the solid substratum of the Christian faith,—even that evidence which arises from the miracles and prophecies of Scripture, from its internal character and experimental verifications, and which is still available for the benefit of modern times, and will continue to be valid till the end of the world.

Christianity was *first* addressed to the JEWS, and it offered itself to them as a completion of the scheme which had been revealed in their own Scriptures. Some of them believed the Gospel; others rejected it, and were peculiarly zealous and active in opposing the progress of what they conceived to be an unwarranted and impious innovation on the religion of their fathers. Their opposition began during our Lord's ministry, and was continued under that of his apostles; so that we have in the New Testament itself the earliest authentic account of the

grounds of their unbelief, which are the same in substance, with some modifications, that are insisted on by their descendants at the present day. It would appear from the sacred narrative that, even during the short period of our Lord's public ministry, the question had assumed two successive shapes: at first it was merely, whether Jesus was a prophet sent from God? and for a time many seem to have been willing, like Nicodemus, to acknowledge him in this character on the strength of his impressive teaching and his amazing miracles; but afterwards, when he proclaimed himself as the Messiah that had been promised to their fathers, they were shut up to the alternative of either admitting this high claim, or of denying that he was a prophet at all; and hence those who expected and wished a temporal deliverer rather than a spiritual Saviour, treated him as an impostor, and ascribed his very miracles to Satanic agency. This seems to have been the mental process by which many who were willing at first to acknowledge his prophetic character were ultimately led to reject his claims. Had the question been, whether he was a prophet sent from God? they might have regarded his teaching and his miracles as a sufficient evidence in his favour; but when the question came to be, whether he was the Messiah of whom Moses and the prophets did write? another element must be taken into account, viz., the conformity between his character and work, and the descriptions of both which were contained in the Old Testament. And hence all the objections which are mentioned in the New Testament as having been raised against him during the course of his personal ministry are directed to this point, and designed to shew that he wanted some mark or other which was to be characteristic of the Messiah, and by which he should be identified when he came. In like manner, the great object of the Apostles in arguing with the JEWS, was just to prove that "Jesus is the Christ" by appealing to their own Scriptures, and shewing that all the predictions and types of the Old Testament had their true and complete accomplishment in him.

These remarks may serve to explain the *state of the question* as it existed in the Apostolic age. The unbelieving Jews did not deny the miracles of Christ, but conceived that if they could convict him by their own Scriptures of pretending falsely to the character of the promised Messiah, they might account for his miracles by ascribing them, as they did successively, to the power of Beelzebub, or the influence of magic, or to the mystic virtue of the Shem-hamphorash, the ineffable name. It is very remarkable that in their own account of the life of Christ—the *Toldoth Jeshu*—they never once deny his miraculous powers, but attempt merely to account for them by one or other of the

causes to which we have just referred. Their infidelity, then, rested on an intelligible ground: it may be traced to certain peculiarities in their hereditary opinions and expectations, which originated in an erroneous interpretation of the Old Testament, and it may thus be accounted for in perfect consistency with the admitted reality of those miracles which the Christians ascribed to God, the God of Truth, and the Jews to Beelzebub, the Father of Lies. It is not difficult to discover the original grounds of their objections to Christianity. The grand parent cause of their unbelief was undoubtedly that aversion to spiritual religion, and especially that repugnance to the essential doctrines of the Gospel which is natural to the human mind; but next to this, the cause which operated with the greatest efficacy was a prejudice induced by their education in the schools of the Scribes and Pharisees, who had put their own interpretation on some important parts of the Old Testament Scriptures, and who taught them to expect a very different Messiah from what they found in Jesus of Nazareth. There were several distinct topics on which the Christian scheme differed widely from their traditional opinions, and against these their objections were mainly directed. They had been taught to expect a temporal deliverer in the person of Messiah, a powerful prince, who should emancipate their nation from the thralldom of Rome, and re-establish the dominion of the house of David; whereas Jesus appeared as "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," in a state of poverty and humiliation, attended only by a band of humble fishermen. He proclaimed himself, indeed, as a prince, but only as "the Prince of Peace;" as a king, but as one whose "kingdom was not of this world;" as a Saviour, but as one who came "to save his people from their sins." They had been taught that the law and the institutions of Moses, established as they had been by Divine authority, were immutable and perpetual; and, looking rather to the letter than to the spirit of that economy, they regarded every alteration in its form as an impious attempt to supersede or to innovate on a constitution which had received the seal of God's miraculous attestation: whereas Jesus appeared, declaring, indeed, that "he came not to destroy the law but to fulfil," yet proclaiming also, that "the kingdom of God," a new and better dispensation, was at hand, and that "the hour cometh when neither in the mountain of Samaria, nor yet at Jerusalem, should men worship the Father, but all should worship him everywhere in spirit and in truth." They had been taught to regard themselves as standing in a peculiar relation to God, from which the Gentiles had been expressly excluded, and to believe that none could share in the blessings which belonged to the faithful, otherwise than by becoming proselytes to the

Jewish faith and worship; but Jesus appeared, proclaiming his reverence for their religious services, yet predicting the abolition of their distinctive privileges, and the destruction of the Temple itself: and he was followed by his apostles, who announced the calling in of the Gentiles, without any of the forms of Jewish proselytism, and without even the preliminary of circumcision. They had been taught that their acceptance with God stood connected with the observance of their sacred rites, and might be secured by the works of their law: hence they gloried in their being the children of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise; but Jesus appeared, declaring that the righteousness even of the Scribes and Pharisees could not entitle them to admission into the kingdom of God: and that another method of salvation, not by works but by grace, was announced in the gospel of his spiritual kingdom.

There were many other points of inferior moment, which gave rise to occasional controversy between the first Christians and the Jews, in those colloquial discussions which preceded the literary warfare on the subject; but the topics which have been briefly indicated were the cardinal hinges on which the whole question turned in primitive times. At a later period, the Jews, while they retained and transmitted the old objections of their fathers, along with their comments on the life and miracles of the Saviour, were driven by the progress of events, and especially by the destruction of Jerusalem, the dispersion of their nation, and the continued disappointment of their fondly cherished hopes, to have recourse to other expedients, both for vindicating their own cause and assailing the credit of the Christian Church; and their more recent grounds of objection may be described as consisting chiefly in the following particulars:—The prophecies which their earlier writers had usually described as Messianic, were otherwise applied, some to Hezekiah, others to the Jewish nation at large, so as to evade or invalidate the proof which Christians had derived from them in favour of the Lord Jesus Christ. The predictions, again, which were still acknowledged to be Messianic, were said to be suspended, or their fulfilment delayed, on account of their sins, and to wait for their accomplishment until the dispersed of Israel should return to God with their whole heart. Some of their writers, too, broached the idea of *two* Messiahs, the one a suffering, the other a conquering and victorious Saviour, endeavouring thereby to evade the argument from the fulfilment of ancient prophecy, both in the humiliation and exaltation of Jesus of Nazareth. They further endeavoured to invalidate the authority of the New Testament in a great variety of instances, and by most minute and captious criticism, by shewing that it is self-contradictory, as well as utterly at variance with the true

meaning of the Old Testament, on which it was professedly founded. And finally, after the corruption of Christianity, both in the Eastern and Western Churches, the Jews found a fertile, and, it must be owned, a well-founded ground of objection against Christianity as it was then exhibited, in the superstitions which had become incorporated with it, and especially in the idolatrous worship of saints and images, which they justly conceived to be at direct variance with the whole design and scope of the Old Testament, and with the express law of the Decalogue; and thus these flagrant corruptions served not only to weaken the Christian Church, but also to confirm the unbelief of God's ancient people, who did not discriminate aright between the system of Christianity as it is revealed in the New Testament, and the corrupt form of it which was embodied in the visible Church. These are the principal heads of the controversy between the Jews and Christians, first in primitive, and then in more recent times. On both sides, it has been partly *defensive*, and partly *aggressive*: the Jews having defended their own position, and assailed that of the Christians; while the Christians have vindicated the Gospel from Jewish objections, and assailed the Jews in their turn, by shewing the inconsistency of their tenets with the true meaning of their own Scriptures. In reviewing the whole course of this most interesting discussion, between the representatives of God's ancient people and the followers of Christ, we can hardly fail to be impressed with the feeling that the continued unbelief of the Jews, notwithstanding the disappointment of their long-cherished hopes, and the signal accomplishment of the Scriptures in their mournful experience, is a very awful phenomenon in the moral world; but it is one which should in nowise shake or stagger our faith: on the contrary, it is a signal proof of the Divine prescience by which it was predicted; and it should lead us to remove every stumbling-block out of their way, by reforming the abuses of the Church, while we wait in faith and prayer for the time when Israel shall be grafted in again, and when their conversion will add fresh evidence and impart new life to the Christianity of the whole world.

The literature of this *first* branch of the great controversy is peculiarly rich. It commences with the earliest Apologists; it is continued onwards from age to age, long after Paganism had been overthrown; it employed many pens amidst the darkness of mediæval times; and even at the present day, amidst the light and civilisation of the nineteenth century, it is neither obsolete nor unimportant. Any one who is disposed to study it as a distinct branch of the general subject, may consult with advantage a few standard works, produced at each of the

successive eras of its history: in primitive times, we have the dialogue of Justin Martyr with Trypho a Jew, and Origen's reply to Celsus, who personated a Jewish objector to Christianity: in the middle age, we have the "*Pugio Fidei adversus Mauros et Judæos*," written in the thirteenth century, and afterwards published at Leipsic with valuable prefaces by De Voisin and Carpzovius: at a later period, we have the "*Tela Ignea Satanae*," by Wagenseil, including amongst other curious pieces, the *Toldoth Jeshu*, or the Jewish account of the life and miracles of Christ; we have also the valuable work of Limborch, "*Amica collatio cum erudito Judæo*," (Dr. Orobrus,) with the treatises of Kidder and Stanhope in the Boyle Lectureship: and in our own age, and for popular use, we have Charles Leslie's "*Short Method with the Jews*;" Dr. Greville Ewing's "*Essays addressed to the Jews, on the authority, the scope, and the consummation of the Law and the Prophets*;" and "*The Old Paths, or a Comparison of the Principles and Doctrines of Modern Judaism, with the Religion of Moses and the Prophets*," by Dr. Alexander M'Aul of Trinity College, Dublin. These works, read in connexion with Allen's "*Modern Judaism*," which gives an interesting account of their present opinions and observances, and with Dr. Owen's "*Preliminary Exercitations*," which contain a vast amount of information on the methods and artifices of Rabbinical exegesis, will be sufficient for the illustration of the *first* branch of Christian Apologetics.

The controversy with Judaism began during the personal ministry of our Lord; it was speedily followed by the *Pagan* controversy, when, under the ministry of his Apostles, Christianity was openly proclaimed to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews. The history of this *second* branch of the subject is deeply interesting; it leads us to contemplate the progress and triumph of Divine truth, proclaimed by a few fishermen and tentmakers, in opposition to the learning, and policy, and power, of the greatest empire that ever existed in the world. We must endeavour to conceive of the grandeur and gorgeousness of that system of superstitious worship which then prevailed, if we would estimate either the difficulty or the value of the triumph which Christianity achieved. It was a system of Polytheism, universally diffused and firmly established: tolerant of all forms of religious observance, and of every variety of religious creed, one only excepted,—a system which had been the gradual growth of centuries,—which priests had hallowed, and poets celebrated, and princes patronized: a system defended by the policy and power of the Roman Empire, and associated with the prejudices and habits, the affections and interests, the very pastimes and passions of the people: a system

which statesmen upheld as a convenient engine of government; which philosophers might inwardly despise, but would not openly assail; and to which the veriest sceptics offered the homage of outward respect and observance. In the words of Gibbon,—“The policy of the emperors and the Senate, as far as it concerned religion, was happily seconded by the reflections of the enlightened, and by the habits of the superstitious part of their subjects. The various modes of worship which prevailed in the Roman world were all considered by the people as equally true, by the philosopher, as equally false, and by the magistrate, as equally useful: and thus toleration produced not only mutual indulgence, but even religious concord. The superstition of the people was not embittered by any mixture of theological rancour; nor was it confined by the chains of any speculative system. ‘The devout Polytheist, though fondly attached to his national rites, admitted with implicit faith the different religions of the earth.’ ‘Such was the mild spirit of antiquity, that the nations were less attentive to the difference than to the resemblance of their religious worship.’ Notwithstanding the fashionable irreligion which prevailed in the age of the Antonines, both the interests of the priests and the credulity of the people were sufficiently respected. In their writings and conversation, the philosophers of antiquity asserted the independent dignity of reason, but they resigned their actions to the commands of law and of custom. Viewing with a smile of pity and indulgence, the various errors of the vulgar, they diligently practised the ceremonies of their fathers, devoutly frequented the temples of the gods: and sometimes condescending to act a part on the theatre of superstition, they concealed the sentiments of an Atheist under the sacerdotal robes.”\* Such is the modern sceptic’s glowing picture of ancient Paganism: yet, suddenly a few fishermen appeared in an obscure corner of the Roman Empire—they preached, and with no power, excepting that which accompanied their word, their doctrine spread, and spread the wider and faster by reason of persecution and martyrdom, until that old, established, and gorgeous superstition fell, like Dagon before the ark of the living God.

The Pagan controversy was in some respects widely different from the Jewish. With a few inconsiderable exceptions, the Gentiles had no previous knowledge of the character and will of the true God as these had been revealed to the Jews in the Old Testament Scriptures: they held principles, or rather were preoccupied with prejudices, of a directly opposite kind. It was necessary, therefore, to reason differently with them, and

\* Gibbon’s *Decline and Fall*, vol. i. p. 41.

to direct their thoughts in the first instance to the fundamental truths of a pure Theism, and the flagrant errors of their favourite superstitions. Accordingly, we find in the New Testament, which contains the earliest information on the subject, that the Apostles reasoned with the Gentiles in this way; as when Paul stood on Mars’ Hill, and addressing the cultivated inhabitants of Athens, exclaimed, “Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are exceedingly given to the worship of the Gods, (ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ, Acts xvii. 22;) for as I passed by and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, HIM declare I unto you. God that made the world, and all things therein.” “In Him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring. Forasmuch, then, as *we* are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art or man’s device.” This is a beautiful specimen of the primitive argument against Paganism. The question, however, assumed several distinct shapes in the subsequent history of the Church. In its earliest stage it was simply a question as to the claims of Christ as the founder of a new religion, or as the object of religious worship; and had the Apostles contented themselves with merely urging these claims, without denouncing the creeds and customs of Polytheism, there seems to be no reason to doubt that multitudes who were ready to welcome any new system which commended itself to their taste, might have consented to give Christ a place in the Pantheon, and Christianity full and ample toleration in the empire. But the very genius of Christianity forbade such an alliance: it was essentially and directly opposed to Paganism in all its forms—it admitted of no compromise, and could not speak to error in the language of conciliation; and as soon as its true character was discerned, the controversy assumed a new and more formidable aspect. At this second stage, the prejudices and passions of the people combined with the policy and power of government to put down Christianity by persecuting its disciples, not because Christianity professed to be a true and good religion, for this many might have been willing to concede, but because it professed to be *the only* religion that was pleasing to the one living and true God. Hence “the mild and tolerant spirit of Paganism,” which could endure and even protect and establish every form of superstitious worship, was converted at once into a spirit of persecution. This was the age of martyrdom, and the arguments of the first Christians were sealed with their blood. As persecution waxed hotter, the controversy became, on the side of the Christians, rather an assault on



Paganism than a defence of Christianity; the courage of the martyrs rose as their danger increased, and they boldly attacked both the superstitions of the common people and the philosophical systems of the more refined advocates of the established worship. A *third* stage arrived, when the opposition which had hitherto been made to Christianity by the brute power of the mob or the magistrate, was embodied in writings designed partly for the vindication of the ancient system, and partly for the conviction and exposure of the Christians. Various charges of a most heinous and offensive nature were preferred against them, charges which, if they had been true, might have justified the interference of the Government in crushing an immoral and unsocial abomination; and the Christians replied in self-defence, renewing, at the same time, their solemn protest against Paganism as a false and debasing superstition. This was the era of the Apologists, whose writings, often addressed to the Roman magistrates and emperors, were mainly directed to disprove the accusations which had been brought against them. The *last* stage of the controversy arrived, when the defenders of Paganism, driven from many of their ancient strongholds, and no longer able to defend the old superstitions in their naked grossness, had recourse to an allegorical explanation of them, contending that they were designed to represent the principles and processes of physical nature, and that, when thus interpreted, they contained the maxims of a hidden wisdom. They had recourse, too, to another expedient—that of writing the lives of their great men, such as Apollonius of Tyana, and setting them up as rivals to Jesus Christ. The extant remains or reputed opinions of Porphyry, Jamblichus, and Julian, throw an interesting light on this phase of the great argument.

But Paganism was doomed; the breath of the Lord had smitten it, and neither the power of the empire, nor the prejudices of the people, nor the artifices of the priests, nor the plausible sophistries of a pliant philosophy, could save it; it fell before an humble band of Galilean preachers, and now, throughout the whole extent of Europe, it lives only in the classic page.—“Stat nominis umbra.”

For a full view of the controversy, which issued in the downfall of ancient Paganism and the public establishment of Christianity, recourse must be had to the early Apologists—to Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Minucius Felix, Arnobius, Eusebius, and Augustine. In the “*Démonstrations Evangéliques*,” several treatises belonging to this era are given entire in a French version, viz., TERTULLIAN’S “*Apologeticus adversus Gentes pro Christianis*,” and also (for a special reason which will be noticed afterwards) his “*Liber de Pre-*

scriptionibus Hæreticorum;” ORIGEN’S treatise against Celsus; the Evangelical Preparation and Evangelical Demonstration of EUSEBIUS; and AUGUSTINE’S treatise on the true Religion. These are the only treatises given in this work that bear on the early history of Christian Apologetics; and from the age of Augustine there is a sudden leap to that of Montaigne and Bacon. The bill of fare is somewhat meagre in this department. We have nothing of Justin Martyr, nothing of Clement, and nothing of “the City of God.” We thankfully accept the valuable treatises of the Bishop of Cæsarea, and have long wished to see them translated, so as to be made accessible to the unlearned reader. In our own language we have a good specimen of the earlier Apologies in Mr. REEVES’ translation of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, and Vincentius Lirinensis, which may be read with the greater advantage after a careful perusal of Archbishop Wake’s “*Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers*.” The Abbé Houteville, in a discourse prefixed to “*The Christian Religion proved by Facts*,” gives an interesting “review of the method of the principal authors who have written for and against Christianity since the Apostolic age.” This discourse was translated into English, and published separately. SEMISCH in his “*Life and Times of Justin Martyr*,” has collected a large variety of information illustrative of the same subject. But by far the best source of information, next to the study of the original writers, is the immortal work of LARDNER, a work that can never be superseded nor surpassed, and which will only acquire a higher value in proportion as the principles of historical evidence are more thoroughly understood, and the application of them more carefully studied.

The conflict with ancient Polytheism had scarcely terminated, when there arose in the East a new and formidable antagonist to Christianity, which, unlike Paganism, loudly proclaimed the unity of God, and admitted generally the truth both of the Old and the New Testaments, while it proposed a new and authoritative revelation from Heaven. Christianity had already become corrupt or lethargic, and MAHOMET was sent as a scourge to the Eastern churches. “With the sword in one hand, and the Koran in the other,”\* he speedily obtained a complete mastery over extensive and populous regions, and established an almost insurmountable barrier against the progress of gospel truth. Yet Mahomet and his followers were not unbelievers, in the ordinary sense of the term; they recognised both Moses and Christ as true prophets; and the Koran itself contains innumerable refer-

\* Gibbon’s *Decline and Fall*, vol. ix. pp. 192, 224. (12mo.)

ences to the facts and doctrines both of the Old and the New Testaments. It is, in fact, founded on these earlier revelations, and professes to be supplementary to them; but it speaks not only of the corruption of the Christian churches, it speaks also of the corruption of the sacred writings; and Mahomet is described as the Paraclete or comforter whom Christ promised to send, after his ascension, to guide his disciples into *all truth*. It contradicts the received Scriptures, both in regard to some matters of fact, and to several important points of faith and practice; but, speaking generally, it does homage to the great facts on which the Jewish and Christian religion are based. Its brief but comprehensive confession of faith may be summed up in two articles, which are described by Gibbon as "an eternal truth and a necessary fiction;" that THERE IS ONLY ONE GOD, AND THAT MAHOMET IS THE APOSTLE OF GOD.

Propounded as it was to rude and ignorant tribes, many of them still practising the rites of Sabeian worship, and offering their homage to the sun, moon, and stars, as well as to departed but deified heroes, and published at a time when the Christian Churches in the East had fallen into corruption and decay, it excited opposition, as every innovation in religion must,—but this was speedily quelled, not by spiritual but by carnal weapons. We have fragments of colloquial debate and discussion during the life of Mahomet, which are incorporated in all the authentic histories of his singular career, and which are sufficient to shew that his revelations were not at first received with implicit credence: but we have no record of any literary controversy on the subject until a much later period, when the claims of a system, already firmly established by force, began to be canvassed at the bar of reason. The translation of the Koran by Sale, with his introductory dissertations; and the writings of Pococke, Reland, Prideaux, and Boulainvilliers, may be consulted with advantage on its earlier history: but more recent works must be referred to if we would understand fully the precise state of the question as between the Christian and Mahommedan faith. This branch of the general controversy is often regarded as one of very subordinate interest, and as having little claim on the attention of students: and it is true, so far, that we are less in danger from the claims of the false prophet, than from the cavils and objections of infidels within our own borders. But there are at least *two* considerations,—the one of a general, the other of a more special kind,—which may serve to vindicate the claims of the Mahommedan controversy to the careful study of the more inquiring members of the Christian ministry:—the *first* is, that it serves, in the way of contrast, to enhance the strength and value of the Christian evidence, by shewing how difficult, or

rather how impossible it is for any scheme of imposture to *simulate* an evidence of the same or of a similar kind; and by exposing the shifts and expedients to which, in the absence of that evidence, every impostor, however fanatical, must necessarily be reduced. The *second* is, that if it be not necessary for all, it is indispensable at least for our missionaries in the East, to acquire a thorough knowledge of the arguments *pro* and *con* as between the advocates of the Christian and Mahommedan faith; since they must necessarily come into frequent intercourse with the followers of the false prophet, and they will find, that of all the opponents of Christianity, they are the least ready to be convinced or impressed by the preaching of the Gospel. On this subject, we refer to a very curious collection of papers recently published by Dr. Lee, Professor of Arabic at Cambridge, entitled, "Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mahommedanism, by the late Rev. HENRY MARTYN, and some of the most eminent writers of Persia." In a very long and learned Preface, Professor Lee gives "some notices and extracts from the controversy, as it existed prior to the times of Mr. Martyn,"—especially from three books, "one composed in the Persian language by Hieronymo Xavier, a Catholic missionary: another, containing a reply to Xavier's work, by a Persian nobleman named Ahmed Ibn Zain Elébidín, written also in the Persian; and the third a rejoinder in Latin, by Philip Guadagnoli, one of the Professors attached to the College *de propaganda fide*, in defence of Xavier's work." In the first of these treatises the elementary principles of Theism are inculcated at the outset, in opposition to the Eastern doctrines of Pantheism and Absorption: then the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, such as the doctrine of the Trinity, and original sin, are expounded; and, finally, the contrast between the Christian and Mahommedan faith is illustrated in a variety of distinct particulars. All this, however, is intermingled, as might have been expected, with doctrines peculiarly Popish; such as the worship of images, and the virtue of sacred relics, the religious observance of saints' days, and the temporal and spiritual power of the Popes. In the reply of the Persian nobleman there is not a little of acute ingenious pleading, founded on the contents of the New Testament itself. He attempts to shew that our Lord's warning against false prophets does not apply to Mahomet, whose advent had been predicted, as well as that of Christ, in the earliest Scriptures—the Pentateuch; for the words, "a light came from Mount Sinai," apply to Moses; and the words, "it shone upon us from Mount Seir," apply to Christ, who spoke from Seir in Galilee: and the words, "it was revealed to us from Mount Paran," apply to Mahomet, who spake from Mount Paran, in the neighbourhood of Mecca. He farther attempts to shew, that

Christ's teaching was as much opposed to that of Moses as Mahomet's was to that of Christ, and that we are shut up, either to the impartial rejection of both, or the admission of their respective claims. He argues, too, with all the subtlety of a European critic, quite, indeed, in the vein of Strauss and his compatriots, on the discrepancies of the sacred narrative, and is quite as decided, and as *rational* too, as any Socinian in denying the divinity of Christ, and denouncing the doctrine of the Trinity. The defence of Xavier by Guadagnoli, which is dedicated to Pope Urban VIII., and which bears upon it the approbation and *imprimatur* of the sacred college, is divided into *four parts*, corresponding to the four principal heads of objections by the Mahommedans; the first relating to the sacred mystery of the Trinity; the second, to the ineffable sacrament of the Incarnation; the third, to the authority of the sacred writings; and the fourth, to the Koran, and the claims of Mahomet as a legislator. The controversy between the saintly *Henry Martyn* and the Mahommedans commenced in 1811. Mirza Ibrahim, the preceptor of all the Moolas, was the writer of a book in defence of Mahommedanism, which appeared on the 26th of July. "A considerable time," it is said, "had been spent in its preparation, and on its seeing the light it obtained the credit of surpassing all former treatises upon Islam." Henry Martyn's biographer says that his reply to it was divided into two parts—the first devoted principally to an attack upon Mahommedanism; the second intended to display the evidences and establish the authority of the Christian faith. Professor Lee, however, divides it into three parts, and offers first a translation of the Arabic tract of Mirza Ibrahim, in defence of Islamism, with an appendix, containing an extract from the tract of Aga Acber, on the miracles of Mahomet; and then the translation of the first, second, and third tract of Mirza Ibrahim, by Martyn, with the rejoinder of Mohammed Ruza in reply, and a copious criticism by the editor and translator. We have referred to this work as affording the best exemplification, accessible to us, of the state of the Mahometan controversy in the present age; and we cordially agree with Professor Lee in thinking, "that the general attention that has of late been paid to missionary exertion, both within and without the pale of the Church of England, constitutes a farther motive to the prosecution of these studies; and that without an extensive cultivation of them, there is not much reason to anticipate the success to which it is their object to attain."

The more modern controversy between Christianity and unbelief falls to be divided into two parts—the Deistical and the Neologian.

The revival of letters, and the reformation of the Church, aided by the invention of printing, and the general progress of civilisation, produced an active and restless spirit of inquiry in Europe, while the offensive and intolerable corruptions which had infected the visible Church gave rise in many minds to a deep-seated, heartfelt prejudice against Christianity itself. The right of private judgment, which had been violently wrested from men, and as violently redeemed, was no sooner restored than, by a natural reaction, it sought to revenge itself on those by whom it had been forcibly enchained. And the *fourth* great controversy between Christianity and the spirit of unbelief, was *occasioned*, more or less directly, although it cannot be said to have been *caused*, by that great revolution in the public mind of Europe.

There is a striking difference between the ancient Pagan and the modern Deistical controversy. In the former, the advocates of Christianity were called to expose the absurdities and immoralities of Polytheism, which had become, under the unaided light of nature, the universal religion of mankind: in the latter, they were met with the plea that Revelation was unnecessary, and therefore incredible, by reason of the *perfect sufficiency of the light of nature*, and the purity and perfection of the religious system which it was able of itself to establish in the world. What had occurred, it might be asked, in the ages which intervened between the two to account for, or to justify so great a change in the state of the question? Had human reason excogitated for itself a system of pure and perfect Theism? or had she derived from Christianity a new view of nature, and decked herself out in borrowed plumes! The Bible, as God's own commentary on his works, throws a flood of light on the constitution of Nature, and on the course of Providence: it appeals above all to the conscience, and rouses it into vigorous action; and thus, even where its heavenly origin is doubted, or its peculiar doctrines despised, it may operate powerfully in producing both a purer Ethics and a more perfect Theism, than had ever been attained to through the unaided light of nature; and on the ground of this very benefit,—a secondary and derivative result of revelation, the pride of man's reason may found an argument to shew that Natural Religion is all-sufficient, and supernatural teaching superfluous. Now that reason was recognised as a rightful inquirer, she must forthwith arrogate the functions of an arbiter, and the authority of a judge: she must deliberate on the *reasonableness* of every article of faith, and receive or reject it without reference to *authority*, whether human or Divine; and thus, instead of sitting down meekly as a scholar, she must exalt herself as a superior, and man's folly must give or deny its sanction to

the wisdom of God. This fatal principle,—so different from that of the mere right, or rather the moral duty of private judgment,—led as a necessary consequence to the rejection of the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel; for these doctrines which constitute the characteristic features and the very essence of real Christianity, are alike offensive to carnal reason, and opposed to the corrupt passions of men; they must, therefore, be discarded as “foolishness,” and those lessons of Scripture must only be retained which commend themselves to the unrenowned mind. Hence the Deism of Lord Herbert; hence the meagre heresy of Socinus; and hence also the monstrous Neology of Germany.

But this controversy also has assumed various shapes, and passed through several successive stages. Sometimes it has deified Nature and denied God—not only as the revealer of supernatural truth, but also as the creator and governor of the world; and in this form the system of Pantheism, idealistic or material, is substituted for the religion of the Bible, as in the writings of Spinoza and Comte. Sometimes it has decried reason and undermined all the principles of human belief; and in this form a withering and dreary scepticism takes the place of a simple and confiding faith, as in the writings of Montaigne and Hume. Sometimes it has attempted to establish a system of pure Theism, on the ground of natural evidence and without the aid of revelation; and in this case, a cold and lifeless form is substituted for the vital spirit of Christianity, as in the writings of Herbert of Cherbury. On this important branch of the great controversy, we possess an invaluable treatise in Dr. JOHN LELAND’S “VIEW of the principal Deistical Writers that have appeared in England in the last and present Century;” a work which states the views, and answers the objections of Herbert, Hobbes, Blount, Toland, Shaftesbury, Collins, Woolston, Tindal, Morgan, Chubb, Hume, Bolingbroke, and some other anonymous writers, and gives an account of the various answers which were published against them at the time when their writings appeared. The “Démonstrations Evangéliques” furnish a useful supplement to this important work, by making us acquainted with a considerable number of Continental writers, whose works are not so generally known in this country, and whose views, although somewhat different from those of the Protestant defenders of Christianity, are often such as to contribute both strength and ornament to the same august and noble cause.

The Deistical controversy in England had a closer connexion than may at first sight appear, with the rise and progress of Rationalism in Germany. For, whether we accept the testimony of the “Tracts for the Times,” “that the Rationalism of Germany was occasioned in good measure by the importation of

deistical books and opinions from England—books and opinions which England herself had rejected;” \* or the somewhat contradictory testimony of Dr. Pusey, “that the constant appeal to the rationality of Christianity, which led Tindal to conceive of it as a mere republication of the religion of nature, was extremely encouraged in Germany by the translation of the works of the earlier English apologists;” †—in either case a connexion is established between the two great phases of English and German infidelity; and such a connexion as proves the filiation of the one from the other. The supposed “reasonableness of Christianity” led some, in the first instance, to explain away all that was peculiar to the Gospel, or offensive to the natural mind; and when this attempt was found to be too arduous, it was succeeded by the theory of myths, which essayed to account for every fact or doctrine of Scripture on purely natural principles. The history of this portentous aberration of reason is sketched by Amand Saintes, in his “Histoire Critique de Rationalisme en Allemagne;” ‡ and its leading principles are well discussed in the “Etudes Critiques sur le Rationalisme Contemporain,” par L’ABBÉ H. DE VALROGER. § In its earlier development it is illustrated by Mr. Rose and Dr. Pusey; in its latest it is embodied in Strauss’s *Leben Jesu*, which has been answered by Neander, Tholuck, and others, a specimen of whose arguments is given in Dr. Beard’s “Voice of the Church.”

We have thus briefly sketched the outline of a comprehensive course of study in the department of Christian apologetics; and we think that some such arrangement of the various topics of that complex theme as we have ventured to indicate might be adopted with great practical advantage. Before leaving the subject we may add, that besides the “Discours Historique et Critique,” by the Abbé Houteville, to which we have already referred, the history of apologetic literature has been written in German by *Tschirner*, (*Geschichte der Apologetik*;) that Dr. Gerard of Aberdeen has exhibited a succinct but comprehensive “View of the Controversy concerning the Truth of Christianity,” in his *Compend of the Evidences*; and that the student will find an excellent guide in the “*Delectus Argumentorum et Syllabus Scriptorum qui Veritatem Religionis Christianæ adversus Atheos, Epicureos, Deistos, seu Naturalistos, Idololatros, Judæos, et Muhammedanos lucubrationibus suis asseruerunt*,” by J. A. Fabricius.

The voluminous, and in some respects valuable work, whose title stands at the head of our Article, has not been framed according to the method which we have described. The editor,

\* Tracts for the Times, No. 57, p. 8.

‡ Paris, 1841.

† Dr. Pusey on the Theology of Germany.

§ Paris, 1846, pp. 912. 8vo.

following no other order of arrangement than that of mere chronological succession, and guided in his selection of the treatises which should be inserted simply by his own views, or by the advice which he received from others, in regard to what might be best suited to the wants or tastes of the present age, has presented to the public a translation of a large number of volumes and tracts, generally well executed, and often accompanied with valuable literary notices, both of the authors by whom they were severally written, and of the various discussions to which they gave rise. The work, however, can only be regarded as a store-house of materials for the construction of a system of apologetics—a store-house which is peculiarly rich and full in the department of the more modern Continental treatises, but comparatively meagre in that of the earlier apologists. The plan of publishing the entire treatise, in every instance, which is generally followed, cannot be too highly commended; and we are only the more confirmed in this opinion by several instances in which the editor has departed from it, as in the case of Montaigne, Boyle, and Nicole. The editor and his accomplished associates deserve our thanks for the intellectual banquet which they have prepared for us; the viands are so good, and at the same time, as we are assured, *so very cheap*, that they might have been safely left to commend themselves; and surely it could scarcely be necessary to introduce such a work to the only class of readers who are at all likely to relish it, by the following astounding *gasconade*—"Nous ne craignons pas de dire de cette publication qu'elle est, sans contredit, sur la vérité du Christianisme en général, et du Catholicisme en particulier, l'ouvrage le plus fort qui existe dans le monde entier." "Nous ne craignons pas d'avancer que celui qui posséderait bien nos *Démonstrations*, pourrait à bon droit faire dire de lui à tout adversaire, *Timeo unius libri virum*; et si, dans nos temps de scepticisme, de doute et d'indifférence, quelqu'un, laïque ou prêtre, se trouvoit condamné à n'avoir qu'un seul ouvrage en sa possession, nous lui conseillerions volontiers de donner, après les saints livres, la préférence à nos *Démonstrations*!"

The work thus highly extolled is liable, in our opinion, to at least one very grave and serious objection. It is avowedly a defence of Christianity in general, and of Catholicism in particular; and hence, while the writings of Bacon, Grotius, Boyle, Locke, Burnet, Leslie, Clarke, Tillotson, Sherlock, Leland, Chalmers, Keith, and many other Protestants, are laid under contribution for the general defence of Christianity, those of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Fénelon, Bergier, Gerdil, and above all, of Wiseman, are added not only in defence of the same cause, but also in support of the peculiar doctrines and claims of the Church

of Rome, which the former class of writers would have indignantly denounced as flagrant corruptions of "the faith once delivered to the saints." We do not accuse the editor or his associates of *mala fides* in this, for the plan of the work is boldly announced at the outset, and we are frankly told that the writers have been purposely selected, on the principle of providing for two distinct objects:—That "the one half of them might demonstrate Christianity, in opposition to doubters and infidels of all sorts, and the other half might compel all heretics to rush into the arms of Catholicism as their only safe resting-place. Nor are we prepared to say that every allusion to the distinctive principles of the Church to which the writer belongs is forbidden by the laws of legitimate controversy. But we do most seriously protest against any attempt to make Christianity responsible for the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, or to throw the *onus* of defending the spiritual and temporal supremacy of the Pope, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the worship of saints and images, on her apologists. We hold that these doctrines and rites constitute no part of genuine Christianity; and we know of nothing more fraught with danger to the sacred cause, than any attempt to mix them up with the faith which we are concerned to defend. What can be more revolting to reason, or more inconsistent with the testimony of our very senses, than the figment of Transubstantiation? or what better fitted to strengthen the prejudices of worldly men against religion, as if it were the product of mere priestcraft, than the arrogant pretensions of the Pope and his hierarchy? And what more grievous stumbling-block to the surviving representatives of God's ancient people than the apparent idolatry of the Church of Rome? Yet all these obnoxious tenets and observances are blended in this work with the great truths of natural and revealed religion, and placed, in point of evidence and authority, precisely on the same level; as if Christianity could not exist or could not at least be proved without the recognition of what every Protestant abhors and abjures: and this, too, while the Christianity of Bacon, and Locke, and other Protestants, is largely insisted on, and their writings are laid under contribution in aid of the sacred cause. There is in our mind a manifest and glaring inconsistency in the procedure of the learned Abbé and his assistants in this matter. We have, on the one hand, a formal recognition of the personal Christianity of such Protestant writers as Bacon, Boyle, Grotius, Newton, and Clarke; and yet we have, on the other, an equally explicit denial of their claim to be regarded as members of the one true Catholic Church. They were Christians, and sincere Christians too; nay, they were able and valiant defenders of the common faith of Christendom, inasmuch that even the Papacy

itself has not scorned their aid in constructing a body of apologetic theology : but they were Protestants, and as such separated from the pale of that Church which claims a monopoly of salvation. They "were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenant of promise." Surely the learned Abbé must see that, if real personal Christianity may exist in a state of separation from the Church of Rome, the exclusive claims and arrogant pretensions of that Church are not a little preposterous. And yet, while it is admitted that Bacon was profoundly versed in the knowledge of Scripture, and that it was a delightful task to collect the fragments which serve to shew the profound religion of that great man, (*la religion profonde de ce grand homme,*) while the personal piety of Boyle, Newton, Stanhope, and many more, is explicitly declared, we are nevertheless assured that they had no part nor lot in the Church on earth, and could have no hope of being admitted into the Church in heaven! GROTIUS had said towards the close of his great work—that he would now shew in a few words to Christians, of whatever nation or sect, what use they should make of the truths which had been established : and this truly liberal and catholic recognition of true Christianity wherever it exists is immediately followed up by a note breathing the unchangeable spirit of Popery. "C'est une erreur de croire qu'il y ait d'autres vrais Chrétiens ni d'autres domestiques de la foi, que les fidèles qui sont dans le sein de l'Eglise Catholique ; ceux qui s'en sont séparés, ceux qui forment ces sectes, qui toutes divisées entre elles, ne s'accordent que pour s'élever contre l'Eglise Romaine, la seule véritable,—tous ceux-là ne sont point enfants de l'Eglise : comme ils ne reconnaissent point celle-ci pour leur Mère sur la terre, ils ne doivent point espérer d'avoir Dieu pour Père dans le ciel. L'Eglise est l'Arche hors laquelle il n'y a point de salut !" We had thought that all true Christians belong to the true Church here, and might hope for admission into the Church above ; but no ; the Christianity of Bacon and Boyle is admitted, nevertheless they were Protestants, and as Protestants they must be excluded. And yet occasionally we discover some traces of a natural relenting—some indications of a certain degree of indecision. They are once called "*nos frères séparés ;*" and the definition of the Church is sometimes made wide enough to embrace all in every place who profess to believe in Jesus Christ, and who observe the ordinances of his house.

We cannot of course attempt, within our assigned limits, to offer a detailed criticism on the various treatises, extending, as we are told, to somewhere about 150 octavo volumes, which are comprised in sixteen folios, closely printed in double columns ; but, on a general survey of their contents, we have collected a

few *notabilia* which may serve to illustrate at once the general plan of the work, and the method in which it is executed.

The selections from the writings of TERTULLIAN, which form the first article in the series, are sufficient to indicate the twofold object which the editor has kept steadily in view throughout—his one object being the defence of Christianity in general, he has given Tertullian's APOLOGY against the Gentiles, and his other object being the defence of Catholicism in particular, he has added Tertullian's Treatise "*De Præscriptionibus Hæreticorum.*" This "unique argument des Præscriptions," is said to be vastly effectual, and it certainly is *very convenient* : it is described as "a peremptory exception which the defendant is entitled to take against the assailant, and by which the latter is non-suited, owing to the absence of a title to plead, without entering at all into the consideration of his reasons or his method." And with this formidable weapon Tertullian is said to have vanquished all the sects that were hostile to the Church, "*without refuting any of their arguments—without even examining any of their doctrines.*" Why then did Tertullian publish his Apology ? why did he enter on a formal refutation of the errors of Marcion ? why did he argue and redargue as if everything depended on the strength of his proofs ? and why do his Popish Translators reproduce his arguments in defence of Christianity at the present day ? Surely if *Prescription* had already taken place while he lived, and were sufficient of itself to bar all pleas whether of infidels or of heretics, it must have been confirmed by the lapse of 1600 years ; and yet even the Church of Rome will not leave the cause to rest upon it ; she eagerly lays hold of every subsidiary prop which reason may furnish, and does not disdain even to accept the aid of Leland, and Chalmers, and Keith.

We gladly accept the version of Origen's reply to Celsus, and the two great works of Eusebius—the latter being still a desideratum in our own language. The treatise selected from the writings of Augustine is too brief to afford an adequate representation of the apologetics of the author of "*The City of God.*" In these cases the rule of translating the entire treatise has been adhered to, but we are now introduced to a class of writings which are presented only in fragments, and these fragments are selected and arranged without any intelligible principle other than the mere taste of the translator. Thus, after a long disquisition, entitled, "*The Christianity of Montaigne,*" in which the philosophical sceptic is declared to have been a sound believer and a true Catholic, nay, all but inspired, if we can believe his enthusiastic panegyrist, who does not scruple to say, "*L'Esprit de Dieu semblait dicter, et Montaigne tenir la plume,*" we are presented with a long series of extracts from the Natural Theo-



logy of Raymond de Sebonde, accompanied with a corresponding series of extracts from Montaigne's Essays, and these are strung together without any discernible principle of connexion.

Next in order comes the immortal BACON; and we are gratified to find that, although not a Catholic, he is recognised as a Christian, while his great merits as the Father of Inductive Science are frankly acknowledged. In a preliminary discourse, containing some interesting literary notices illustrative of the opinions which have been entertained of the Baconian philosophy on the Continent, and especially in France, the translator confesses, that, in common with many writers of the Romish Church, he entertained a very natural prejudice against Bacon on account of the encomiums which had been pronounced upon him by the Encyclopædists and other enemies of Christianity; but adds, that this prejudice was entirely dissipated by a careful study of his writings, and gave place to a sentiment of profound admiration, not only of his genius, but of his piety. It is not a little strange that, when Romish writers abroad are beginning to appreciate the religious spirit of Bacon, some liberals in our own country have not scrupled to hint at the Atheistic tendency of his system, and have even had the effrontery to affirm, that his professed belief in God was a necessary expedient for retaining his Chancellorship!\* The revolting imputations of Atkinson and Martineau are similar to those which were long since broached by the author of the Analysis of Bacon's Philosophy, published in 1755, by which he was for the most part known in France: and they are answered by anticipation in this preliminary discourse.

Thus far we are indebted to our French neighbours for the vindication of our illustrious countryman: but we cannot approve of the manner in which they have exhibited his views by means of *garbled extracts*, nor of the use which they have sometimes made of his remarks on disputed points of doctrine. Thus, we are told that Bacon was a Protestant, but that in his confession of faith there is nothing that might not be assented to by a member of the Romish Church. This *might* have been perfectly true; for the Romish Church having added the creed of Pope Pius to the articles of the earlier creeds, a Protestant who *ex animo* believes in the latter, might possibly construct a confession from which a Roman Catholic need not dissent: but we greatly doubt whether a staunch Romanist could, consistently with his belief in the decisions of the Council of Trent, subscribe the noble testimony of Bacon, when he says, "that the Church hath no power over the Scriptures, to teach or command any

\* "Letters on the Laws of Man's Nature and Development," by H. G. Atkinson, Esq., and Harriet Martineau. London, 1851. Pp. 174, 182, 220, 265.

thing contrary to the written Word, but is as the ark wherein the tables of the first testament were kept and preserved; that is to say, the Church hath only the custody and delivery over of the Scriptures committed unto the same; together with the interpretation of them, but *such only as is conceived from themselves.*" We are told again, that Bacon always speaks respectfully of the Pope: that if he opposed the temporal power of the Romish See, he did so only as the defenders of the Gallican liberties have done; and that he often praised the writings of the scholastic divines. Let Bacon speak for himself.\* "It was great blasphemy, when the devil said, '*I will ascend and be like the Highest;*' but it is greater blasphemy to personate God, and bring him in saying, '*I will descend and be like the prince of darkness.*'† And what is it better to make the cause of religion descend to the cruel and miserable actions of murdering princes, butchery of people, and subversion of states and governments. Surely this is to bring down the Holy Ghost, instead of the likeness of a dove, in the shape of a vulture or raven; and to set, out of the bark of a Christian Church, a flag of a bark of pirates and assassins. Therefore it is most necessary that the Church by doctrine and decree, princes by their sword, and all learnings, both christian and moral, as by their mercury rod, do damn and send to hell for ever those facts and opinions tending to the support of the same, as hath been already in good part done." In another place,‡ he speaks of the Reformation in these terms: "The purity of Religion, which is a benefit inestimable, and was in the time of all former princes, until the days of her Majesty's father of famous memory, unheard of. Out of which purity of religion have since ensued, beside the principal effect of the true knowledge and worship of God, three points of great consequence to the civil state. One, the stay of a mighty treasure within the realm, which in foretimes was drawn forth to Rome. Another, the dispersion and distribution of those revenues, amounting to a third part of the land of the realm, and that of the goodliest and the richest sort, which heretofore was unprofitably spent in monasteries, into such hands as by whom the realm receiveth, at this day, service and strength, and many great houses have been set up and augmented. The third, the managing and enfranchising of the regal dignity from the recognition of a *foreign superior!*" And in answer to the favourite argument of Papists founded on the existence of sects and divisions in the Protestant Church, he says, "that the Church of God hath been in all ages subject to contentions and schisms: the tares were not sown but where the wheat was sown

\* Bacon's Works, II. 487. † *Ibid.* II. 260. ‡ *Ibid.* III. 54, 59.  
VOL. XV. NO. XXX. 2 A

before. Our Saviour Christ delivered it for an ill note to have outward peace." "And reason teacheth us, that *in ignorance and implied belief it is easy to agree, as colours agree in the dark*; or if any country decline into Atheism, the controversies wax dainty, because men do think religion scarce worth the falling out for; so as it is *weak divinity to account controversies an ill sign in the Church*." Bacon's Protestantism can scarcely be questioned after reading these explicit testimonies: but by a peculiar sort of management, which has often been resorted to by Popish controversialists, his writings may be garbled, and the reader may be misled by partial quotations. We have some amusing instances of this in the compilation of M. Emery. He translates a large portion of "The Characters of a believing Christian, in paradoxes and seeming contradictions:"\* but on comparing the translation with the original, we find that the first *four* paragraphs are entirely omitted; that the fifth is in one important respect mistranslated; for Bacon's words, "He believes God accepts him in these services wherein he is able to find many faults," are rendered thus—"il croit que des actions où Dieu peut lui reprocher bien des fautes, *servent à sa justification*;"†—that the *sixth* is added with some alterations to the fifth; that the *seventh* is abbreviated; that the *eleventh* and *thirteenth* are omitted—the latter for this good reason apparently, that it condemns the worship of angels; and this is only a specimen of the mode in which several works are given which are described on the general title-page as "reproduites INTEGRALEMENT, non par extraits." Bacon's "Advertisement touching the Controversies of the Church of England," is given only in part, and that too in detached fragments: and his noble introduction, in which he expressly contrasts the controversies which Protestants have waged among themselves, with the more vital questions between them and the Church of Rome, is entirely suppressed.

In connexion with the illustrious BACON, we cannot refrain from referring to the treatment which another of our most distinguished countrymen has received at the hand of the editor and his associates—we mean the truly excellent and amiable ROBERT BOYLE. Of all his admirable treatises one only is given in this voluminous collection, viz., his "Dissertation on the profound reverence which is due to God;" and while his enlightened zeal for the cause of revealed religion is explicitly acknowledged, the truly Catholic spirit which prompted him to found the noble Lectureship which bears his name, and which dictated the terms of his bequest, is so ill appreciated by his Romish commentators, that they affect to find in it a proof of

the inherent weakness of Protestantism, or at least of his want of confidence in its stability. For *several times*, in different parts of the work, we have the same miserably low-minded estimate of the motives which induced that truly noble man to found a lectureship on "the truths of the *Christian religion in general*, which should *not* enter on the discussion of those controversies by which Christians were divided among themselves." Thus in the *fourth* volume of the "Démonstrations Évangéliques," after quoting the terms of the bequest, as providing "pour un certain nombre de sermons qu'on doit prêcher toutes les années sur les vérités de la Religion Chrétienne en général, sans entrer dans les disputes particulières qui divisent les Chrétiens," the writer adds, "*il sentait que la secte qu'il professait ne gagnerait rien à cette discussion*." And again in the *sixth* volume, "on aperçoit facilement, d'après la disposition qu'on vient de lire, que le testateur, *intimement convaincu de la faiblesse des sectes Protestantes*, craignit de les détruire toutes, et la sienne en particulier, en les mettant aux prises, et jugea à propos, pour éviter ce danger, de s'attacher à la défense du Christianisme en général." (!) Surely it might have occurred to the mind of any candid Catholic that the defence of Christianity is one thing, and the defence of any particular denomination of Christians another; and that to such a lofty and comprehensive mind as that of Robert Boyle it might seem to be expedient to unite all the churches of Christendom in defence of their common cause, by excluding from his lectureship everything that might tend to revive unnecessarily the points of comparatively minor moment on which they differed among themselves. And, strange to say, this more liberal view of the matter is given by the French translator of Samuel Clarke's Demonstration, which is inserted in the *fifth* volume of the "Démonstrations;" for, notwithstanding their common connexion with the Romish Church, and the vigilant editorial supervision of Abbé Migne, the translators are not always found to be of the same mind. After narrating the terms of the bequest, it is added, "*il fit plus, car il prit soin de marquer en général le sujet sur lequel il entendait que cette lecture roulât. Il interdit à ceux qui entreraient dans la carrière qu'il ouvrait la controverse contre les sectes particulières qui partagent le Christianisme. Il y a tout lieu de croire que les sages réflexions que cet habile homme avait faites sur la manie de prédicateurs qui, dans presque tous les pays, s'acharnent sur des disputes de néant, pendant qu'ils négligent les matières les plus importantes; il y a, dis-je, tout lieu de croire que ces réflexions ont produit la cause de son codicille qui restreint la lecture en question aux vérités générales et aux principes de la foi*." . . . "Il ordonna en un mot que cette

\* Bacon, II. 494. Démonstrations Évangél., II. 712, 789.

† *Ibid.*, II. 500. Démonstrations Évangél., II. 713, 902.



lecture fût toute employée à mettre en évidence les preuves de la vérité de la Religion Chrétienne, et à les défendre contre les attaques des infidèles, notoirement tels, comme sont les Athées, les Déistes, les Païens, les Juifs, et les Mahométans, *sans toucher aux controverses* que les diverses Sociétés de Chrétiens ont les unes avec les autres." The plan of the "Démonstrations Evangéliques" proceeds on a different principle; it attempts to combine the defence of Christianity with the vindication of Popery, and is as much directed against the Protestant as against the infidel cause. We think that M. Abbé Migne had done well to imitate the example of Robert Boyle, and that, in doing so, he would have shewn more of a truly Catholic spirit, and less of a narrow sectarian bigotry.

On the whole, this collection of "Démonstrations Evangéliques," although far from being either complete or in all respects unexceptionable, is a valuable contribution to sacred literature. It offers, at a cheap rate, and in a commodious form, a French version of some standard works; and did it contain nothing else than the massive treatises of Origen, Eusebius, and Huet, it might be accepted with gratitude by every student of Apologetics. But it contains much more. It places before the English reader many treatises well known on the Continent, but hitherto almost inaccessible to ourselves, which possess a high value, both in a literary and theological point of view: such as, the comprehensive work of Statler on the "Certainty of the Christian Religion;" the "Historic Proof," by Beauzée; the "Philosophy of Religion," by the Abbé Para du Phanjas; and the Poems of Cardinal de Bernis and of Cardinal Polignac, ("La Religion Vengée" and "Anti-Lucretius,") and some others, which have hitherto been comparatively little known to the English reader. And we cannot help thinking that it may be salutary to our Continental neighbours themselves to be made acquainted with some of the standard works of our great English apologists: and that the translations of such treatises as those of Clarke, Lesley, Stanhope, West, Bentley, Littleton, Warburton, Chalmers, and Keith, may lead some at least of the more candid Churchmen of Rome to concur with the distinguished Abbé Guenée in saying, "Rendons justice à la nation Anglaise, quoique maintenant notre ennemie. Il est glorieux pour elle que la religion Chrétienne y trouve des défenseurs si zélés parmi ceux qui y occupent les premiers rangs dans la littérature, et les plus hautes places dans l'Etat. Nous accusons souvent l'Angleterre comme la source de l'incrédulité parmi nous: et de son côté, elle nous rend bien ce reproche; mais, *il faut l'avouer*, si l'on ne saurait nier que la religion n'ait été souvent et vivement attaquée par quelques écrivains de cette nation, elle n'a guère été nulle part plus sagement défendue."