

possessing
discovery
such fac-
tions. But
advanced.
principles of
ner. Her
fully and
especially
it is declar-
se unto sal-
spiration of
correction
God may be
ks." The
babes, the
thereby;"
d, which is
as well as
s than one,
y to the sa-
y inventing
vances, vari-
most absurd

thern barba-
plined races
the Church
materials of
ng her back
n to the do-
had recourse
nely, a revi-

Here, it may first be remarked, that there is proof, from the Essayist himself, to show the weakness and inaptitude of his fanciful invention of the colossal man, as the emblem or representative of the regular progressive growth of our race, in religious and moral principles and conduct. He admits this cessation of growth or rather season of decay, and that his *man* returned to *childhood*. A subsequent, and much longer, and even darker period of decline, has, in this review, already been shown. But we deny that the Church instinctively had recourse to *Judaism*, as the only means that would suit the case; and further assert that it was not the *only* suitable means for employment. What the Essayist erroneously calls, the "instinctive revival of Judaism, to suit the case of the irruptions of barbarism" was, in truth, merely the long and constant progress of Ecclesiastical corruption, and the continued development of the great and prophetically described *Antichrist*, at last matured in the form of the profane and dominant *Roman Papacy*. In regard to the means to suit that case of emergency, the employment and spiritual and faithful application of pure scriptural truth, would have been as suitable and efficacious with those northern barbarians, as it has proved among the barbarous and savage tribes of continents and islands, in subsequent periods, and in our own day.

Page 51. Treating of the Bible, he says,—“Its form is so admirably adapted to our need, that it wins from us all the reverence of a Supreme authority, and yet imposes on us no yoke of subjection. This it does by virtue of the principle of private judgment, which puts conscience between us and the Bible, making conscience the supreme interpreter, whom it may be a duty to enlighten, but whom it can never be a duty to disobey.”

This passage, as will now be shown, exhibits a jumble of inconsistent, contradictory, and absurd assertions. In a pre-