

THE GOSPEL TRIBUNE, AND CHRISTIAN COMMUNIONIST

A
Monthly Interdenominational Journal.

VOLUME III.]

MARCH, 1857.

[NUMBER 11.]

"ONE IS YOUR MASTER, *even* CHRIST: AND ALL YE ARE BRETHREN."

Topic for the Month.

The following Analysis of Bishop Butler's inimitable "*Analogy of Natural Religion*," was not originally intended for publication, but was written by Mr. Clark simply as an exercise, (while examining the evidences of Christianity,) the better to impress his mind with the method and argument of Butler's work. Having been favoured with a perusal of the analysis, permission to publish it in the *Tribune*, was kindly given on request being made.

In these days of rampant infidelity, it is to be hoped that this analysis, entering through the columns of the *Tribune* into many dwellings whose inmates may never have read the "*Analogy*," will create in their minds an ardent desire to equip themselves fully, with the armour of its arguments, and thereby be enabled to withstand successfully every attack of scepticism. The readers of the *Tribune* cannot be otherwise than grateful to Mr. Clark for this valuable and satisfactory digest of the Bishop's reasonings.

ANALYSIS OF BUTLER'S ANALOGY OF NATURAL RELIGION.

BY DANIEL CLARK.

The cardinal points contested between the Christian and his opposer, the infidel, are:—whether there is a futurity to man beyond the grave, or whether there is none; whether our conduct here will affect our interests there; whether God, in the management of his terrestrial affairs, in a mental and sensational point of view, does reward and punish; and if he does so, has he any rule in doing so? Does he punish and reward indiscriminately, without respect to good or evil; or does he reward the good and virtuous, and punish the evil and vicious? Whether it is reasonable to act with reference to what we are taught our state will be hereafter; and whether, granting there is a species of necessity, we should not act as free. These are the main points at issue, and, as may be plainly seen, momentous questions; because, on their right solution we build our hopes of immortality. Snatch away these anticipations, and nought that affects our weal or woe in eternity can be presented to our intellectual

or spiritual vision. This is what infidelity, in its true garb, attempts to do. It comes to man, with its insidious smiles, and says,—“There is not—there cannot be—a future state. Religion is false. The believers in it are deluded.” It clusters around this declaration many others of the same import; but this is the warp of the dark pall which it would roll around our soul—this is the envenomed shaft which it shoots to poison the heart of our divine system. Bishop Butler, in the admirable work which we are about to analyze, takes up the gauntlet against the revilers of Natural and Revealed Religion in a manner altogether unlooked for in his day. He took up a position from which it was impossible to drive him. He reasoned by analogy, or rather from analogy, yet the book has nothing of a controversial tone. He indicates the truths of Natural Religion, not by laying down any uncertain hypothesis for a foundation, and then raising “a castle in the air” upon such a presumptive basis. He did not say,—“Let us suppose such and such as a truth, and then if this be true these things will be true also.” No; that was not his *modus operandi*. He showed that those things which religion teaches are paralleled by the facts of experience; and that nature, considered as a revelation, points out—though not so fully—the very doctrines which the sceptic hoots at. He proves that the evidence is the same as that upon which we act in our temporal concerns; and that perhaps it is left in this way, that our behaviour with regard to it may be part of our probation for a future life.

I. But Butler's Analogy does not stop here, for it is clearly to be conceived that if analogical reasoning establishes, in any degree, what has been already hinted at, it can do much more by the same process. In order to understand this, let us put the question,—“What is Analogy?” Archbishop Whately says,—“It is a similarity or sameness of two relations.” We understand by this that the similarity need not be direct. Things that are equal to the same things, in any respect, are equal in these respects to each other; also, things brought in juxta-position, by comparison, may be unlike, and yet bear a like relation to some other objects, e. g. : the sun, which is the central orb of our solar system, may be called the heart of that system, from its bearing, in some degree, the same relation to its own planets that the human heart does to our physical economy. In “*Mill's Logic*” we find a more general definition of the term, for he says, that analogy may extend to every resemblance which does not amount to strict in-