

BARROW.

(From The Church of England Quarterly Review.)

While the air of France was nourishing the youthful intellect of Bourdaloue, there was growing up on the opposite shore a genius of even greater vigour and amplitude. Bourdaloue was born upon the 20th August, 1632; Barrow, in October, 1630. It is a curious circumstance in literary history, that the masters of sacred eloquence should have arisen, both in France and England, almost simultaneously. Flechter, Bourdaloue, and Bossuet, were only divided in their birth by intervals of two or three years; while, in our own country, we find Hall, Taylor, Barrow, South, and Sherlock, forming an unbroken chain of Christian eloquence and learning. And as we see Sherlock taking up the last link which had fallen from the hand of a mightier master in Israel, so in France, Massillon, born in 1663, replaced, with a very different kind of rhetoric, the majestic declamation of Bossuet. In England, our most famous satirist and our most glorious poet, appeared soon after each other. Milton was born in 1608; Dryden in 1631. In France, Corneille, Boileau, Racine, and Moliere lived to honour and applaud each other. We might pursue this inquiry with interest to ourselves, and probably with pleasure to our readers; but we forbear, and return to Barrow.

A copy of Montaigne, with the autograph of Shakespeare, has, in our own day, almost in a literal sense, been deemed worth its weight in silver. Nor can any intellectual than those who pursue this inquisitive reader is accustomed to take in the company of an illustrious author—to trace back to its secret springs the river of golden eloquence; to refresh the eye with the diversified landscape through which it flows; to be carried, as it were, in the garden of luxuriant imagery into which he is conducted, and to behold the gradual swelling and impetuosity of the stream—these are sources of high and beautiful interest. But the personal history of an author has a still livelier charm. To travel over the glories of his mind—to think with him, to feel with him, to live with him—this is, rarely afforded, delightful. This enjoyment, however, is rarely afforded to the reader of Barrow; of his private character as a Christian or a scholar, biography has supplied very scanty notices. He belonged to the reflective literature of his age; and had derived no popularity from any alliance with the interests or the vices of the day. Those gales of popular opinion, if we may so express ourselves, which tossed about the names of many humbler contemporaries, seem very seldom to have caught up that of Barrow. He was, in truth, above his age. Nor had he thought it desirable to build up, during his life-time, that great reputation for sacred eloquence which posterity has universally assigned to him. He only published two sermons. Tillotson, whom he had known when a student of Clare Hall, was to present them to the public, and to construct out of those precious mines his own softer and more flowing system of rhetoric.

One particular circumstance, however, of his history has been fortunately recorded, and ought to be had in perpetual remembrance. Barrow was what is commonly called a dull boy; and his father's prayer, that if God would take any one of his children he hoped it might be Isaac, has descended to posterity as a striking instance of parental delusion. The father of Barrow has not been without successors. The youthful character of Sheridan is mentioned as being, but an anecdote which has been related of Thomas Watson, an ingenious historian of our poetry, may not be in the recollection of some of our readers. Thomas, accompanied by his brother Joseph, the accomplished friend of Young, was walking with his father in the neighbourhood of Windsor. The surrounding scenery, and the solemn and animating associations of the place, appeared to produce no effect upon the boy; "There goes Thomas," said the sorrowful father, "caring for none of these things;" yet that very Thomas Watson was to become, in a few years, one of the most elegant writers of his age; and to entertain, throughout his life, the most ardent attachment to every ancient castle and decoration of chivalry, and to the most romantic solitude of learning. So it was with the child Barrow. Isaac soon began to dispute among the Doctors; and it ought to be considered to be the glory of his life, that he continued, during so many years, disputing and preaching in the temple, and labouring in the service of his DIVINE MASTER. Barrow was not always understood or appreciated. Happening upon one occasion to preach for Dr. Wilkins, at the Old Jewry, the congregation, started by his uncounted and shabby appearance, who had justly quitted the church before he had commenced his sermon, leaving only two or three persons behind, of whom the famous Baxter was one. At another time, when he was preaching in Westminster Abbey, the officers of the church impatiently played him down with the organ, and the orator was obliged to yield to the superior lungs of the instrument. Even within academic walls, his elaborate argument weighed upon his hearers, who seemed to drag, at each remove, "a lengthening chain." To write sermons formed the employment of Barrow during a considerable period of his life. He was accustomed to copy out, with great diligence, passages from Demosthenes and Chrysostom; and the frequency of his transcriptions is attested by the manuscripts themselves. Hence, that pregnancy of thought, which lends so much value to his works; and which induced Warburton to say, that when he read Barrow he was obliged to think. In the library of Trinity College are preserved thirteen volumes of Barrow's works, in manuscript, partly original and partly published. Here may be seen the first elements of his admirable creations; and here, too, may be admired his industrious collection of extracts from Demosthenes, Eschines, Plutarch, Cicero, and the Fathers of the Church. Of his preparation for the pulpit, a characteristic anecdote has been told. "We were once going from Salisbury to London," writes Dr. Pope, "he in the coach with the Bishop and I on horse-back; as he was entering the coach, I perceived his pockets sticking out nearly half a foot, and said to him, 'What have you got in your pockets?' He replied, 'Sermons,' 'Sermons,' said I, 'give them to me, and my boy shall carry them in his portmanteau, and ease you of this luggage.' 'But,' said he, 'suppose your boy should be robbed.' 'That's pleasant,' said I, 'do you think there are persons passing on the road for sermons?' 'Why, what have you,' said he, 'it may be five or six guineas; I hold my sermons at a greater value, for they cost me much pains and time.' 'Well then,' said I, 'if you'll secure my five or six guineas against lay padders, I'll secure your sermons against ecclesiastical highwaymen.' This was agreed; he emptied his pockets, and filled my portmanteau with his divinity, and we had the good fortune to come safe to our journey's end, and to bring both our treasures to London."

The inquiring spirit of Barrow swept over every field of literature; and even the light epigrammatists—the painted butterfly of literature—were not thought unworthy of his gaze. His favourite writers in the classic school were Sophocles, Demosthenes, Aristotle, and, in a later age, Virgil; and according to Dr. Pope, he preferred Ovid to Virgil; and we have the confirmation of that statement from his own pen. In a Latin speech delivered at Trinity College, he pronounces a glowing eulogy upon the elegiac poet, whose verses he declared to be beyond the reach of art; of a milky sweetness, of a graceful purity of language, and in an equal heat and vigour of invention. Ovid had been, in one or two instances, a fortunate author. He was admired and loved by Milton, and in modern times obtained the applause, and satiated the refined and critical judgment of Fox. He deserves a large portion, at least, of this praise; but the general voice of criticism has not been so friendly to his claims. No writer who has attained so lofty a seat in the Temple of Poetry, has received fewer offerings of homage. It is only at long intervals that any incense burns before his shrine, or any lamp is held over the darkness of his tomb. The serene majesty of Virgil has overshadowed him; and the rich and variegated fret-work, so to speak of his fancy, his images of silver, and his beautiful paintings from mythology, have been neglected and despised. Yet there is a picturesque happiness in his groupings, an art in his composition, and, above all, a rich brilliancy in his colouring, that time neither destroys nor even obscures. That Barrow, who called poetry ingenious nonsense, should have been enamoured of Ovid, is not more singular than numerous other anomalies in the intellectual character. Milton preferred Euripides to either of his rivals on the Athenian stage. Moliere thought that his own genius lay in tragedy. It is curious to find Burke sharing the partiality of Milton, and pursuing, with peculiar feelings of pleasure, the aphoristic wisdom of Euripides.

And as the Apostle might, and ought, so in fact 'tis plain that he did delegate that power, which they had of governing the Church, and of ordaining, to single persons. This authority St Paul did commit to Timothy, who was ordained by him. The Apostle teaches him how he was to behave himself in the exercise of that function; that he was to lay his hands suddenly on no man, (1 Tim. v. 22); that against an Elder he should not receive an accusation, but before two or three witnesses, (1 Tim. v. 19); that he should do nothing by partiality, (1 Tim. v. 21.)—All which admonitions were in vain given by the Apostle to Timothy, unless he had received from him a power of ordaining, of hearing accusations brought against presbyters, and of judging in ecclesiastical cases. The same power Titus had delegated to him in Crete by the same Apostle, as is evident from St. Paul's Epistle to him, wherein he tells him, that for this cause he had left him in Crete that he should set in order the things that were wanting, and ordain Elders in every city, as he had appointed him. (Tit. i. 5.) Where we find that Titus, a single person, did receive from St. Paul, a single Apostle, all that power which was granted to the Apostles themselves in the government of the Church, to wit, the power of setting in order what things were defective in the Church, and of ordaining presbyters in every city; to which two heads all ecclesiastical authority may be reduced. Certain it is therefore that this authority was by the Apostle transmitted severally to two single persons, Timothy and Titus; but we never read in any of the apostolical writings, that St. Paul, or any other Apostle, did ever commit the same authority to any body or assembly of men. And if Timothy in Asia, and Titus in Crete, had that authority committed to them severally, we may fairly conclude, that the same authority was by the Apostles in other Churches, committed to single persons every where.—For besides that reason required, that they should give it as they had received it, it cannot be doubted, but that the Apostles modelled all the Churches after the same manner. Uniformity was what they aimed at, and to preserve that, what they ordained in one, that they ordained in all the Churches. And therefore from St. Paul's conveyance of the Apostolical or Episcopal authority to Timothy and Titus, single persons, this conclusion seems fairly and rightly deduced, that it was the will of the Apostles, and the command of Christ, that the power of ordaining, and of administering the government of the Church, should reside in one single person in each City or Church, who was thereby made the President or Bishop thereof.

MATRIMONY.

(From Dr. Hool's Church Dictionary.)

Of these three illustrious preachers [Bourdaloue, Barrow, and Massillon] whom shall we prefer: to which is the crown of eloquence to be awarded? We are not of course referring to their doctrine, for there doubt ceases to have any place; and the elaborate jesuitism of Bourdaloue, and the harmonious sobriety of Massillon, are almost extinguished by the clear and illuminating faith of Barrow. They looked upon Christianity through a glass which the cunning finger of tradition had painted, and every object assumed, in a greater or less degree, the deception of those colours. The tints, indeed, are often beautiful, even when they are most delusive. But when we contemplate these eminent persons on the other side of eloquence, the eye is instantly drawn and detained to the commanding stature and serene physiognomy of the man; never has the sepulchre of Christ been guarded by a more majestic sentinel; never has a brighter or a keener sword repelled the foot of the apostate from the garden of sacred truth; never has a richer or a mightier voice cheered the fainting spirit of the Christian soldier. The sermons of Barrow are the glory of our Church. Taylor had more imagination—Hall had more fancy—but Barrow had most vigour. His flexible argument, woven of bits of adamant, not only crushes, but crushes an antagonist. It has vitality in every fold. Yet, tremendous as are its powers, nothing can be easier than its movements. His most surprising exhibitions of strength cost him no effort. He can balance himself upon the most perilous edges of metaphysical disquisition, and look down with an eye that never quails into the blackest depths of human nature. Of all our writers his logic is the most clear, the most vivacious.

Never, then,—let us say to the youthful student of theology—never, we beseech you, forget the name of Barrow. We would urge this devotion upon him in the language of a most eloquent admirer, who beholds in Barrow "the greatest man of our Church, that express image of its doctrines and spirit, the model without a fault, a perfect master in the art of reasoning, yet aware of the limits to which reason should be confined; nor wielding it with the authority of an angel, and now again stooping it before the deep things of God with the humility of a child; alike removed from the puritan of his own generation, and the rationalist of the generation which succeeded him; no precisian or latitudinarian; full of faith, yet free from superstition; a steadfast believer in a particular Providence, in the efficacy of human prayers, in the active influence of God's spirit, but without any of the visionary consciousness of his own corruptions of our nature, though still thinking he could discover in it some traces of God's image in ruins; and under a lively sense of the consequences of his corruptions, casting himself altogether upon God's mercy through the sufferings of a Saviour, for the consummation of that day which he desired to attain unto, when his mind purged and his eye clear, he should be permitted to behold and understand without the labour and intervention of slow and successive thought, not this our system alone, but more and more excellent things than this."

To this glowing eulogy what shall we add? A word of caution, perhaps, against the ardour of its praise—but we rather abstain. In those fields of eloquence and learning the reader cannot begin to wander too soon, nor can he wander there too long; and even though the service of the altar may not demand of him familiar acquaintance with the eloquence of the pulpit, yet in every situation in life the practical wisdom of Barrow, will be more useful to him, than the sweetest strain of philosophy that ever sounded in the Academy or the Porch. The copiousness of Barrow is almost unrivalled; and if it is always genuine and always pure; but copious as he is, he is rarely diffuse. Sometimes, indeed, we are tempted to cry out of him, as of other famous viri, iste prestat perperam quam indulgere maluisse, quod vir iste prestat perperam quam indulgere maluisse. But the feeling of disappointment subsides at the next word that falls from his lips. Once more, then—hail, and farewell! What we have said has been uttered in a spirit of love and sincerity. The writer of these pages may take to himself the words of Parr, in his character of Warburton, and say that he praises Barrow from no vain and presumptuous impulse of his own abilities, but in obedience to the fervent impulses of his own mind—a mind which that illustrious man, in the language of Parr, has enlightened, enchanted, and improved.

"His saltem accumulalem donis, et fungari inani Munere."

THE POWER OF ORDAINING VESTED IN A BISHOP, AND NOT IN A PRESBYTERY.

(From Bishop Smalridge.)

That the Apostles did transfer that sovereign power, wherewith they were invested, of governing the Church and ordaining ecclesiastical officers, not to many jointly, but to one single person in each city or church, we have very many and very good reasons to be fully assured of. For first, it is not to be doubted, but that the Apostles did communicate this power to others, after the same manner, as near as was possible, that Christ had communicated it to them. Had Christ delegated his authority, not to the Apostles severally, but to the college of them in conjunction, it had been necessary for them to have severally received, to several persons, who after they were to preside over the Church; so that as Christ alone had this authority residing in himself; as each of the Apostles had this authority derived to him from Christ; so one single Bishop in each several Church had the same sole authority entrusted with him, and was in his place and station the substitute of Christ.

Nor can it be controverted, whether Christ did delegate this power to the Apostles severally, or to all of them acting in a body. If he gave it, not to each singly, but to all jointly, they could transact nothing but when they were together; and then to be sure they would not, as we are sure they did, separate from one another in order to propagate the gospel. St. Paul saith himself, that he had the care of all the Churches, (1 Cor. xvi. 16.) and though others had the care of them as well as he, yet in taking care of them he often acted without their advice and concurrence. Taking notice of some disorders in the Church at Corinth, he promises to rectify them when he came, and therefore was not under any necessity of staying till all the Apostles met, in order to correct such abuses. In his Epistles he often gives general precepts concerning all manner of ecclesiastical discipline, to which he expects obedience without appealing to any authority, but that which he had in his own single person. From which it is manifest that the apostolical authority did rest in each Apostle; and therefore was by Christ lodged with single persons, and in conformity with Christ's institution, was by the Apostles to be derived to single persons, their successors. And if this authority was by the Apostles committed to single persons in each Church, then, whether we will call those persons Bishops, or Pastors, or Presidents, or by what other name we please, it is certain that they did preside over others in the Church, and had authority over them by apostolical, or, which is all one, by Divine right; what the Apostles did, being done by Divine guidance and direction.

And as the Apostle might, and ought, so in fact 'tis plain that he did delegate that power, which they had of governing the Church, and of ordaining, to single persons. This authority St Paul did commit to Timothy, who was ordained by him. The Apostle teaches him how he was to behave himself in the exercise of that function; that he was to lay his hands suddenly on no man, (1 Tim. v. 22); that against an Elder he should not receive an accusation, but before two or three witnesses, (1 Tim. v. 19); that he should do nothing by partiality, (1 Tim. v. 21.)—All which admonitions were in vain given by the Apostle to Timothy, unless he had received from him a power of ordaining, of hearing accusations brought against presbyters, and of judging in ecclesiastical cases. The same power Titus had delegated to him in Crete by the same Apostle, as is evident from St. Paul's Epistle to him, wherein he tells him, that for this cause he had left him in Crete that he should set in order the things that were wanting, and ordain Elders in every city, as he had appointed him. (Tit. i. 5.) Where we find that Titus, a single person, did receive from St. Paul, a single Apostle, all that power which was granted to the Apostles themselves in the government of the Church, to wit, the power of setting in order what things were defective in the Church, and of ordaining presbyters in every city; to which two heads all ecclesiastical authority may be reduced. Certain it is therefore that this authority was by the Apostle transmitted severally to two single persons, Timothy and Titus; but we never read in any of the apostolical writings, that St. Paul, or any other Apostle, did ever commit the same authority to any body or assembly of men. And if Timothy in Asia, and Titus in Crete, had that authority committed to them severally, we may fairly conclude, that the same authority was by the Apostles in other Churches, committed to single persons every where.—For besides that reason required, that they should give it as they had received it, it cannot be doubted, but that the Apostles modelled all the Churches after the same manner. Uniformity was what they aimed at, and to preserve that, what they ordained in one, that they ordained in all the Churches. And therefore from St. Paul's conveyance of the Apostolical or Episcopal authority to Timothy and Titus, single persons, this conclusion seems fairly and rightly deduced, that it was the will of the Apostles, and the command of Christ, that the power of ordaining, and of administering the government of the Church, should reside in one single person in each City or Church, who was thereby made the President or Bishop thereof.

The state in England has declared that marriage may be hereafter regarded merely as a civil contract, and as far as the effects of the law are concerned, they who contract marriage by a merely civil ceremony, will undergo no disabilities, their children will not be illegitimate, and they will themselves be regarded to all intents and purposes as man and wife. Yet although this is the case, the Church, (in this respect opposed to the state, or rather the state having placed itself in opposition to the Church,) at the very commencement of the marriage service, declares, that so many as are coupled together otherwise than God's Word doth allow, are not joined together by God, neither is their matrimony lawful,—it is not lawful, in the eyes of the God—for its legality in the eyes of the state cannot be questioned. The case is actually this,—the state says, if you choose to consider matrimony to be a civil contract, the law of the land will permit you to enter into the marriage by a civil ceremony; but the Church has not as yet been silenced, and she affirms that though the state may permit this, the Word of God instructs us otherwise, and marriage is a religious contract; therefore do not avail yourselves of the permission here given by the state.

That such is the doctrine of the Church now, must at once be admitted, and equally admitted it will be, that it was so at the Reformation of the Church of England, and before the Reformation. For the question is, was it one of those dogmas introduced in the middle ages? such as transubstantiation, praying to the saints, worshipping images, and certain other superstitions, which distinguish the Church of Rome from the Church of England. And we may answer at once in the negative, because we find allusion to the sacred nature of the marriage contract, in the writings of the very earliest Christian authors. For instance, St. Ignatius, the disciple of St. John, who was afterwards Bishop of Ephesus, and died a blessed martyr—on St. Ignatius, writing to Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, says expressly,—It becomes those who marry, and those that are given in marriage, to take this yoke upon them with the consent or direction of the bishop, that their marriage may be according to the will of God, and not their own lusts: meaning that the bishop should take care that there be no impediment of kindred or alliance, or any other lawful cause to hinder the proceeding of the said matrimony; a primitive custom still retained by us, who before marriage either obtain the bishop's license, or else before being asked, the minister is to inform the bishop if he is impeded by the law. Another early father (Tertullian) writes, How shall I sufficient say forth the happiness of the marriage, which the Church brings about by her procurement, which the Eucharist confirms, which angels report when done, and the Father ratifies."

In those days the members of the Church were in much the same situation as that in which we are ourselves now placed. The law of the land regarded marriage as a civil contract, and the Church did not annul or disallow the legality of such marriages, or solemnize them again, on the parties becoming converts,—it admitted the validity of the act when done, though it declared the invalidity of the members of the Church whenever they were married without the sacerdotal benediction. The practice for Christians to be married in the Church appears at first to have been universal, except when a Christian was unequally yoked with an unbeliever; he was then obliged to have recourse to the civil authorities, because the Church, censuring the alliance, absolutely refused to solemnize the marriage.

When the Church, in the time of Constantine, became allied with the state, and religion began to cool, (the laws were enacted, that the privilege of consecrating Christians be not to fall off from the privilege of citizenship, some for one reason and some for another, and to contract marriages according to the civil form. To correct which abuse Charles the Great enacted in the eighth century for the Western Empire, and Leo Sapiens in the tenth century for the Eastern Empire, that marriages should be celebrated in no other way except with the sacerdotal blessing and prayers, to be succeeded by the reception of the Eucharist or Lord's Supper. And this continued to be the practice in our own country until the usurpation of Cromwell, when marriage was declared to be a merely civil contract. At the Restoration of Charles the Second, marriage was again regarded as a religious ordinance, though the Church no longer insisted that the parties married should receive the communion, but contented herself with remarking in the Rubric succeeding the ordinance, that it is expedient the new married couple should receive the holy communion at the time of their marriage, or at the first opportunity after their marriage, declaring the duty, but not absolutely compelling its observance; and thus things continued till the present time. At the present time, of course, all Christians must adhere to their principle, that marriage is a religious contract, and that those marriages only are lawful, in the sight of God, which are contracted in his name, and by his ordinance. And for this acting, we have the highest authority which earth or heaven can afford, that of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ himself. When he was in the flesh, marriage was regarded by Jews and Gentiles as a mere civil contract, and that a very binding nature. He did not on this account declare the offspring of such marriages to be illegitimate;—and yet when appealed to, he assumed the fact, as one which the Scriptures plainly declared, that marriage was of divine institution (Matt. xix. 6.) The Pharisees came unto him tempting him and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? Now this was a very natural question for those to ask who considered marriage as a mere civil contract. Whenever such is the case, one of two things in process of time is found to follow—polygamy, or the allowance of frequent divorce. Men soon came to reason thus,—If marriage, and the logic is not to be gainsaid,—is merely a bargain between two parties for mutual convenience, why should not the bargain be dissolved when the convenience no longer exists, and why, if a man wishes for more wives than one, should he be prevented from having them, provided he parties making the contract

agree that the first wife shall have the pre-eminence, and her children be the heirs of the family property? It is all a matter of mere civil convenience and expediency.—The Jews thus arguing had permitted polygamy; they did possess many wives, and now they entertained the question whether these wives might not be dismissed for almost any cause whatever. The subject being much under discussion they appealed to our Lord—and how did he meet them? By arguments against the expediency of polygamy or frequent divorce? No, but by assuming at once, that according to Scripture marriage is not a mere civil but a religious contract. Have ye not read, he says, thus referring to Scripture,—that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, for this cause shall a man leave father and mother and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh.—Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh.—What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. The permission of divorce is out of the consideration of mere expediency, the ordinance is of God. If the contract were merely a civil contract, man might legislate with respect to it,—but man may not legislate for it, because it is an ordinance of God, a religious and not a mere civil contract.

And all this is the more remarkable because our Lord, in his reply to the Herodians, carefully distinguishes between the things of Caesar and the things of God, and on several occasions disclaims all intention to interfere with the civil with those things which had reference merely to him on a doubtful dispute, when the Pharisees appeal to him on a doubtful dispute, growing out of their allowance of divorce, he says not, as on another occasion, put the question aside by asking who made him a judge in such matters, but he instantly exercises his judicial authority without reservation, thereby, by that very fact, declaring that God, not Caesar, or the state, is the supreme authority, to whose tribunal the decision with respect to matrimony belongs. He pronounces the vital principle of marriage to be the making of twain one flesh, and expressly declares that it is by God's joining them together that this blending of their nature takes effect, and that the contract, once made, is on this account inviolable,—may he declares to be an exempt jurisdiction reserved by God exclusively to himself, and not to be modified, or in any respect invaded by human authority. Man's law indeed may compel male and female together, but as the Church declares, on the authority of our Lord, it is their being joined together by God, and as God's law doth allow, that in his sight makes their matrimony lawful.

Indeed the Scriptures from first to last, envelope this union with a sacred and mysterious solemnity. In the first marriage, that of Adam and Eve, God himself was the minister who officiated, even God, who by that very act, instituted the ordinance, and stamped it as a divine, and not a mere human contract. The whole proceeding, and not a mere human contract, the work of God, and under circumstances calculated to awaken the most solemn attention. As to the other creatures of his hand, they were produced by a fiat of the Almighty will, (male and female of every species,) a corporeal and instinctive adaptation to herd together, being the bounds of their perfection. But in the case of the human species, a course very far removed from this compendious process was observed: the man was first formed a splendidly gifted individual, who soon is made to feel his social wants, (by a survey of all God's creatures, and of himself,) and to express by that plaintive reference to his own comparative destitution with which the scene is now opened how desolate he was even in paradise, being alone in the garden of delights, and how hopeless was the search for a help meet for him, throughout the whole compass of hitherto animated nature. Then it is that God puts his last finish to the visible universe by his own wonderful counsel for supplying the deficiency. He takes from man's own substance the material from which his second self is to be formed, as the term employed by Moses in a technically imports, he works upon it with the skill of a profound artificer; and having framed and modelled out of it, after man's own image, softened and refined, but still retaining its divine similitude, the grace of social life, he himself brings her to him to be his bosom counsellor, and partner of his joys, (for cares and sorrows, he, as yet, had none,) knitting them together, and pouring on them the most precious benedictions. Thus, I repeat, was the first marriage solemnized by the great God himself, and even so do his ambassadors now; they,—as an ancient writer observes,—they, as the representatives of God, come forth to the persons who are to be joined together, to confirm this their sacred covenant by the offering up of holy prayers.

By the same Holy Spirit who directed this record of the first marriage to be preserved, all the Sacred Scriptures were indited, and however different parts of Scripture may be, a uniformity of principle prevails throughout. And to the sacredness of the marriage contract, therefore, frequent allusions are made. Thus, Israel is said to have been married to the Lord; and idolatry, (that is, the following of the gods of the heathen,) is represented as adultery, a breach of the covenant between God and Israel. God's reproofs to them for their infidelity are sharpened by the recollection of their marriage relation with him. The state of believers in this world is compared, by the Apostle Paul, to the time that used to elapse between the betrothing and the actual marriage among the Jews—may St. Paul goes further, he alludes to this sacred contract as a type or representation of the mysterious love of Jesus to his Church. For our Lord forsook his heavenly Father and did cleave unto our nature, becoming one flesh with us, giving to the Church his Spirit for a dowry, and Heaven for a jointure, feeding her at his table, adorning her by his grace, and protecting her by his power; and from this love of Christ to his spouse, the Church, are many converts begotten unto God, through the gospel, and born again of water and the Holy Ghost, they become heirs of glory. Thus honoured is the marriage contract, by being made an emblem of so divine and mysterious a mercy. It was indeed to hallow the rite by this application, that St. Paul wrote, since in the passage I refer to he was arguing against certain seducers, who would have disgraced Christianity by imputing to it the forbidding of its disciples to marry. He shews, on the contrary, that marriage, so far from having any discredit cast upon it by the gospel, is advanced in honour. He describes, indeed, the ministerial office to consist in espousing the Church to Christ; and St. John, in the Apocalypse, depicts the communication of all things as the marriage of the Lamb and his Wife,—the beatific union between Christ and his redeemed ones, between God and the Church, when the Church has been cleansed and sanctified, and become a glorious Church, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing.

CHRISTIANITY THE BENEFACTOR OF THE WORLD.

(From Bishop Horsley.)

Comparing the world as it now is with what it was before the promulgation of the Gospel, we shall find the manners of mankind in this respect at least improved, that they are softened. Our vices are of a more tame and gentle kind, than those of the ancient heathen world; they are disarmed of much of their malignity, by the general influence of a spirit of philanthropy, which, if it be not the same thing in principle with Christian charity (and it may indeed be different), is certainly nearly allied to it, and makes a considerable part of it in practice. The effect of this philanthropic spirit is, that the vices which are still generally harboured are sins of indulgence and refinement rather than of cruelty and barbarism—crimes of thoughtless gaiety rather than of direct premeditated malice.

To instance in particulars. We are not destitute, as the heathen were, of natural affection. No man in a Christian country would avoid the burden of a family by the exposure of his infant children. No man would think of setting the point with his intended wife, before marriage, according to the ancient practice, that the females might bear should be all exposed, and the boys only reared—however inadequate his fortune might be to the allotment of large marriage-portions to a numerous family of daughters: nor would the unnatural monster (for so we now should call him), who in a single instance should attempt to revive the practice of this exploded system of economy, escape public infamy and the vengeance of the laws. The frequency of divorce was another striking symptom, in the heathen world, of a want of natural affection, which is not found in modern manners. The crime indeed which justifies divorce is too frequent; but the hus-

band is not at liberty, as in ancient times, to repudiate the wife of his youth for any lighter cause than an offence on her part against the fundamental principle of the nuptial contract. Upon this point the laws of all Christian countries are framed in strict conformity to the rules of the Gospel, and the spirit of the primeval institution.

We are not, as the apostle says the heathen were, "full of murder." The robber, it is true, to facilitate the acquisition of his booty, or to secure himself from immediate apprehension and punishment, sometimes imbrues his hand in blood; but scenes of blood and murder make no part, as of old, of the public diversions of the people. Miserable slaves, upon occasions of general rejoicing and festivity, are not exposed to the fury of wild beasts for a show of amusement and recreation to the populace, nor engaged in mortal combat with each other upon a public stage. Such bloody sports, were they exhibited, would not draw crowds of spectators to our theatres, of every rank and sex and age. Our women of condition would have no relish for the sight: they would not be able to behold it with so much composure, as to observe and admire the skill and agility of the champions, and interest themselves in the issue of the combat: they would shriek and faint; they would not exclaim, like Roman ladies, in a rapture of delight, when the favourite gladiator struck his antagonist the fatal blow; nor with cold indifference give him the signal to despatch the prostrate suppliant. Nor would the pit applaud and shout, when the blood of the dying man, gushing from the ghastly wound, flowed upon the stage.

We are not, in the degree in which the heathen were, "unmerciful." With an exception in a single instance, [viz., that of the slave-trade, at that time not abolished,] we are milder in the use of power and authority of every sort; and the abuse of authority is now restrained by law, in cases in which the laws of ancient times allowed it.—Capital punishment is not inflicted for slight offences, nor in the most arbitrary Christian governments, is it inflicted, upon the bare order of the sovereign, without a formal accusation, trial, conviction, sentence, and warrant of execution. The lives of children and servants are no longer at the disposal of the father of the family; nor is domestic authority maintained, as formerly, by severities which the mild spirit of modern laws rarely inflict on the worst public malefactors.

In the virtues of temperance and chastity, the practice of the present world is far below the standard of Christian purity; but yet the worst excesses of modern voluptuaries seem continent and sanctity, when they are set in comparison with those unnatural debaucheries of the heathen world, which were so habitual in their manners, and made a part of even the religious rites of the politest nations. You will remember, that it is not to extenuate the sins of the present time, that I am thus exact to enumerate the particulars in which our heathen ancestors surpassed us in iniquity; I mean not to justify the ways of man, but of God. The symptoms of a gradual amendment in the world, I trust, are numerous and striking. That they are the effect of Christianity, is evident from this fact, that in all the instances which I have mentioned, the perceptible beginnings of amendment cannot be traced to an earlier epoch, than the establishment of the Christian religion in the Roman empire by Constantine; and immediately after that event they appeared. The work of God, therefore is begun, is going on, and will unquestionably be carried to its perfection. But let none imagine, that his own or the general conduct of the world is such as may endure the just judgment of God. Sins yet remain among us, which, without farther reformation and repentance, must involve nations in judgment, and individuals in perdition.

HEATHEN OBSTACLES TO THE FIRST PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

(From the Rev. H. H. Milman's Bampton Lectures.)

Conceive the Apostles of Jesus Christ, the tent-maker or the fisherman, entering as strangers into one of the splendid cities of Syria, Asia Minor, or Greece. Conceive them, I mean, as unendowed with miraculous powers, having adopted their itinerant system of teaching from human motives, and for human purposes alone. As they pass along to the remote and obscure quarter, where they expect to meet with precarious hospitality among their countrymen, they survey the strength of the established religion, which it is their avowed purpose to overthrow. Every where they behold temples, on which the utmost extravagance of expenditure has been lavished by succeeding generations; idols of the most exquisite workmanship, to which, even if the religious feeling of adoration is enfeebled, the people are strongly attached by national or local veneration. They meet processions in which the idle find perpetual occupation, the young excitement, the voluptuous a continual stimulant to their passions. They behold a priesthood numerous, sometimes wealthy; nor are these alone wedded by interest to the established faith; many of the trades, like those of the makers of silver shrines at Ephesus, are pledged to the support of that to which they owe their maintenance. They pass a magnificent theatre, on the splendour and success of which the popularity of the existing authorities mainly depends; and in which the serious exhibitions are essentially religious, the lighter as intimately connected with the indulgence of the baser passions. They behold another public building, where even worse feelings, the cruel and the sanguinary, are pampered by the animating contests of wild beasts, and of gladiators, in which they themselves may shortly play a dreadful part.

"Butcher'd to make a Roman holiday!"

Show and spectacle are the characteristic enjoyments of a whole people, and every slow and spectacle is either sacred to the religious feelings, or incentive to the lusts of the flesh; those feelings which must be entirely eradicated, those lusts which must be brought into total subjection to the law of Christ. They encounter likewise itinerant jugglers, diviners, magicians, who impose upon the credulous to excite the contempt of the enlightened; in the first case, dangerous rivals to those who should attempt to propagate a new faith by imposture and deception; in the latter, naturally tending to prejudice the mind against all miscellaneous pretensions whatever: here, like Elymas, endeavouring to outdo the signs and wonders of the Apostles, thereby throwing suspicion on all asserted supernatural agency, by the frequency and clumsiness of their delusions. They meet philosophers, frequently itinerant like themselves; or teachers of new religions, priests of Isis and Serapis, who have brought into equal discredit what might otherwise have appeared a proof of philanthropy, the performing laborious journeys at the sacrifice of personal ease and comfort for the moral and religious improvement of mankind; or at least have so accustomed the public mind to similar pretensions, as to take away every attraction from their boldness or novelty. There are also the teachers of the different mysteries, which would engross all the anxiety of the inquisitive, perhaps excite, even if they did not satisfy, the hopes of the more pure and lofty-minded. Such must have been among the obstacles which most have forced themselves on the calmer moments of the most ardent; such the overpowering difficulties of which it would be impossible to overlook the importance, or elude the force; which required no sober calculation to estimate, no laborious inquiry to discover; which met and confronted them wherever they went, and which, either in desperate presumption, or deliberate reliance on their own preternatural powers, they must have contemned and defied.

SPIRITUAL MEANING OF FORMS.

By a form, in meant some outward act or object, intended to represent an inward spiritual meaning. The king's crown is a symbol of his Supreme power. The priest's white dress, of the purity which should clothe his life. Kneeling in the form of devotion. Black is the sign of sorrow. Uncovering the head is a form of respect. The external usages of society are forms