

tions, and not as matters of faith. All that is essential, for example, to Orthodoxy, in respect to the vital doctrine of Atonement is, that we should ascribe the salvation of man to something which Christ has accomplished by his incarnation and sufferings, and without which salvation would be impossible. Whether this necessity consists in the indispensableness of his death as a means of ransoming mankind from Satan, or of appeasing divine anger, or of maintaining the authority of the Lawgiver while the penitent is pardoned, or in some other principal, Orthodoxy requires only that we should believe in the necessity, and ascribe to Christ's death our salvation and the glory of it."—*New Englander*, Oct. 1845.

These instances are specimens of the entire alteration which has taken place in modern times in relation to this doctrine. There are few anywhere who maintain the theory of satisfaction in its ancient rigor. It may even be asserted that some modern Orthodox writers have gone *too far* from the ancient doctrine, and that there is a meaning and reality in it which they fail of perceiving. It would not be surprising if the Unitarian theory of the Atonement, in its further development, should accept more of the theory of Anselm than is now generally received by the graduates of the Calvinistic Theological Schools of New England.

IMMANUEL KANT CONCERNING WOMAN.

HE who first comprised all womanhood under the general denomination of the *fair sex*, might perhaps have intended nothing more than a little delicate flattery, but it was a much more correct designation than probably he had any idea of; for without considering their figure, which in general is more elegant, their features more delicate and softer, their aspect more lively and attractive in its expression of friendship, gaiety, and affability, than