

Such are the titles of another set of small volumes, from the same prolific source. The stories are so told that we have no doubt they will hold the attention of some who can scarcely claim a place among the ranks of juvenile readers: and the moral lessons they are intended to teach, are not only sound, but important. The Boy and the Birds will undoubtedly be a great favourite among the younger sort of our little friends.

*The Communicant's Manual*; or a series of Meditations designed to assist communicants in making Preparation for the Holy Supper. By J. J. Janeway, D.D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. pp. 219. 18mo.

From the well known character of Dr. Janeway, our readers can easily conceive what are the characteristics of this little volume. Very many pious persons, even among the more intelligent classes, find a great difficulty in conducting profitably such meditations as they may earnestly desire, in connexion with the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. Part of the difficulty is due to the want of fertility of mind, to suggest sufficiently varied and appropriate themes: but still more to the want of that mental discipline, which will enable them to keep their thoughts fixed upon a given subject, long enough to exhaust its riches. We take for granted, therefore, that very many feel the want of some assistance; and would esteem it a great privilege, to be permitted to hear an experienced Christian minister, like Dr. Janeway, *think aloud* on such occasions. This little volume contains twenty-nine different exercises; to each of which an appropriate form of prayer is appended.

*A new Token for Children*. Compiled for the Presbyterian Board of Publication. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This is a collection of twenty-six narratives, going to show the power of religious truth as exemplified in the life and death of remarkable children. We confess that upon our own mind this book produces an impression far more powerful and salutary in consequence of the conviction that we are dealing with actual facts. The interest awakened by these remarkable examples of the beauty and power of religion in moulding the character of mere children, and changing the whole aspect of their death, is absorbing to a degree that is almost painful.

1. *Old Anthony's Hints to young people to make them both cheerful and wise*. Embellished with six engravings. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.—2. *Walks of Usefulness in London and its Environs*. By the Rev. John Campbell, Kingsland, near London. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.—3. *Causes and Cure of Scepticism*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

The first of these three little books, is entertaining in its matter, and benignant and earnest in its spirit; the second is instructive and full of piety, zeal and wisdom in teaching us how to do good: and the third is a discriminating and thorough analysis of the causes, tendency and treatment of the scepticism of the human heart, enlivened by narratives of actual cases, illustrating each of the topics. It is an extract from a work attributed to the author of "Domestic Portraiture, or Leigh Richmond and his family."

*Antichrist; or the Spirit of Sect and Schism*. By John W. Nevin, President of Marshall College. New York: John S. Taylor. 1848. pp. 89.

The doctrine of this book is the doctrine of the "Mystical Presence" by the same author. Dr. Nevin's mind seems possessed with certain ideas, which are reproduced every time he puts pen to paper.

All Christians agree in regarding the person of Christ as the centre of the gospel. The answer to the question, What think ye of Christ? determines not only a man's theology, but his character. Christology, therefore, takes the first position in the Christian system. If a man reject the truth as to Christ's person, if he denies that God has come in the flesh, he is antichrist. But what does this mean? Does it mean that the eternal Son of God took upon him a true body and a reasonable soul, and so was and continues to be, God and man, in two distinct natures, and one person forever? So the church says, in all her creeds, Greek, Latin, Lutheran and Reformed. In opposition to this church doctrine, which is founded on the assumption of an essential difference between the divine and human natures, which natures the church declares to be distinct, and therefore to imply different attributes, and different activities, there is a modern doctrine, founded on the assumed identity of the divine



and human natures, and which teaches there is but one life in Christ, which life is truly and properly human. He is the ideal man. Our nature is restored and healed in him. Of his one theanthropic life all his people partake. As all men partake of the life of Adam, and therefore of his corruption, so we must partake of the life, the human life of Christ, and with that life, of the righteousness inherent in it. It is thus we are justified, sanctified and saved. The incarnation is therefore continued in the church. God is manifested in the flesh; not in Christ only as an individual, but in human nature. The commencement of this process, the constitution of Christ's person is miraculous, or supernatural, but afterward it is a natural organic historical development. His life being diffused through the church, is propagated by its grace-bearing sacraments and ministry. Hence sect and schism, separation from the church as a historical organism and organization, is separation from Christ; and anti-christ and anti-church become synonymous terms.

Such as we understand it is the doctrine of Dr. Nevin as set forth in this and his previous writings. In our number for April last, we said that this, as far as it goes, is Schleiermacher's system, a declaration, which seems to have given Dr. Nevin and his friends very unexpected and, as it seems to us, very unnecessary trouble. Prof. Schaff felt called upon to assert, for his colleague the character of an independent thinker. And Dr. Nevin himself in his review of our April number and in his preface to the present Tract, devotes no little attention to the consideration of his relation to Schleiermacher, "with whose whole system" he says, "that article has found it convenient to invest me, in the way of borrowed drapery, for the purpose of bringing my theology into discredit."

Dr. Nevin is very often much too careless in his assertions. It is not true that we charged him with "the whole of Schleiermacher's system." We took great pains to say distinctly and repeatedly that we attributed nothing to Dr. Nevin but what he had advanced in his book, that his system as far as he went was Schleiermacher's, but how far he carried it out we had no means of knowing beyond what he had furnished in his writings. It was only as to the person of Christ and the associated doctrines, that we spoke at all, and we attributed Schleier-

macher's system, even on those subjects, to Dr. Nevin, only so far as he had avowed it. We do not know what "the whole system of Schleiermacher" is. We do not know whether his system admits the existence of a personal God. We very much fear it does not. We fear he did not acknowledge any such thing as sin, and of course any such doctrines as atonement, justification, sanctification, in the scriptural and church sense of those terms. We know he denied the doctrine of the Trinity. We were therefore very careful to avoid attributing to Dr. Nevin, whom we regarded as a friend and as a Christian brother, one iota more of Schleiermacher's system than we found plainly avowed in his work on the Mystical Presence.

Neither Professor Schaff nor Dr. Nevin, though exhibiting such undue sensitiveness on this subject, pretends to question the correctness of our representation. They do not deny that every one of the ideas brought out in our review as constituting the system of doctrine taught in the "Mystical Presence," belongs to Schleiermacher's system. There is not a thought in that book nor in this, of any consequence; not an idea which gives any character or form to the doctrine taught, which is not to be found in the writings of Schleiermacher and his acknowledged followers. What we have said therefore is undeniably true. Dr. Nevin's system, as far as he goes, is Schleiermacher's system. In this there is nothing derogatory to our author. The character of such men as Lücke, Ullman, Dorner, &c., for scholarship or independence, is not impugned by those of their countrymen, who speak of them as disciples of Schleiermacher. No man feels himself insulted by being called a Calvinist. Nay, we were not much disturbed by Professor Schaff's informing his readers that our review of Bushnell's Christian Nurture was taken substantially from Dr. Nevin's strictures of the same book; nor did we feel called upon to defend ourselves from the charge made by both of those gentlemen, that the authorities quoted in our Review of the Mystical Presence, were taken second hand from that book itself. We should be very glad if Dr. Nevin would father both of those reviews, authorities and arguments together. We should then have a much better opinion of his theology, to say nothing of his good sense, than we have at present. We have said nothing, therefore, of Dr. Nevin's rela-



tion to Schleiermacher that is not consistent with his taking his place along side of Ullman, Dorner and other eminent men of the same class. More than this he ought not to claim or desire.

There are, however, two points as to which there is a striking contrast between those theologians and Dr. Nevin. They openly repudiate the church-doctrine as to the person of Christ. Dorner, for example, to whom Dr. Nevin refers in terms of unmeasured commendation, insists that two distinct natures in Christ of necessity suppose two activities, and two activities two persons. He discusses every attempt made by the church to save the unity of Christ's person, on the theory of a twofold nature, and endeavours to show that they all, even the Lutheran, failed. The new doctrine, therefore, is different from the old. Dr. Nevin insists that the new is the old. He is thus in an entirely false position. He lacks either the light or the courage to do as his German friends do, that is, to cast off the trammels of the old doctrine, and to teach the new as new.

Strauss says that the great majority of modern theologians, have made Schleiermacher's Christology, their own, nay, their darling and the child of their bosom. The old building with its towers and corridors, its wasteful halls and spacious apartments, he says, Schleiermacher could not undertake to repair. He therefore erected in its stead a new and modish pavilion, suited to modern tastes and modes of life. To this new building, he adds, all the inhabitants of the old, except a few old house-cats, have passed over—none of them having eyes to see that the iron and stone of the old, as mere material, is worth all the new put together. Now the trouble is, Dr. Nevin wishes to live in both these houses at the same time. He wants the eclat, the tasteful and commodious apartments of the new, and yet is unwilling to give up the security and respectability of the old. It is, however, out of the question for him to be in two places at the same time; and it is no less impossible for him to hold at once the Christology of Schleiermacher and the Christology of the church.

Again, these German theologians above referred to, hold their opinions with calmness and dignity. They believe them to be correct, and maintain that they serve to present important truths in a clearer light, and to free them from difficulties. Still they

see that it is only a new philosophy. They never denounce as heretics those who differ from them. The case is far different with Dr. Nevin. He holds these doctrines with a vehement and even fanatical spirit. No Dominic could be more denunciatory, no Pusey more exclusive. If a man does not believe in the continued incarnation of God in the church, he denies that God is come in the flesh, and is antichrist. If he does not believe that the church, as an historical organization, is instinct with the theanthropic life of Christ, which it propagates by a regular development, he does not believe in the church at all. He is a sectary and a schismatic. The professions of faith of all such men are set down as infidel cant; and their exhibitions of piety as pretended or delusive. Now all this is simply ridiculous. It is but just to say that Dr. Nevin does not get this spirit from Schleiermacher. It has much more the appearance of the working of a Hegelian leaven.

With Professor Schaff's course in this matter we have been somewhat disappointed. We had looked to him as a kind of guardian of Dr. Nevin. His work on Protestantism, in which there was such a discriminating and definite assertion of the doctrine of justification by faith and of the normal authority of scripture, as the two great principles of Protestants, led us to hope that his influence would be really conservative. His chivalry, however, has led him to throw away his own standard and to raise that of his colleague. We are sorry for it. It is a real loss, for he has too much of an English mind to allow him to think that his new doctrine is the same with his old. He is not the man to be the subject of the hallucination that he can live in two separate houses at the same time.