lowing solemn charge, with which the late Dr. Taylor of Norwich was wont to preface his Theological Lectures :

“ I. I do solemnly charge you, in the name of the God of Truth, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and before whose judgment-seat you must in no long time ap­pear, that in all your studies and inquiries of a religious nature, pre­sent or future, you do constantly, carefully, impartially, and consci­entiously, attend to evidence, as it lies in the Holy Scriptures, or in the nature of things, and the dictates of reason ; cautiously guarding against the sallies of imagination, and the fallacy of ill· grounded conjecture.

“ IL That you admit, embrace, or assent to no principle or senti­ment by me taught or advanced, but only so far as it shall appear to you to be supported and justified by proper evidence from revelation or the reason of things.

“ III. That if, at any time hereafter, any principle or sentiment by me taught or advanced, or by you admitted or embraced, shall, upon impartial and faithful examination, appear to you to be dubious or false, you either suspect or totally reject such principle or senti­ment.

“IV. That you keep your mind always open to evidence : That you labour to banish from your breast all prejudice, prepossession, and party-zeal : That you study to live in peace and love with all your fellow-Christians ; and that you steadily assert for yourself, and freely allow to others the unalienable rights of judgment and conscience.”

“ Bene precasse," said Luther, “est bene studuisse.”

Christian theology may be divided into *four* parts ; the first, embracing the doctrines concerning God ; the second, those concerning man ; the third, those concerning the scheme of man’s salvation through Jesus Christ ; and the fourth, those respecting the means to be used by man for the furtherance of the work of grace in his soul. The last of these relates chiefly to the constitution and duties of the Christian church, and has been already sufficiently consi­dered in this work. See Episcopacy, Indefendents, Methodists, Presbyterians, Pope, Quakers, &c. Baptism, Eucharist, &c.

Of the other three parts we shall here present our rea­ders with a concise view of the leading particulars.

Part I.—Doctrines respecting God.

Sect. I. *Of the Divine Existence.*

Iν every system of theology the first truths to be believ­ed are those which relate to the being and attributes of God. The Jewish lawgiver, therefore, who records the earliest revelations that were made to man, begins his his­tory with a display of the power and wisdom of God in the creation of the world. He does not inform his country­men, and expect them to believe, on the authority of his divine commission, that God *exists;* for he well knew that the being of God must be admitted, and just notions enter­tained of his attributes, before man can be required to pay any regard to miracles which afford the only evidence of a primary revelation. “ In the beginning,” says he, “ God created the heavens and the earth.” Here the being of God is assumed as a truth universally received ; but the sentence, short as it is, reveals another, which, as we shall afterwards shew, human reason could never have discovered.

The evidence of the Divine existence is drawn partly from the intimations of conscience within us, and partly from the marks of adaptation and design in the world around us. The conviction that, apart from any human influence whatever, we are *obliged* to do one thing and to refrain from doing another, and the accompanying sense of *responsibility* which attaches to us in regard to all parts of our conduct, lead us directly to the assurance that there exists for us an *Obliger* and a *Judge.c* So also the obvious adaptation of the world, both as a whole and in its separate parts, to certain definite and ascertainable ends, constrains us to admit the conclusion that it must be the product of some

great, wise, and powerful being, whom we call God.d Other modes of proof, such as the ontological one of Des Cartes, and Clarkes *a priori* one, have been adopted and advanced by philosophical theists, but their argumentative value is more than questionable.e

c The principal supporter of this moral proof (as it has been called) of the Divine existence, is Kant, who has urged it in se­veral of his works. See his ***Kritik der reinen Vernunft,*** s. 223 ; and his ***Krit. der Urtheilskrοft,*** s. 426. Part of the latter passage is given by Storr in his “ Biblical Theology,” (translated by S. S. Schmucker, D. D. Loud. 1839.)

d This argument is admirably developed by Paley in his Natural Theology, and fully illustrated by the authors of the Bridgewater Treatises.

e Vide Cartesii ***Meditationes de Prima Philosophia,*** Med. 3 et ***5.*** Leibnitii ***Opera Theologica,*** tom. i. p. 5, &c. ( Ed. Dutens. Genev. 1768.) Clarke’s Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God. Brougham’s Discourse on Natural Theology, p. 81, &c. Gillespie's Necessary Existence of Deity.

Sect. II. *Of the Divine Unity.*

As the marks of design in the universe convince us that it is the work of divine power, so the perfect harmony which pervades the universe evinces that that power is the property of *one* intelligence. That on this globe the seve­ral elements serve for nourishment to plants, plants to the inferior animals, and animals to man ; that the other pla­nets of our system are probably inhabited, and their inha­bitants nourished in the same or a similar manner ; that the sun is so placed as to give light and heat to all, and by the law of gravitation to bind the whole planets into one system with itself—are truths so obvious and so universally acknow­ledged, as to supersede the necessity of establishing them by proof. The fair inference therefore is, that the solar system and all its parts are under the government of *one intelligence,* which directs all its motions and all the changes which take place among its parts for some wise purposes. To suppose it under the government of two or more intel­ligences would be highly unreasonable ; for if these intel­ligences had equal power, equal wisdom, and the same de­signs, one of them would evidently be superfluous ; and if they had equal power and contrary designs, they could not be the parents of that harmony which we clearly perceive to prevail in the system.

The truth thus intimated by the harmony of nature is plainly and frequently asserted in the scriptures. The texts affirming this great and fundamental truth are almost numberless. “ Unto thee,” says Moses to his countrymen, (Deut. iv. 35 and 39 ; vi. 4), “ it was shewcd, that thou mightest know that the Lord is God ; there is *none else besides him.* Know therefore that the Lord *he is God* in *heaven above* and upon the *earth beneath ; there is none else."* And again, “ Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is *one Lord,"* or, as it is expressed in the original, “ Jehovah our God is one Jehovah,” one Being to whom existence is essential, who could not have a beginning and cannot have an end. In the prophecies of Isaiah, God is introduced as repeatedly declaring the same truth. (Isa. xiv. 5,6, 18; xliv. 8.) In perfect harmony with these declarations of Moses and the prophets, our Saviour, addressing himself to his Father, says, (John xvii. 3), “ This is life eternal, that they might know *Thee, the only true God,* and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent and St. Paul, who derived his doctrine from his divine Master, affirms, ( 1 Cor. viii. 4), that “an idol is nothing in the world ; and that there is *none other God but one.”*

The unity of the divine nature, which, from the order and harmony of the world, appears probable to human rea­son, these texts of revelation put beyond a doubt. Hence the first precept of the Jewish law, and, according to their own writers, the foundation of their whole religion, was, “ Thou shalt have none other gods before Me.” Hence, too, the reason of that strict command to Jews and Chris-