

The Christian Visitor.

A FAMILY NEWSPAPER: DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

REV. I. E. BILL, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth Peace, good will toward Men." EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

GEO. W. DAY, Printer. SAINT JOHN, NEW-BRUNSWICK, WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 1855. VOL. 8.—NO. 19

The Reviewer Reviewed;

Or the Reply of the Rev. Charles Mackay to the Review of his Pamphlet on Capital Punishment by the Editor of the Morning News.

No. 4.

THE BUSINESS AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN LIFE PRODUCED AMONGST THE HEBREWS BY THIS STATUTE.

I have now proved to you the original, comprehensive ordinance unshackled, unrestricted, bold, universal, in an authoritative announcement as simple, clear, conclusive, as any command in the decalogue, with reasons as manifest, with cogency as great. I then prove to you afterwards additional particular statutes framed manifestly under the authority of this universal statute, in the legislation of a people who received this first book containing it as one of the portions of the Divine law; and this particular enactment as belonging to themselves, as one of the great families of mankind sprung from Noah;—which local statutes, though restricted to the Jews, look back to the great original statute as their fountain, and prove incontrovertibly that thus far that statute had never been repealed. I show these statutes to you couched in such terms, accompanied with such remarkable declarations as to the guilt of murder, that even in local enactments this crime has been manifestly singled out and held up to the world as an exception to all others, in admitting no reprieve or repeat in any case whatever from its assigned penalty. There are no deeper colours, in which the pencil of inspiration itself is ever dipped.

It is astonishing to mark the jealousy of the Divine Being, lest the sympathy of his fallen creatures with sin, and their mistaken pity for the murderer instead of the murdered victim, should turn the course of justice from its prescribed channel. Doubtless the Divine Legislator had observed an unwillingness to follow his supreme wisdom, a readiness to connive at crime and clear the guilty, a readiness on the part of witnesses and of judges to perjure themselves, a sympathy produced partly by family influence, partly by the clamour of demagogues, partly by infidelity, and partly by the plausible pretence of a benevolence superior to God's. For a season, these explicit statutes prevailed to check these influences, and stay the crime of murder, so that, under the administration of the Judges it was so uncommon, that the whole nation from Dan to Bersheba rose up in a complicated case, to punish it. A noble state of public opinion, and produced entirely by the salutary power of these laws. But in after times the law grew again to be neglected, and this remissness in its execution is charged against the nation, as constituting one of its greatest sins, this carelessness of human life, and this permission of bloodshed without avenging it. Your hands are full of blood, says the prophet Isaiah, unavenged blood, and therefore you may be ever so religious in your prayers, but God will not hear them.

It is described as one of the characteristics of a religious man, which shall dwell on high, that he shutteth his hands from holding bribes, and stoppeth his ears from hearing blood; will not, for one moment, listen to anything, but the execution of the Divine law upon the murderer. All this is remarkable. And all these instances are proofs of the admirable character of the Jewish code: in no nation in the world, while it was observed, had human life any sacredness or protection compared with that experienced among the Hebrews. And in the period of that nation's greatest prosperity, the feeling of such sacredness, and the sense of the Divine law, had sunk down so deep into the soul of people and king, that David, about to depart from life, could not rest, while he remembered that the crime of murder in one of his own captains had gone unpunished. He was compelled by the invisible Spirit of Law and Justice, and Humanity too, to leave it as his dying injunction to Solomon, that the blood of Amasa and Abner, whom Joab slew, should be avenged as the Divine statute directed.

THIS STATUTE REPRODUCED AND ESTABLISHED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Passing now from the argument among the Hebrews of the old dispensation, I carry you down to the period of the great re-enactment and publication of the Divine law by the Saviour, its re-promulgation under the form of love—which quality is the basis of all Divine legislation; for the restraint and punishment of vice in the vicious, grows out of love to the virtuous; and I prove to you that at that time, and all long, before and after, there were cases of capital punishment, and that the authority and power of capital punishment is held undiminished, and of divine origin and sanction. I prove to you that in the time of the apostles this power is recognized as belonging to the magistracy, so that Paul apparently almost goes out of his way to reiterate it, and to hold it up as the highest delegation of power from God to man, emanating directly from the Divine Legislator. And I show you, that so far from any appeal being taken from this law to the law of Christ, it is confirmed by the gospel; and that, so far as our blessed Lord remarked upon the Mosaic institutions, it was not to condemn them, but the rapacity, cruelty, and oppression of the Jews, abusing them, and turning their spirit of justice and love into malignity; not to repeal a single one of them, but to regulate their application. I prove to you, that even if our Lord had stricken out, with his own hand, any one of them, this would not have lessened the authority of those that remained; for till the same hand should blot them all away, no human authority should

dare to do it. So that, as long as there cannot be found the slightest reference by our Saviour to the law of death for murder; except it may be where he declares that they that take the sword shall perish by the sword, which saying, so far as it goes, is a reiteration of that law; even if he had said distinctly as to the law of retaliation by an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, it is all done away; which he never did say, but simply rebuked the spirit of private revenge making use of that law as its instrument or for its concealment; this would not have the least bearing on the penal statute for murder, either to question, restrain, limit, or repeal it. Even supposing one statute of the Divine Law repealed by its author, who dare take this example, and follow in the repeal of another, without a direct command from the Deity? This mode of reasoning is altogether presumptuous and incorrect.

The precepts of our Saviour are sometimes urged as if really the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ were contradictory. When the Saviour says, Thou shalt love thine enemies, it is the same benevolence which speaks, The murderer shall surely be put to death.—When God says, Resist not evil; Repomense to no man evil for evil; Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord; he speaks to individuals and not to the civil government; there could not be a more perfect obedience to this command, than when the avenging of the blood of a murdered man is put into the hands of the government, and God's own penalty is executed. This is God's own vengeance; this is God repaying, and not man. Your obligation to love your enemies, is no greater than your obligation to love the community. This train of thought is admirably developed by Rev. Mr. Thompson of New York. What it may be wrong for you to do as a private individual, it may be wrong for you not to do as a citizen or an officer of justice. You have no right to inflict a personal injury upon your neighbour, but to love him, though he be your enemy; even if he have murdered your own brother, you are bound to forgive him the injury yourself; but you are also bound to bring him to justice. If you are a magistrate, and your neighbour or your enemy is brought before you charged with an offence against the laws, you are bound to inflict an injury upon him, by the penalty of law, and if the crime be murder, by death. If your dwelling should be set on fire at midnight, and one of your children murdered by your enemy, the Spirit of Christ commands you to forgive him personally, but it commands you also not to shield him from the penalty of the law. The same Spirit of Christ commands you, as you love the welfare of the community, to bring this murderer to justice, to have him arrested and put in prison to receive his doom. You yourself would be an enemy to the community, if you connived at his escape.

In view of the above consecutive and irrefragable arguments and reasonings of Dr. Cheever, it will easily be seen, that the passages of Scripture cited by the Editor of the News has no bearing whatever on the subject. Some of the passages he has quoted are merely designed to regulate the feelings and conduct of Christians in their private and social intercourse with their fellow men; and others are designed to regulate their feelings and conduct towards fellow Christians with whom they may be associated in the fellowship of the Gospel as members of the same Church. We here insert the passages in order as given by our editor.

"Recompense no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men."

Again—
"Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay saith the Lord."

Again—
"Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

And again—here is something addressed to spiritual men in particular—
"Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted."

"Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ."

Again—
"For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this—Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

Again—
"And be ye kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you."

Again—
"Above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness."

Again—
"Be patient to all men."

Take now as an example of the appropriateness (1) of the above quotations to prove that the death penalty for murder is *unchristian*, the passage which our editor tells us "is something addressed to spiritual men in particular"—"Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." Now suppose we take this passage as the rule of our conduct toward the deliberate murderer we must neither execute nor imprison him, but restore him to his former position in society! On the side of our opponent the passage proves too much, and therefore proves nothing. Many a Sabbath-school scholar in this City could have informed him, that the passage is designed to teach the members of a Christian church how they are to act towards a brother Christian in

the same fellowship who, having fallen into open sin has acknowledged his fault and proved himself penitent. Such an one they are to restore to his former place in their confidence and fellowship, considering how liable they themselves are to fall before the power of sudden temptation. This passage our editor tells us "is something addressed to spiritual men in particular." The word *spiritual* he puts—as we have put it—in italics. This is designed, to mean something. Does it mean that our editor does not profess to be a *spiritual* man? If so, then, of course, he must be a *natural* man. And if he be, that sufficiently accounts for the ignorant manner in which he makes use of Scripture. For here "is something addressed to" *natural* men in particular—"The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." If, therefore, our editor be a *natural* man, they who take him as a leader in the interpretation and application of Scripture may rest assured on the Divine testimony that they are following a blind and ignorant guide. Having made the above inappropriate quotations our editor goes on to say "With these evidences before us (taking the New Testament as our guide) we are surprised, if not shocked, to think that so many Ministers of the Gospel should be advocates of the death code. But, then, it was the Chief Priests and Scribes in the days of the Redeemer who clamoured the loudest for a Saviour's blood—"Crucify him"—"Crucify him"—"Jesus rather than Barrabas." Now, this may be very good as a stroke of rhetoric, but it is very bad argument. Unfortunately for our opponent we do not profess to be in the *succession* of the *Chief Priests* in the days of our Redeemer. Query. Does our editor know the distinction that exists between a Chief Priest in the days of our Redeemer and a Minister of the Gospel now? Is he acquainted with the wide difference that exists between their respective functions? If he is, we hesitate not to say, that he is wilfully guilty of disingenuousness in thus seeking to produce a false impression on ignorant minds by making an unjustifiable attempt to identify the Minister of the Gospel of Christ with the Chief Priest and Scribes in the days of our Redeemer. We prefer rather to believe, that our editor is himself ignorant of the distinction of character, and difference of functions existing between the Chief Priests and Scribes in the days of our Redeemer and the Ministers of the Gospel of our Redeemer now; than to believe that he is guilty of disingenuousness with a wilful intention to produce a false impression on the minds of his readers.

As proof of the more humanizing teachings of the New Testament over the Old, our editor refers to our Lord's forgiveness of the adulterous woman, who under the Old Dispensation was deserving of death. Our reply is, that our Lord sent her away from his presence with an admonition to sin no more, because there was no one to condemn her. When she was first brought to him he condemned her to be put to death according to the law of Moses; for he came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it. He commanded those who brought her who were without guilt, equal to her own, to cast the first stone at her. And then stooped down and wrote on the ground, supposing—humanly speaking—that she would immediately be stoned to death. But they who heard what he said, "being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last; and Jesus was left alone and the woman standing in the midst. When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more." It would have been strange indeed, if Jesus in the character or capacity of a judge had put this woman to death with his own hands without any one to accuse her; for her accusers had all departed. Had he done it in this case, he must to have been consistent, have done it in all similar cases. And had he done so, we fear he would have had a great deal to do in the way of putting such criminals to death. We are in fact expressly informed that this woman was brought to Jesus with a view to ensure him. Those who brought her said unto him "Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? This they said, tempting him that they might have to accuse him." But our Lord showed his wisdom in the manner in which he disposed of the case without allowing himself to be ensnared. The case of this woman therefore proves nothing on the side of our Reviewer but rather the very opposite when duly considered and properly interpreted.

Our Reviewer speaks of the blood-thirsty Jews, the inhumanity and barbarism of the Mosaic code, &c. &c. Does he know what he says, and whereof he affirms? Is he aware that in speaking thus, he is presumptuously arraigning the wisdom of Deity, and uttering blasphemy? Does he not know that the Mosaic dispensation was a Theocracy—that God himself was the Sovereign and Lawgiver of the Jewish people under that Dispensation; and that Moses was only—so to speak—the Chief Magistrate whom God had appointed to see the laws which He Himself had given, faithfully carried into execution. If the Jews were blood-thirsty, it was God who commanded them to be so. If the Mosaic code was a "barbarous code," it was God Himself who made it so. But hear Dr. Cheever on

what our Reviewer designates the "barbarous code of the blood-thirsty Jews," &c. &c.

The argument from Scripture in favour of capital punishment, is plain and powerful. It is easy to distinguish between what is local and transitory on the one hand, and what is universal and permanent on the other. We do not resort to the former, but confine ourselves to the latter. We do not inquire concerning the social or civil regulations of the Hebrews, as if, because they possessed the divine sanction for themselves, therefore they are binding upon us; at the same time we may derive much instruction from their study. In looking carefully for the final causes of the local Mosaic enactments, we shall often have reason to admire their wisdom, when a superficial observer would set them down as capricious or unintelligible. Their thorough examination requires much research and discriminating observation; and it has come to be a common thing, for persons who have never made the Antiquities of Christianity in any shape the object of their study, to speak of the Mosaic code as "crude, cruel, unchristian."

Now there are four things to be remarked of this code, in its particulars.

1. The laws were not those of Moses, but of God. Jehovah himself was the Lawgiver, and Moses acted simply as his agent or minister, being in no sense himself a lawgiver, as we apply this title to men like Solon or Lycurgus. The whole code, from beginning to end, was framed by divine inspiration, and possesses the authority of the divine sanction, whether consisting of new precepts revealed for the first time from heaven, or of precepts already in existence, and permitted by the divine wisdom to stand.

2. Not one of these precepts was ever abrogated by our Saviour, but on the contrary, they were sustained and sanctioned by his own declarations and example. His own death fulfilled, and so abrogated, the Jewish dispensation; but not one of its laws was abrogated, not even of its typical and ceremonial institutes, while he was living; and as to its moral precepts, they all, as well as the final causes of them, were to endure not merely to the time of his crucifixion, when he should say, It is finished; but till heaven and earth should pass away, not one jot or tittle was to be repealed, till all should be fulfilled.

3. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. Thus did our blessed Lord extend into the Christian dispensation, and confirm and re-promulgate there, as of perpetual obligation in that kingdom of heaven, which was to have no end,—the moral precepts of the Jewish dispensation.

4. They contain the great law of love, promulgated anew in the Gospel. It is as really revealed in the Mosaic precepts, as it is in our Saviour's sermon on the Mount. The spirit of courtesy, kindness, and benevolence prevailing in them is remarkable; their protection of the stranger and the poor, the fatherless and the widow; their inculcation of love to God, love to our neighbour, and kindness even to enemies, would have constituted in the Jewish nation, had they obeyed them, a bright transcript of the divine perfections. And as to their penal sanctions, a learned and judicious writer has remarked, after speaking of the offences punished capitally by the Jewish law, that "in the other penal laws of the Mosaic code, there prevails a constant spirit of mildness and equity, unequalled in any other system of jurisprudence, ancient or modern."—The Jewish law adjusted its punishments more suitably to the real degree of moral depravity attending different species of guilt, than modern codes do.

5. They were, in that age and generation, a collection of superhuman wisdom, standing out in such bright contrast with the statutes of the heathen world, as to constitute a most satisfactory and conclusive demonstration of their divine origin. The calmest profound study of them does entirely justify the declaration of Moses himself to his countrymen in reference to their observance:—"Keep therefore and do them: for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for? And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous, as all this law, which I set before you this day?"

We here at this point insert the article from the Boston *Congregationalist* alluded to last week as a reply to Mr. Phillips' speech before the Legislature of Massachusetts, which will complete all that we intend to adduce, in the present discussion on the Scriptural view of the subject. We are, however, prepared to go into it at much greater length whenever a competent opponent may express a willingness to discuss the subject with us either from the platform, or through the press.

Our Reviewer directed us to inquire of the Rev. Messrs. Bennett, Harris and Robinson whether they entertained views similar to our own. We have done so of the two former gentlemen; and they have answered us to the effect, that they are favourable to the abolition of the death penalty, but that their opinion is not decidedly formed, they not having given the subject their deliberate and mature consideration. This is the very state of mind

in regard to the subject in which we supposed our friend and ministerial brother the Revd. Robt. Irvine might have been in when the peculiar circumstances in which he was placed led him to advocate the abolition of the death penalty; and moreover to question whether that friend entertained the same sentiments on the subject now which he did then. Our Reviewer has tried to give his readers a laugh at our expense by remarking "this is rich—very. We have a better opinion of the *solidity* of Mr. Irvine than this." The Rev. Mr. Robinson we have not seen, but unless our memory is greatly at fault, he informed us in a conversation which we held with him some time ago not fifty yards from the office of the *Morning News* that he had read our pamphlet and entertained our views on the subject.

The articles from the *Congregationalist* is as follows:—

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

It would be very strange if God, who has given us, in the Bible, directions for every exigency of life, should have excluded therefrom all reference to one of the greatest exigencies of civil society—that in which the life of one of its members is taken by another.

If permitted to go on, such procedure would, in a very short time, be fatal to society. It is therefore vital to its existence. We may infer then that, being so vital, God would allude to it in some way in that volume, which so tenderly cares for the public weal as well as for private welfare. It is our purpose now to examine the Bible to see if it has any teachings upon this subject, and, if so, what they are, and whither they tend.

The first passage which has any reference to the subject is connected with the history of Cain. Cain was the first murderer, and God "cursed him" and said unto him, "a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth." But Cain, under the impulse of the feeling that having taken the life of a man, men would therefore, from a sense of natural justice, seek to take his life, replied, "it shall come to pass that every one that findeth me shall slay me." Then the Lord answered him thus:—"whosoever slayeth Cain vengeance shall be taken on him seven fold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain; lest any finding him should kill him."

Concerning this whole transaction, we ought to consider, in the first place, that it is a merely individual instance, decided by the peculiarities which belonged to itself, and contains neither the announcement of a precept, nor the exposition of any great and general principle in regard to the crime of murder. It pleased God to permit Cain to live; though he was a murderer: nay, more, to protect him in some way, (the exact particulars of which we cannot understand), from the execution of that penalty which he anticipated and dreaded at the hands of his fellow men, as the natural instinct of universal humanity. God did not at this time say whether other murderers should live or die—left that for future exposition. Why he permitted Cain to live, and took measures to protect him from the natural vengeance of the race, he has not told us. It may have been because his life, as a warning to others of the dreadful effects of giving loose to the wickedness within, might be of peculiar value, outweighing any advantage from his execution in that comparatively private manner, which the sparseness of the population in any one locality would then necessitate. It may have been because civil society in any such sense as we now give the term, did not exist. It may have been because God was willing to try, for a few centuries, the experiment of no capital punishment. But, whatever the reasons influencing the Divine mind, by the very individuality and isolation of the case, and the fact that God dealt with it in a private manner, and made it no precedent, and the occasion of no statute, it is taken out of the general question before us, and the Bible—so far as this history is concerned—teaches nothing binding upon us in regard to the proper treatment of the murderer.

Passing on to the 9th of Genesis we find a distinct (and the first) instance of something like Divine legislation upon the subject. The entire existing race—in the persons of Noah and his family—had just come out of the ark. Standing upon the slopes of Ararat they looked down toward a new life upon a new earth. As they offered sacrifices to God in the first gladness of their hearts, and remembered that all this waste and desolation, of which they had been the solitary living witnesses, had come because of human sin, and that they had been saved by faith, it was natural that they should start upon their new career with the endeavor to avoid the old mistakes of their former fellows, and shape the life of the future race by the patterns of the Divine will.—It was natural, also, that God—before he sent them away to multiply and replenish the earth—should say such words and give such counsels to them, as he saw were especially needed, in the light of the sins and sufferings of the past. Whether or not the absence of capital punishment for murder in the anti-deluvian centuries had been an experiment which had failed, and so tended to increase that awful and abounding wickedness which demanded the deluge—a theory which the passage (Gen. vi. 13, "The earth is filled with violence," &c.) might perhaps warrant—it is certain that God took this occasion most solemnly to suggest, in the hearing of all the founders of the new nations, the principles which should affix capital punishment to the crime of murder. It was in these words (literally) "shedding man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Our common translation prefixes the pronoun "whoso," to supply the ellipsis of the Hebrew—and if that translation were to be translated literally back

to Hebrew, it could take no other shape than the original as it stands in the text of Moses. Some have argued that the pronoun "whosoever," instead of "whosoever,"—limiting the force of the precept to the unintelligent part of the creation—might be the true reading. But to this there are three objections.—The first is that such a rendering would imply the statute of all dignity, force, and fitness to its place and end; the second, that it would make nonsense of its twin clause and reason—"for in the image of God made he man;" the third, that the fair construction of the Hebrew tongue will not allow it. All the commentators of any eminence in Hebrew (indeed we might almost say all the commentators) are on one side—unanimous in the opinion that the passage as it stands in the English Bible fairly represents the words of Jehovah, as recorded in the book of Moses. Now of this passage, so rendered, three things are true.

1. It is a distinct and direct expression of the opinion and will of God, that the murderer should be punished with death by his fellow men. It is a specific and solemn part of the Divine re-institution and recognition of civil society after the deluge.

2. It was given for the instruction and direction of the race and the whole race in all its future nations, ages and circumstances.—So far from being limited to one of the sons of Noah and the descendants which should come from his loins, it is expressly stated to have been spoken to all the family, and was couched with such references to their future fertility as to make it certain that—so long as it remained uncontradicted—it was to be of universal weight. It was given centuries before the name of Jew was ever heard of—ages before there was any Moses, or Mosaic statute—so that, if it remain, it remains as forceful now as ever—and, since humanity has not changed its nature or essential circumstances of being, remains as beneficent now as ever.

3. It is not pretended that these words of God have ever been recalled, except as some have urged that, in a general way, the mild precepts of the New Testament are to be construed. But as we shall show hereafter, the New Testament, so far from repealing, specifically confirms them.

The objections which have been insisted on against this passage, all fail to weaken its force or change its aim. Mr. Phillips, the other day, at the State House, made short work of it—as he thought—but if his logic were not usually better than upon that occasion, he would never have reached his present eminence as a reasoner. Let us see how he spoke against it. He said; (we quote from Mr. Yerrinton's photographic report, as published in the *Bee* of March 20th).

1. "It is a command to the Jewish nation so far as we know." One might as well argue that Kansas and Nebraska were two of the original thirteen States of our Confederacy. But, waiving this, he next urged:

2. "If it is a law of God" (given through Noah to all men) "it must be fully, entirely obeyed: no man has any right to take exceptions to it. It is but a single line of Hebrew. But there are as many as twelve different interpretations of it—no two of the great lights of oriental learning and the Hebrew language have been able to agree upon an interpretation." This is a mistake. Mr. Phillips—whose great abilities lie in another direction—has been misled by somebody in this particular. Luther and Calvin, Grotius, Michaelis, Rosenmuller, Selden, Gesenius and Robinson, with a host of equal or lesser names, agree in affirming the substantial accuracy of our English translation. Indeed, we challenge Mr. Phillips or anybody else to produce the name of a single Hebraist of acknowledged thoroughness and ability, who has denied or will deny that the translation in common use among us is a fair rendering of the original. Dr. Kraissir—as Mr. P. says—undertook to show that it "only forbade cannibalism—the eating of men;" but he failed to show it—as M. D'Olivet and J. W. Browne had failed before him. That is all the reason why his eminent testimony is valueless in the present case. Whether that remarkable Hebraist, Mr. Giddon—in his "Types of Mankind," has expressed himself unfavorably to the received rendering of this passage, we have not time, at this moment to investigate.

3. Mr. Phillips next urges that the sentence really reads, "Whosoever sheds man's blood, his blood shall be shed." That is the whole sentence, 'by man,' is an interpolation. Here again he has been imposed upon. If he were himself a Hebraist he would know that this is the most utter nonsense. We should like to see a Hebrew Bible which has thrown it out of its text. Dr. Wetste was not wholly uninclined to novelties and "progress" in Sacred Philology, but he gives us the following as his translation of the verse, "Wer Menschen-Blut vergiesset, durch Menschen soll sein Blut vergossen werden." No respectable critic that we ever heard of, throws out the words, "by man," and yet Mr. Phillips speaks as positively of its being an "interpolation," as if he had seen Moses write the original without it—as if all scholars were agreed upon the point. We are loth to think that he presumed upon the "Knowing-Nothing" character of his audience for impunity to this misrepresentation of the facts.

4. Next Mr. Phillips urges the *ad captivum* argument that there is but one passage, and it is old—"it is not singular, that so transcendent an act of legislation as 'breaking into the bloody house of life,' as Shakespeare writes—the taking of human life,—should be left to hang on a doubtful sentence, in a dead language, more than three thousand years old?" We shall show that the argument by no means rests on this passage alone—but

† Matt. v. 17—19.
† GRAVES on the Pentateuch. Part II., Lec. 3.
† Deut. iv. 6—8.