

This sketch of the early history of the Japanese, will afford us a part of the data upon which we must form our opinion of their national character; at the same time, we must avail ourselves of the testimony of those who have visited the country since it became known to Europeans in the sixteenth century. Granting it to be a fact, as it seems most probable, that the Japanese are not descendants of the Chinese; yet having been civilized by that people, and having derived from them no small part of their laws, literature, and religion, it is not strange that they should bear a very striking resemblance to the Chinese. This resemblance of course is not so visible in their form and features, as in the great outlines of their national character. Pride and arrogance are the distinctive traits of the Japanese of all classes. They look down with scorn upon all their neighbors, not excepting even the Chinese. Those who are in authority are fond of pomp and show; and whenever they appear abroad are accompanied by a retinue, and always exact from their inferiors the same respect that they themselves pay to the emperor. As to the courage and bravery of the Japanese, writers are not agreed; but in these qualities they would be found, we apprehend, if put to the test, not very unlike the Chinese.

Van Overmeer Fisscher, who resided in Japan from 1820 to 1829, and visited the court of the seogun at Jedo in 1822, has published to the world the results of his observations in that country. The most prominent trait in the character of the Japanese, he says, is ambition. 'The princes voluntarily make the greatest sacrifices in order to obtain from the seogun new titles and more elevated rank; and their vassals likewise, in their turn, employ every expedient to procure honors and advancement from them. The superior classes alone have a right to be carried in a closed palanquin; those of the inferior ranks can use only a kango, a kind of sedan. Etiquette is rigidly observed in every thing, and no one dare to refuse to a person of superior rank the honors due to him. Notwithstanding the wealth of the mercantile class, traders are held in no esteem; they therefore strive, by rendering financial services to the princes and grandees, to obtain some post in their suite, which gives them a title to wear distinctive signs.' Mr. Fisscher, though evidently disposed to eulogize the Japanese, acknowledges, with all others that have visited their country, that there are usages among them which "cannot fail to shock even European ideas." Additional light will be thrown on the character of the Japanese when we come to speak (as we intend to do in our next number,) of their government, their literature, religion, manners, customs, and intercourse with foreign nations. Captain P. Gordon, who visited Jedo in 1818, says he never was in a country, 'the inhabitants of which conducted themselves with so much propriety as the Japanese; they were not only polite and affable towards him, but invariably so towards each other.' The captain here speaks of the *people*; and there is no reason to doubt, that were they free from the restraint of their rulers, they would, like the *people* of China, welcome foreigners to their shores.

ART. II. *Mohammedanism; its present attitude in eastern and western Asia, with an outline of a defense of the gospel against the Malayan Mohammedans.*

A correspondent, who has long been familiar with the Malays, has forwarded to us a paper containing an epitome of a work now publishing in the language of that people. It is entitled 'a Defense of the gospel against Mohammedan objections;' and is a curious and interesting work, and will prove instructive and convincing to Muslims. It seems to have been called forth by the present circumstances of the Mohammedans in the Malay states. The religious tenets of the Turk and Malay, derived from the same source and cherished for several centuries, have given to them a degree of similarity in their national character. Though the Turk is possessed of more political power than the Malay, yet he scarcely exceeds him in those qualities which have rendered them both alike formidable to their enemies,—and all are their enemies who are not with themselves worshippers of the false prophet. In the administration of justice the Malays are lax in every respect; but generally heavy armed to enforce their haughty claims. In some of the settlements, every man has a sword, a creese, sometimes two, and frequently two or three spears. The latter might rather be termed javelins, being very heavy, and are thrown so exact, that at the distance of ten or twelve paces, they will pass through the body of a man. The Malays who are trained and armed in this way are usually proud idlers, and are frequently engaged in deadly quarrels. But the gospel of God is destined to subdue and triumph over all the bad passions of these men; and already the circulation of Bibles and Christian books among them and their neighbors has roused many of the Malays to search the Scriptures, and to compare them with their own creed,—the doctrines of the Koran.

In western Asia, Mohammedanism has heretofore exhibited a still more imposing aspect. "Its laws have ever imposed tribute, or the forfeiture of life, upon unbelievers, and denounced inevitable death upon apostates. Its professors have long held at the disposal of their arbitrary will, large bodies of subjugated Christians; they once triumphed over the chivalry of Europe; and their sovereigns sat upon the subverted throne of the Cæsars." But changes have taken place even in Turkey—the very seat of the monster; changes which tend to liberalize and humble the disciples of the Arabian conqueror. By his recent adoption of Christian improvements, the sultan, the vicergerent of Mohammed, has broken the spell which bound to him millions of loyal subjects. To that religious fanaticism which has ever been the strongest principle of obedience in the Turkish vassal, and of bravery in the Turkish soldier, he can no longer appeal. Once he had only to impose the ban of empire upon the famous Ali Pashá of Yoannina, and the head of the outlaw soon graced the portals of

the seraglio. Now the same interdict is issued against Mohammed Ali of Egypt, and his victorious army only marches the bolder towards the walls of the capital. The late Russian war and the battle of Navarino, with other cases, have shown the Mohammedans of the Turkish empire that they are but men—men too who have their equals. The consequence is, that the improvements of modern Europe can now be introduced, and will probably soon spread, throughout western Asia. By some such means, doubtless, a way will be opened for the introduction of the same improvements among the inhabitants of eastern Asia. The Mohammedans that are found in China, have lost much of their characteristic pride, (by the endurance of the still greater haughtiness of their masters. The Turk adds to his spirit of domination great strength and boldness; the Chinese has indeed the haughtiness, but not the nerve and daring of the Turk. On every side, therefore, we see reasons for encouragement. In the Malay states, the spirit of inquiry is waking up, and search is being made for the truth. In western Asia, the glory of the sultan is waning, and the pride of his subjects is brought low.—But we must return to the paper before us, which we give in the words of our correspondent, only ‘curtailing’ some parts of it, agreeably to his suggestion.

The first chapter commences with an account of the sacred oracles, and produces many passages out of the Koran in praise of the Old and New Testaments, pointing them out as the fountain of truth, and the sure directory in matters of faith and practice. It then shows the attempt which Mohammed made to establish the truth of his own mission by an allusion to the sacred books of the Jews and Christians, and how he told his followers to go and ask those religionists whether the law and gospels did not contain prophecies respecting himself; but supposing (as well he might) that the Jews and Christians would not bear him out in his claims, he further enjoined it on his followers not to give heed to what those religionists should say. Finding at length that the Jews and Christians would have the best of the argument with him, and be enabled to convict him of advancing unfounded assertions, showing from their books, that no such things were prophesied of him as he pretended, he then sought to shelter himself under the assertion that the Jews and Christians had struck out or altered all those passages which referred to himself. Various passages from the Koran and other Arabic writers are then quoted, in which Mohammed brings forward this charge; and one passage in particular is adduced, which Mohammed affirms in his Koran referred to himself, and which the Jews and Christians had struck out of their writings. This is the well known passage in the 61st ch. of the Koran; “and Jesus the son of Mary said, O children of Israel, verily I am the apostle of God sent unto you, confirming the law which was delivered before me, and bringing good tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, and whose name shall be *Ahmed*.” But this passage, it is shown, never was uttered by Jesus, and is to be found in no gospel, either authentic or spurious, now extant. The reply to this, that the

passage being not now found in the gospels, is no proof that it never was there, is then discussed, and the proofs brought forward that the sacred Scriptures, as they now exist in the hands of the Jews and Christians, are unaltered and unadulterated, and remain the same as they were when they proceeded from the hand of the prophets and apostles; and since the Mohammedans ground the controversy on the assertion that our sacred Scriptures have been altered, if we can show that they have not been altered; then the main argument of the Mohammedans falls of itself to the ground.

The second chapter goes largely into the proof of the point that the sacred oracles have not been falsified or changed. In order to this, it is shown that the Scriptures held sacred by the Jews and Christians consist of two parts, the Old and New Testaments; of these the Jews acknowledge only the first, but the Christians, both the first and second. With respect to the Old Testament it is shown that the whole work was not written at one time, or by one individual, but that it is divided into various sections which were written partly by Moses and partly by other prophets; and as these prophets were not contemporary, their writings were published at different intervals. Further it is observed, that the sacred writings were not sent down ready made from heaven, but were written by human pens, while the authors were under the influence of the Spirit of God, by which means they were kept from error, and wrote only those things which were agreeable to the mind of God. The various dates and authors of each of the sacred compositions are enumerated, and it is then shewn that about 400 years before the coming of Christ, the whole of the sacred books of the Old Testaments were collected into one volume which from that time to the present has been carefully guarded and highly esteemed by the Jews, who use it in their synagogues, read it in their dwellings, place their whole confidence in it, and would rather die ten times over than let it go out of their hands. They have even counted the number of words, letters and points in this book. Indeed so very particular are they, that if a letter is wanting or even written awry in any sheet, they instantly reject it. From these things it is inferred, that the Jews would on no account presume to alter their sacred writings, and should one individual dare to do it, the whole nation would rise against him and condemn him. The translation of the Old Testament into Greek, about three hundred years before the coming of Christ, is then alluded to, the causes which led to it, the way in which it was executed, and the use it was of both to Jews and Greeks, among whom it was widely spread; all this occurred about a thousand years before the coming of Mohammed; it is therefore argued that, if the Jews in the time of Mohammed should have thought of altering the Hebrew Bible, they would not have been able to alter the Greek translation, that having been made a thousand years before, and carried round to countries 1000 miles distant; and if they had altered the Hebrew Bible only, and not the Greek translation, then the latter would have falsified the former, and a great discrepancy would have appeared between them:

but on examination no such discrepancy is found;—the inference therefore is, that neither the one nor the other have been altered.

It is next shown that no part of the N. T. was written by Jesus himself, or during his lifetime, but by his apostles and first disciples after his ascension, who going about from place to place preaching the word and establishing churches, were required to write some account of what they had heard and seen, and to correspond with the various societies of Christians established by their instrumentality on the subject of the religion they professed: thus the gospels and epistles were written at various times, by eight different individuals, from ten to sixty years after Christ's ascension. The miracles wrought by the writers of the New Testament are then spoken of, as credentials, proving the divine origin of their mission, and the high authority of their writings; on this account their publications were received by the Christians of that day, as of binding obligation in the church of God. Each society of Christians obtained one or other of the gospels or epistles, which they carefully preserved and communicated to others of their brethren, till within a short time after the death of the last of the apostles, when the whole were collected into one volume and called the New Testament.

Had the autographs of the apostles been preserved to the present day, and could they be produced, the controversy would have been set completely at rest. These being however lost through the long lapse of ages, recourse must be had to manuscripts taken from them, and copied after them: of these, numbers are preserved, which are thought to be, more or less, 1200 years old. Proofs are then brought forward of the antiquity of such manuscripts in something of the following order. Books in the present day are printed, but printing has not been invented above 500 years; thus if any one should bring us a printed book, we might certainly know it to be no more than 500 years old; but if he should produce a manuscript, we might consider it to be more than 500 years old, because people would not take trouble to multiply copies of a work by writing, when they could do it much more easily by printing. Again, we now use paper to write on, but paper has only been invented 1000 years; if one should bring us a book written on paper, we might know it to be less than 1000 years old, but if he should bring us a book written on parchment, and not on paper, we might judge it to be more than 1000 years old, because people would not write on dear parchment when they could get cheap paper. Moreover the Greeks have been in the habit of using two kinds of letters, large and small, but the small letters were invented 1200 years ago; if therefore a person should produce a book written in small Greek letters we might know that it was less than 1200 years old; but if he should produce one written in large Greek letters, we might conclude it to be more than 1200 years old, because people would not write in large letters which occupy much space, when they were acquainted with small ones which would come in a less room. Besides this, we may judge of the age of a manuscript by examining the condition of the paper or parchment

on which it is written, and the color of the ink employed. If the former exhibits marks of decay, and the latter is turned pale, or yellow, we may then know that the manuscript is old. Something also may be gathered from its history, and if according to authentic records it has been handed down from high antiquity, we may arrive at a degree of certainty respecting the age of the manuscript.

An account is then given of some of the most ancient and celebrated manuscripts, with a short description of their age, history, present condition, and where they are to be found; viz. the Alexandrian, the Vatican, the Cottonian, the Colbertensian, the Cesarean, and the Bezan; most of which are considered to be 1200 and 1300 years old, or even more; besides these, six more from 1000 to 1200, and 469 nearly 1000 years old. Allusion is then made to the ancient versions, such as the Coptic, the Syrian, the Abyssinian, the Vulgate, the Persian and the Armenian; some of which were made within a century after the apostolic age, and some later, and all of which are in a good state of preservation to the present day. It is then shewn that all those manuscripts and versions have been carefully examined, and diligently compared, both with each other, and with the received text of the present day; and this has been done by men of wisdom and skill, as well as of probity and good report, who have given their undivided attention to the subject for years together, and some during the whole of a long life, and who are therefore entitled to our regard and confidence.

Something is then said about the liability to error in all human productions, and that there probably never was a copy of any thing made, which in every letter, stroke, and dot, followed the original. The prophets and apostles wrote indeed as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and therefore all their writings were correct; but when their books were copied or translated by uninspired men, it was to be expected that faults would appear, not important ones, such as would affect the sense, but trifling discrepancies in letters, points, &c. It is then suggested that even in the Koran varieties appear between different copies; for in the time of Mohammed the different chapters of the Koran were published by piecemeal, and deposited in a chest one by one, just as they were issued, until the death of Mohammed, when the whole were collected and arranged by Abu Beer. In the mean time, however, others had recollected various passages, which they had committed to writing from memory, and thus discrepancies arose; so that there are now seven separate versions of the Koran, all of which differ from each other, in the number of the verses, and in other not unimportant particulars. So that the Koran of the Persian, differs from that held by the Turks, to such a degree that a copy of the Koran brought from Bagdad would not be received at Constantinople, and one from the latter city would not be acknowledged at the former: while both Persians and Turks think with themselves that they severally possess the true Koran.

It is acknowledged, that inasmuch as all copies differ in some respects from their originals, so the copies of the Old and New Testa-

ment, as well as the Koran, exhibit slight discrepancies; but if any should say that the sacred books were altered on purpose, in order to establish one religion and falsify another, we can then affirm that it is not true; and we may safely demand proof from those who make the assertion that the law and the gospels are falsified, which proof being wanting, their assertion must of course fall to the ground. It is then shown what kind of proof would be available in order to establish the assertion, and without which the saying will not stand; viz. they must first bring copies of the law and gospels older than the time of Mohammed, which according to them have not been falsified, in order to compare with the ancient copies in our possession, which they say have been falsified: secondly, the copies which they thus bring must be more ancient and more numerous than those which we can bring, if not, it would be our duty to reject the copies which are few and modern, and to adopt those which preponderate on the side of number and antiquity: thirdly, they must point out the places in which the sacred books have been altered, and bring the true readings to insert instead of the spurious ones: and if they can do neither of these things we may then see that their assertions are but wind.

Proof being wanting on the part of our antagonists, it is then shown, that proof can be brought forward by us, to establish the truth that the law and the gospels have not been falsified. First, there are now in Europe fourteen manuscripts older than the time of Mohammed; these have been accurately and carefully compared with the received texts of the Old and New Testaments, and no difference has been found to exist between them, except in a few unimportant particulars, which may be ascribed to the carelessness of transcribers. Secondly, it is seen that all men are very careful of their sacred books, as being the standards of faith and practice, and the basis of their best and dearest hopes; if a controversy arises they appeal to their Scriptures, and the matter is at once decided; it follows then that if the Scriptures are falsified all will be uncertain; hence men of every religion have been attentive to the preservation of their sacred books, that they may be kept free from alteration while they live, and be handed down unadulterated to their posterity when they die. Thirdly, every thing done by reasonable men must be done from some motive, and without a motive no one would act; thus we may infer, that without a motive urging them to the act, the Jews and Christians would not alter their Scriptures. If any should say, that this was done out of envy and spite against Mohammed, we might reply, that Mohammed was an Arab, and as long as he lived did not spread his religion beyond the confines of Arabia: but the Jews and Christians of that age were spread abroad throughout all Europe, and the greater part of Asia and Africa, the most of whom never heard the name of Mohammed, and for hundred of years knew nothing about him; thus it was impossible that they should either envy or hate him, and if they did not envy or hate him, when they never could have altered their Scriptures out of envy or hatred. Fourthly, if the Jews

and Christians had hated Mohammed, and if they had sought to alter their Scriptures, they would not have been able to effect it on account of its difficulties; for if they had altered one copy, they must have altered all, otherwise their alteration would have been of no use; for if one copy had been altered, and the whole had not been altered in like manner, then the one altered copy would have been condemned by the united voice of the whole. Now in the time of sultan Othman, half the followers of Islam made use of the version of the Koran, which had been arranged by Abu Beer, which was in the hands of Haphsa, and half made use of the version which was received from the mouth of Mohammed himself, so that there was a discrepancy between them. On this account sultan Othman issued an order, that all the other copies should be collected and burnt, and that a number of new copies should be made according to the version in the hands of of Haphsa; thus all the copies of the Koran were made nearly alike, with only a few verbal discrepancies between them. Now this was comparatively easy, because Othman was a sultan, governing the whole of Arabia, and the koran was written in Arabic alone, and had not yet reached to foreign countries: but with respect to the altering of the law and gospels, great difficulty would have been experienced, for in the time of Mohammed, the Old Testament had been published 1000 years, and the New, 600; thousands of copies had been taken of both these works, they had been dispersed through hundreds of countries, and translated into scores of different languages; therefore if any one had wished to have altered these books, he must have sought for these thousands of copies, and traveled to those hundreds of countries, and have learned those scores of languages; further he must have burnt all the former copies, and have made a complete set of new ones, a work of no small difficulty, and beyond the compass of human effort. Fifthly, we may ask, if the law and gospels are falsified, by whom was it done? Whether by one man alone or by all together? If it is said, by one man, we may reply, that is impossible as is above shown. If it is said by all together, we may reply, that is impossible also; for if a few Jews had taken it into their heads to alter the law, and a few Christians to alter the gospel, the whole body of Jews and Christians would not have acceded to it, and if all the Jews had agreed to alter the law, and all the Christians to alter the gospel, these two bodies of people would not have come to terms about what was to be altered, because they were enemies to each other, and if the Jews had dared to alter their Scriptures, the Christians would have condemned them.

The third chapter treats of those passages of our Scriptures which are quoted by Mussulmen in favor of their prophet. It commences with saying, that since many Mussulmen, more intelligent than the rest, have found that the proofs brought by Christians in favor of the genuineness of their Scriptures are unanswerable, and since they find that the Scriptures held by the Jews and Christians have not been altered, they take up the law and gospel as they stand and examine them, to see if they cannot find some expressions which refer to Mo-

hammed in the said books. Thus by diligent seeking, they have succeeded in selecting a few passages which, according to them, do refer to Mohammed and Islamism; it is necessary therefore to consider such, in order to see whether they do indeed refer to Mohammed. First, Mohammedans bring a passage out of Deuteronomy, ch. 33, v. 2, which reads thus, "The Lord came from mount Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them, he shined forth from mount Paran," which they thus explain: "The Lord came from mount Sinai," intimates that God gave the Law to Moses on mount Sinai. "He rose up from Seir," intimates that God gave the gospel to Jesus, who came out of Seir or Nazareth, from which circumstance the Christians are called Nazarenes. "He shined forth from mount Paran," intimates that God gave the Koran to Mohammed, for Paran is a hill near Mecca. In addition to this, the Mohammedans quote Habakkuk ch. 3, 3. "God came from Teman, the Holy One from mount Paran, his glory covered the heavens and the earth was full of his praise." Now Teman they say, is in Arabia, and Paran is Mecca, and praise is the same with Mohammed, which means in the original 'praise;' "the earth was full of his praise," therefore means the earth was full of the religion of Mohammed. To all this we may reply, that when any wish to establish the proofs of a religion, it is not sufficient to bring intimations and suppositions; for we may suppose these expressions to refer to Moses, and Jesus, and Mohammed, when they neither refer to one nor the other, and so the whole supposition falls to the ground. That the law was given to Moses on mount Sinai is true, but that Jesus sprung from Seir is not true, for Jesus was brought up in Nazareth in the land of Galilee to the north of Judea, while Seir is in the land of Edom, to the south of Judea, which latter place Jesus never visited, and therefore could not spring from thence. Moreover, mount Paran is not near Mecca, but forty days journey distant therefrom, and Mohammed never went to that mount, neither did his religion spring from thence. Now if any should wish to know the meaning of the passage quoted, he may read the whole chapter from which this is taken, and thus he will see that the sacred writer is not speaking of the origin of various kinds of religion, but is praising the Lord for all the goodness shown to the Israelites when they came out of Egypt, and traveled through the wilderness to the promised land; thus he said, the Lord came from mount Sinai, where he proclaimed the ten commandments, and he rose up from Seir, where he displayed many signs and wonders in the sight of the people, and he shined forth from mount Paran, where he wrought greater miracles by the hand of Moses. These three places are the halting places of the Israelites during their journey; and as the power and glory of God were more and more displayed, the farther they went, thus there is a climax in the expressions, for it is first said, he came, then he rose up, and then he shined forth. With respect to the quotation from Habakkuk, we may reply, that Teman is in the land of Edom, and not in the province of Hedjaz, where Mohammed was born, and Pa-

ran is nearer to Judea, than to Mecca. But because many Mussulmen boast themselves that the name of Mohammed is contained in the expression, 'the earth was full of his praise,' we may reply, that the word employed means 'hymns of praise,' and not simply 'praise,' and if one will take the trouble to examine the Arabic version of the Bible, he will not find it written that the earth was full of his *ahmed*, or praise, but the earth was full of his *tasbihat*, or hymns of praise. Thus even this vain supposition falls to the ground. [Twelve other passages are taken up and examined by our correspondent in the same manner as the preceding.]

The fourth chapter is devoted to the consideration of certain passages quoted by Mohammedans, as if from our Scriptures, but which are not to be found therein. The fifth, consists of inferences drawn from the preceding chapters.

The sixth contains an account of those prophecies found in the Scriptures, which are supposed by most wise and good men to refer to Mohammed and his religion. First, the 8th chapter of Daniel is taken and explained, particularly with reference to the little horn which is supposed to allude to Mohammed. This supposition is grounded on its *origin*, springing up out of one of the four kingdoms into which Alexander's empire was divided; for the kingdom of Egypt which was towards the south, included part of Arabia, and particularly the province of Hedjaz, where Mohammed was born. Further, on account of its mean appearance, and subsequent prosperity, being at first a little horn, and afterwards a mighty empire; for the power of Mohammed was in the beginning small, being himself in his youth a poor orphan, and having at the first establishment of his religion, no more than his wife, his slave, his disciple, and his friend, for followers. But afterwards he became very great towards the south, and towards the east, and towards the pleasant land. For when he found that he could not prevail by persuasion, he drew the sword, and declared war against the unbelievers, from which time he waxed exceeding great, toward Arabia in the south, Persia in the east, and Judea, "the pleasant land"—the capital of which was taken in the 15th year of the Hedjra. The little horn may be shown to be Mohammed, on account of his *success* against the ministers of the Gospel, for he cast down some of the host of heaven, and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them: and thus we find that Mohammed did prevail against many of the servants of Christ, partly by his wiles in inducing them to apostatize, and partly by violence, crushing them when obstinate. The little horn may be said to typify Mohammed, on account of his exalting *himself* at the expense of the Savior: for he magnified himself even to the prince of the host: placing himself on an equal or even higher rank than the son of God. The angel Gabriel has likewise told us that this power, should be a king of fierce countenance, which exactly suits Mohammed, who propagated his religion by the sword, and who was called the prophet of the sword, and the slaughterer. It is also said, that he should understand dark sentences, and in the 13th chapter of the Koran,

Mohammed speaks of having had a sacred history revealed to him, while the mystical letters at the commencement of several of the chapters of the Koran, which Mohamméd affirms no one knew the meaning of, except himself, may also be considered among the dark sentences which this king should understand. Gabriel has also told us, that his power should be mighty, but not by his own power; accordingly we find that the influence of Mohammed was great, but that he prevailed not so much by the solid weight of his arguments, as by the sharpness of his sword; and that his logic would not have been so successful, had it not been for his skill and courage in war. Gabriel has assured us further, that through his policy he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand. The craft in his hand is doubtless the book which he assumed to be of heavenly origin; but which would not have been received as such, nor the invention prospered, had not policy been employed. Now the policy was, giving himself out as the illiterate prophet, and yet producing a book superior to all the productions of the age. That such a craft was to be found in his hand is not to be wondered at, when we remember what Mohammed himself has said in his Koran, 66 chap. "God hath allowed you the dissolution of your oaths;" now if a man will not only break his oaths, but give out that God has allowed him so to do, it is but natural to expect craft in his hand. Finally, Gabriel has foretold, that he shall be broken without hand. That is, the system which he has founded shall be overthrown; not by the power and policy of man, by means of which it was set up, but by the mighty energy of the Holy Spirit, through the preaching of the everlasting gospel.

The second prophecy, is that contained in the 9th chapter of Rev., where the locusts of the bottomless pit, and the Euphratean horsemen are supposed to refer to the Mohammedans. The star falling from heaven, who opened the bottomless pit, and let out the smoke, doubtless referred to Arius, or some archapostate from the orthodox faith of Christ, who by the broaching of heretical opinions, darkened the atmosphere of the Christian world, and made way for the diffusion of the pernicious tenets of Islamism. These tenets, and those who spread them, are compared to locusts, with which it is known that Arabia abounds: these locusts were commanded not to hurt any of the real servants of God, who are compared to grass and trees, but those only who had not the seal of God in their foreheads; hence we see that the arms of the Saracens did not prevail so much against those Christians who remained faithful to their Lord, as against those who became corrupted by the poison of Arianism. Further, the shape of these locusts was like wild horses prepared unto the battle; no country is so celebrated for war horses as Arabia: on their heads were, as it were, crowns of gold, which may refer to the turbans worn by the Arabs, which were frequently adorned with gold: their faces were to be as the faces of men, with long beards and fierce aspects; but their hair long like the hair of women, which the Arabs were accustomed to wear loose and disheveled when rushing on to battle, but tied up and plaited, when in peace and at home. Their tails being

like scorpions, and their having stings in their tails, may refer to the tenets of their religion, which at first appear plausible, but afterwards occasion remorse. The time fixed for the duration of their successes is five months or 150 years; so from the year 612, when the Hedra commenced, to the year 762, when Bagdad was taken, and the wars of the Arabs there terminated, is exactly 150 years. These locusts had a king whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, or the Destroyer, which name suits no one so well as Mohammed, the prophet of the sword. The prophecy goes on to speak of the four angels bound in the river Euphrates, by which are supposed to be meant the four sultans of Persia, Kerman, Syria, and Roum, who were restrained for a time by the wars of the Christians in Syria, but at the termination thereof were loosed, and thus the hordes of the Turks were let loose to carry war and bloodshed all around. The time of 391 years is then specified as the period which the Turks should prevail; and accordingly we find that the first victory obtained by the Turks was in 1281 and the last in 1672. The immense number of the horsemen intimates hosts of cavalry, which they would bring into the field; their breastplates of red, blue, and yellow, prefigured the precise colors under which the Turks fought as the banner of their faith; and the fire, smoke, and brimstone, issuing out of their mouths, may allude to the use of gunpowder, which was employed by the Turks in the siege of Constantinople. From all these things it appears, that the affairs of Mohammed, and of the Arabs and Turks are prophesied of in the word of God; insomuch that if any one should read those prophecies with attention, and should compare them with the histories of the periods referred to, he could not fail to be filled with astonishment at the power and wisdom of God; and to conclude that the rise and progress of Mohammedanism are not the result of chance, but were foreordained of God, and permitted by him for the punishment of careless and lukewarm Christians, and for the trial of the faith of those who really fear God; which end once obtained, the system of religion thus strongly fortified, and widely spread, will be broken without hand.

The above is a general outline of the Defense of the Gospel against Mohammedan objections; the whole work in the Malayan language occupies about 150 pages. The books consulted in its composition were Maracci's preface to his refutation of the Koran, Horne's introduction to the study of the Scriptures, and Bush's life of Mohammed. Should it be read with attention, and the arguments followed out to their conclusions, it may, under the divine blessing, prove useful in combating the prejudices which Mussulmen have conceived against our Scriptures, and in rebutting the charge so frequently brought, of their interpolation and corruption. When once the Scriptures are received as the word of God, and as the final appeal in religious differences, the battle with Mohammedan objections is half-won; and the first of John, with the second of Philipians, may be thus brought to bear with their full force against these stout-hearted deniers of our Lord's divinity.