



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### **Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### **About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>













THE  
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

CONDUCTED BY AN ASSOCIATION.

VOL. XVI.



Truth and Progress.



DOVER:  
FREEWILL BAPTIST PRINTING ESTABLISHMENT.  
MDCCCLXVIII.



THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY  
571683  
ASTOR, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.  
R 1912 L



## INDEX—PRINCIPAL PAPERS.

Jesus Christ: His Person and His Plan. By Rev. John Clifford, L. L. B., London, England, - - - - -	1
Recreation and Amusements. By Rev. Enoch Pond, D. D., Ban- gor, Me., - - - - -	31
The Anti-Slavery Record of the Freewill Baptists. By Rev. I. D. Stewart, Dover, N. H., - - - - -	41
Christian Growth. By Prof. B. F. Hayes, Lewiston, Me., - - -	69
Murphy's Commentary. By Rev. Geo. T. Day, D. D., Dover, N. H., - - - - -	86
The Perversion of the Gospel a proof of its Divinity. By Rev. N. M. Wood, Thomaston, Me., - - - - -	98
The German Philosophy. By Rev. A. K. Moulton, Concord, N. H., - - - - -	105
The Blessedness of Giving, as Compared with that of Receiving. By Rev. William Warren, Gorham, Me., - - - - -	193
The Hebrew Lawgiver. By Rev. S. N. Tufts, Farmington, N. H.,	143
The Age of Louis XIV. in Church History. By Rev. W. H. Bowen, North Scituate, Vt., - - - - -	161
Cowles's Exposition of Daniel. By Rev. S. D. Church, Brunswick, Me., Regeneration. - - - - -	178 193
Esther. By Rev. Joseph Fullonton, Raymond, N. H., - - - - -	205
The Millennium. By Prof. B. F. Hayes, Lewiston, Me., - - -	216
Philosophy of Divine Worship. By Rev. S. E. Root, Bangor, Me.,	221
Nature and Functions of Conscience. By Prof. John P. Lacroix, Delaware, Ohio., - - - - -	241
The Sinner's Work in his Salvation. By Rev. G. H. Ball, D. D. Buffalo, N. Y., - - - - -	257
Continuance of Moral Agency. By Rev. A. H. Huling, Evans- ville, Wis., - - - - -	271
Binding the Dragon. By Rev. S. D. Church, Brunswick, Me.,	282
Jesus Christ. By Rev. A. K. Moulton, Concord, N. H., - - -	298
Robertson and his Sermons. By Rev. G. T. Day, D. D., Dover, N. H., - - - - -	336
Christ's Vital Relations to Men. By Rev. G. T. Day, D. D., Dover, N. H., - - - - -	359
Woman's Work in India. By Rev. J. L. Phillips, Midnapore, India., - - - - -	377
The First Chapter of Ephesians or Personal Predestination. By Rev. J. M. Bailey, Saco, Me., - - - - -	388
The Book of Job and its Lessons. By Rev. D. Waterman, Car- ver's Harbor, Me., - - - - -	402
Pulpit Eloquence. - - - - -	412
The Resurrection. By Rev. S. H. Barrett, Rutland, Ohio., - -	425
Personal Christian Development. By Rev. W. Hurlin, Antrim, N. H.,	433
Doctrine and Polity of the Freewill Baptists. - - - - -	446
Art in Instruction. - - - - -	458

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

### NUMBER 1.

I. Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity in the Nineteenth Century, p. 132.

### NUMBER 2.

1. Theological Index, p. 232. 2. Sermons Preached upon Several Occasions, p. 233. 3. History of the United Netherlands, p. 233. 4. Language and the Study of Language, p. 235. 5. The Old Roman World, p. 236. 6. The History of the Great Republic, p. 237. 7. The Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 238. 8. History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America, p. 239.

### NUMBER 3.

1. Bacon's Essays, p. 350. 2. Short Studies on Great Subjects, p. 35. 3. Human Life in Shakespeare, p. 351. 4. The Ground and Object of Hope for Mankind, p. 352. 5. The Worship of Jesus, p. 353. 6. Portraits of Celebrated Women, p. 355. 7. The Gospel in the Trees, p. 356. 8. Sabbath Chimes, p. 356. 9. Problems of the Age, p. 357.

### NUMBER 4.

1. Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature, p. 466. 2. History of the American Civil War, p. 467. 3. The Poems of John Godfrey Saxe, p. 477. 4. The New Testament History, p. 468. 5. Notes, critical, explanatory and practical, on the book of Psalms, p. 469. 6. New Poems, p. 470. 7. Where is the City? p. 470. 8. The History of Napoleon III. Emperor of the French, p. 470. 9. The Scientific Basis of Education, p. 472. 10. What Answer? p. 473. 11. New England Tragedies, p. 474.

THE  
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

---

No. LXI.—JANUARY, 1868.

---

ART. I. JESUS CHRIST: HIS PERSON AND HIS PLAN.

Jesus Christ: His Person and His Plan—has been exercising the thoughts of men for successive centuries, but probably never so fully as in the present. The conflict of opinion began in the brief ministry of the Saviour in Jerusalem; and though sixty generations have passed away since His ascension to heaven it is not yet accomplished. The warfare waxes in intensity. His wondrous life is being written again in the full blaze of the new lights of this nineteenth century; of a historical criticism, as inexorable as it is unfair; of a material science, vaunting its perfection; and of a worship of humanity bidding for the place of the religion of Christ. Emended gospels are issuing from the press, some with not a few additions, and others greatly needing supplements and appendices, if not even more. The enemies of the Cross are not doubtful of the issue. One bluntly says, "The study of the life of Jesus is the snare in which the theology of our time is destined to be taken and destroyed." Another declares, "In a certain sense our God is different from the God of the writers of the New Testament; our world is undoubtedly different, and our Christ can no longer be the same." Nor is this all. The shout of triumph already rings in the camp of the foe. Christianity is destroyed, and left in its putrefaction to seek a deserved grave along with the worn-

out superstitions of a credulous past. The arrows of criticism have shot through the weak places of the armor of the Captain of salvation, and His intellectual and moral errors are laid bare to the gaze of men. Christ has been stripped of the false glories in which loving disciples and weak women had robed Him, and it is now seen that "beautiful errors" were the secret of His power. Falsehood, therefore, has been more fruitful of good than truth. The richest grapes of eighteen hundred years have grown on a thorn!

But the foundation of God standeth sure. We do not give up our convictions because Simon Magus is a hypocrite, nor will we tremble for the kingdom of heaven because Judas betrays Christ. Rather will we hail any controversy concerning the Prophet of Nazareth, believing that anything that brings men into His presence is likely to be fraught with good to the majority, though, alas! it may work the sadder ruin of a few. To touch but the hem of the garment of the Healer of souls is an unspeakable blessing; and men and women may rejoice, even if it be a wearying disease or a pestilent error that forces them beyond the strength of their courage, through pressing crowds of doubts and fears, to stretch forth the trembling hand of trust and stand for a moment near the fringes of His beneficent power.

As we are not appalled, so we are not surprised. The final conflict with unbelief, whenever it occurs, must necessarily be fought around the Person and concerning the Plan of our Divine Lord. Of the battle-grounds of recent generations, some are verdant meadows covered with thick summer grass and fragrant flowers; some well-tilled fields yielding a prodigious harvest, and others the scenes of occasional skirmishing and fruitless sallies of rash and combative men, but never of serious fight. We have almost forgotten Calvin in resisting Comte, and only wish for the brave heart and gentle spirit of Arminius in putting on our armor to contend with Renan. The question of general redemption by the work of Christ that Andrew Fuller and Dan Taylor discussed so warmly is rapidly merging into the larger question, "Is there a divine Saviour at all?" All theological teaching is certainly moving towards Christ himself for its last settlement and victorious defence. The enemy has said, "Here is the heir,

come, let us take him, and then the inheritance shall be ours." The embattled hosts of Christendom gather round the Son of God for their decisive struggle. At this Philippi the contending warriors meet, no matter from what points they start or along what routes they travel. The character of Christ is the key-stone of the arch of New Testament doctrine. Allow the supernatural person of Jesus, and the body of Christian truth has solid coherence of statement, precision of purpose, symmetry of proportion, and fulness of life-giving power. Our view of the inspiration of Scripture must be determined, in part, by reference to His words, and therefore by the judgment we form of Himself. We only know God the Father as we know Him, for "no man hath seen the Father at any time, the only begotten Son he hath revealed Him." The attractions of his cross are powerless if He who dies there be an infatuated revolutionist and not the Prince of Life. History is a blinded muse, and has no interpreter, if Jesus be excluded from the highest throne in the rank of Divine kings. He is the light of the past, as He is the light of the Bible and the life of men. If I cease to admire and adore Him as my Lord and my God, my reason is as much puzzled and bewildered as my heart is orphaned and woe-stricken. The achievements of science are no gospel for me, but merely like strains of beautiful music that fall on the listless ears of the dying, so long as my higher aspirations after God and immortality remain without affectionate response; and the adoration of humanity, so fervently commended by the high priests of a new religion, is but a subtle form of the practice from which, of all others, I am praying and fighting to be delivered; in fact, if the Son of God be taken from me, I have nothing left to hope, nothing to live for, life is a chaos, history a riddle, God a problem, death a terror, and the future an abyss.

The person of Jesus is the Divine centre of Christianity, and the controlling figure of the gospel history. In the former everything depends upon Him as its basis, and in the latter everything gathers around Him as its living core. The principal intention of each Evangelist is to describe the works and words of the Master, not, indeed, so fully as he might have done, but with such completeness as he judged necessary to induce his

readers to believe in the Saviour's name. Owing to the special conditions under which each gospel was written, it is possible for us to discover a suggestive variety in the four-fold representation of the one life; but assuredly the foundation of each historian is the person and plan of Christ. Behind all they narrate and describe—fragments of sermons, complete parables, practical and oft-repeated aphorisms, good deeds in the quiet village or the bustling city—it is intended we should see the form of the Son of God, the presiding spirit of the whole. His presence pervades and suffuses every part of the story. Each writer puts Him in the foreground of his picture, and makes all else subordinate to the exhibition of His inimitable character. It is impossible for us to accept the thinnest “rudiment of certainty” in the gospel account without being brought face to face with the marvellous person of the Son of Mary. Here is a world from which we are as absolutely incapable of banishing Him as we are of excluding the sun from the heavens. His presence glows on every page, is the life of every scene, the thread of gold traversing the entire web, the crowning glory of the whole. Are we favored with glimpses of His legislation? It is not merely that we may see by what politics and according to what rules He would govern men, but that we may behold the King in His beauty, and, being enamored of His charms, yield ourselves in loving homage to His benignant authority. Do we listen to words of grace proceeding from His mouth? It is not as though He were another Socrates uttering His *opinions* as to “what is to be worshipped and what is not, what is beautiful and what disgraceful, what is just and what is unjust;” but that being brought into His presence we may obtain the spiritual life which flows along His words. Are we ushered into the audience-chamber of this King of men, and privileged to behold His miracles? It is not for the sake of seeing the signs, nor that we may open wide the eyes of our wondering credulity and be led to chant the praises of Christ as though He were a magician, but that we may have vital fellowship with the Son of Man, and ourselves do greater works than these through the indwelling of His power. From first to last the aim of the Evangelist is to describe what He did and

said, so that he may make plain what He was ; for these things were written that men might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing they might have life through His name.

This spirit the historians had caught from their Instructor. No other method was possible to them in narrating such a life, for Jesus had made Himself the pivot of all His sayings and the goal of all His works. It is here the marvel begins. From this point we journey along a course which peremptorily refuses to be satisfactorily explained on any merely natural principle. The predominance of Jesus in the evangelistic records might, for the most part, have been easily accounted for by literary considerations only ; but there is something so thoroughly unwonted, so unconsciously vain and pretentious in the perpetual and exaggerated prominence given by Christ to Himself in all His teaching and throughout all His works, that the supernatural or the demoniacal is at once forced upon us, and between the two we must make our choice. To men who set themselves to explain the life by natural causes, this is no inconsiderable difficulty. They do not know what to do with it. They cannot deny it, though they have a "rudiment of certainty" of the extremest tenuity. Approaching it, they express their wonder, and then in a rhapsodical utterance take their leave in quest of less perplexing ground. Everywhere the fact meets us. "He did not," confesses Renan, "preach His opinions ; He preached Himself." Throughout His teaching there is a wearying and offensively repetitious egotism, unless, indeed, we feel that we are listening to one who is our God and Saviour. "I am the way, the truth, and the life ; no man cometh to the Father but by me." "Without me ye can do nothing." "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst : but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life."

The same fact is indisputably supreme in the miraculous works of Christ. The object of the exertion of His wonder-working power was not to gain the applause of men, but the love and worship of Himself as the way to their new life. He was no sorcerer. There is nothing of the patron of sensa-



tionalism in Him. He positively refused to perform miracles to satisfy mere curiosity, and taught His immediate disciples that it was a far worthier thing to believe on Him for His love, and grace, and goodness, than for His "works." A wonder-born faith was depreciated; whilst love like that of Mary's, which gathered about His gracious character and spent itself in lavishing its stores upon Him, received an abundant reward. His "works" were "signs" of what He was, the transjection of His attributes before the eyes of men, that seeing them they might love and live. His unstained unselfishness, strong compassion, gentle sympathy, and divine beneficence, wrote themselves out anew in a living gospel in the healed bodies and enfranchised minds of poor and suffering men, and repeated in another manner the comfortable words, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

Following the steps of the Evangelist and of our Lord, we cannot err in attaching importance to the investigation of this passage concerning the person of Christ. Here, first of all, be it observed He is described as *Jesus*. This designation gives Him a place in the history of the world, allocates and identifies Him with men, and forms a useful starting-point for all inquiries concerning His character. At once we meet with Him on the plane of human life, in the midst of the known and the knowable, a man like ourselves, grafted on the stock of common humanity, and in most essential respects identical with us. His name was not an unfamiliar one at the beginning of the present era. There was nothing strange in it to the ears of His companions in the streets of Nazareth. Betokening Him through whom Jehovah sends salvation, it had passed into common circulation, and was often represented by the Greek Jason. In the list of seventy-two commissioners sent by Eleazer to Ptolemy, it is found twice. One of the books of the Apocrypha is attributed to Jesus the son of Sirach. A companion of St. Paul's at Rome was Jesus, surnamed Justus. According to Matthew the name was given to the son of Joseph because it fitly described the purpose He would adopt, and the work He was destined to accomplish for men. Certainly events have justified the prophecy uttered in the name. John regarded it,

as appears from his first Epistle as well as in this Gospel, as fixing the real human personality of his Lord. It chronicled and reported the fact that He was made a little lower than the angels, that He had a manhood as veritable as our own. His name was not Gabriel or Michael, but Jesus—a common, human, historic name, fitting well the man whose place in the successions of the race of men it registers. “The Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us.” “He was made of a woman, made under the law.” His human nature was real. There was nothing simulated or abridged about Him. He was the fulness of humanity in its depth and height, length and breadth. No one was ever more human than Christ. Never was one so completely and thoroughly man as He!

This has abundant corroboration in the fact that Jesus describes Himself as the *Son of Man* in the hearing of his disciples and antagonists, with a frequency that is an argument, and a persistence of purpose that is convincing. The apostolic writings plainly and of set aim shun that mode of representing Christ as though it inadequately expressed the exalted estimate of His character their authors had formed, so that (it is said) there are only three instances in the whole of the New Testament (the gospels excepted) in which He is referred to by that name, and even those speak rather of His heavenly than earthly appearances; whereas the Lord Himself uses this phrase eighty-eight times in the four gospels to portray His relations to men. Again and again He introduces it, even under circumstances in which we should least expect it, for when He is chiefly concerned to affirm His equality with the Father, He afterwards appends the statement descriptive of His being also the Son of Man. Christ appeared as a man, was a man, and as such wished to be known and remembered. He belonged to mankind, and would not have it forgotten. He took upon Himself our nature even in its infirmities, so far as they are not moral defects, and in that nature He wrought out His purpose and made life possible to man: and He held that it was essential to the success of His plan that it should never be erased from the records of Christianity, that “as by man came death, by man also came the resurrection of the dead.”

The history of Christ proves His perfect identity with ourselves. We feel that we are reading a human life-story. His character was gradually unfolded by means of a mother's affectionate solitudes, a father's authoritative instructions, the probings of trial, the culture of holy aspirations, the severe discipline of temptation, resolute self-government, frequent communion with God, and a faithful obedience to the commands of duty. Although He finished His career as the wisest of teachers, He began it as the humblest of learners. Though at His death He was peerless in goodness and unmatched for all kingly qualities of character, yet not like a gourd in the night had He sprung up, but with painful slowness, even as a youth goes through the critical scenes of his earliest manhood to the solid strength, undaunted purpose, and resolute will of a consecrated life. He heard the voice of Wisdom crying in the streets and learnt her lessons, sat by the streams of Hebrew sacred literature and imbibed knowledge, worked as a carpenter at his father's bench and became strong, endured suffering as a son of the Eternal and learned obedience. The crises of His life are repeating themselves in ours to-day, and it is well indeed for us if we can pass through ours as He did through His. The clouds of doubt hung o'er His sunny horizon, and hid the bright and beautiful from His gaze. Visions of hope cheered and sustained Him in the perilous ascent of the mountain path of holiness. The gnawing worm of disappointment and the corroding touch of grief did not pass Him by as too sacred for their visitation. He was a man of sorrows, and sicknesses were His familiar friends. Death rudely invaded the selectest circles of His affection, and tears started from His eyes at the grave of Lazarus. That universal teacher, experience, who with her wand of office calls us all to school and gives us the advantage of her discipline, did not excuse His attendance, but after some painstaking sent Him forth her most perfect and finished pupil. He partook of our susceptibility to mature by trial, to become strong by suffering, to grow by feeling and doing rather than by dreaming and knowing; and finally gained the altitude of human greatness, not by waiting for fortune's favorable winds to waft Him to the height of His sanctified ambition, but by patiently climbing,

though with wounded feet, the jagged rocks of duty and sacrifice. We repeat it, there never was a man more man than He!

Jesus died young! after a brief ministry, but not before He had become the ideal of manhood, and established additional claims to be considered in a distinguished sense *the* Son of Man. The climax of His career was in the darkest night, but a night that only gave fresh brilliance to the star of purity which shone on His brow. He had passed safely through the most perilous time of human life, and stood forth at the last, apparently beaten, but really a victorious Captain who had defeated every foe, and was scattering the largesses of His beneficence amongst His expectant soldiery. He began well. Conquering in the first and severest crisis, He proves Himself the pattern man. No hour in life's short day equals in tragic interest that early one which links the youth with the man, when there is dimly but with growing distinctness dawning on the soul the sense of its unfolding power, of its immense capacity, of its noble desires and new and untold possibilities. It is the era when the chrysalis of youth is cast off, and the new being that is to mould its own grand future makes its first essays in life and duty. The excitement is portentous. As when the far-resounding sea is lashed by fiercest winds, so the soul is agitated to its lowest depths. Every faculty is raised to the highest pitch of action. Ambitious schemes leap through the soul in rapid succession, like troops of fancies through a poet's dream. Visions follow visions. Temptations gather in besieging crowds, and impetuously rush at every gate of the soul. Angels and men fervently watch and pray for the hour when the crisis shall be passed. Some go through this trying period with faith in God, fortitude, and self-mastery, and they come out men, fully panoplied for the warfare of life, and ready to serve God and their fellows. But many, alas! too many, yield to the intoxication of the hour, and are destroyed for ever. The toga of liberty they have received on their advent to manhood is used as a disgraceful cloak for a degrading and damning licentiousness. But whatever the issue, the trial must be met. We cannot take the position and responsibilities of men without confronting it. The entrance upon life is through a wilderness tenanted by demons waiting to assail us

in our extremity, and by successive strokes of flattery to buy the worship for themselves which should be given to God only.

How welcome, then, the appearance of the representative man, who, in reference to this dawning of manhood, is pre-eminently the type of what we ought to be, and the guide to what we ought to do. As He will not let men forget that He is the Son of Man, so He will not have us suppose He has outgrown the sympathies of His later youth. His history contains the temptation in the desert as well as the mount of transfiguration, a fierce fight with the devil as well as the resurrection from the grave; and thereby assures His aid when most it is needed in the whole education of life. His young manhood meets us with sympathy and help just as we go forth to the Armageddon of our history.

But the representative humanity of Jesus extends to the whole compass of our life, to its duties and joys, even to its saddest and darkest phases, its crushing and agonizing sorrows, and the tangled mystery of pain, disappointment, and bereavement. The Son of Man was a sufferer by pre-eminence. He took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses. Though in the form of God, He emptied Himself of His glories, and became obedient unto death, preferring the most painful and ignominious death, even that of the cross, rather than commit the slightest infraction of the law of God. The Son of Adam did not pass by the cup of suffering, but in drinking its dregs on the slopes of Olivet and on the cross, bore away its curse and substituted a benediction, cast out its poison and changed it to most nutritious food. He suffered being tempted. His brief life was crowded with anguish. Sorrowful emotions rolled like tidal waves through His heart until they broke it. Grief forced Him to prayer, and gave impetus to His cries for help. His mind was wrenched with pain that no one knew save the Father, and no one save He or the Son can describe. Since then, such is the more than magical influence of the Redeemer, suffering has been seen in a new light, and crosses have had a halo of glory that never shone about a monarch's crown!

As the Son of Man, Jesus claims and exercises the prerogatives of a judge and the functions of a king. His peculiar hu-

manity gives Him His supreme qualifications for the seat of judgment and the throne of empire. The sinless man has wrestled with the sin of the world and conquered, knows by experience of His own the infirmities and weakness of the flesh, the actual conditions of the conflict in which we are engaged, and is in Himself the standard by which we are to be judged, and therefore "the Father hath committed all judgment unto Him." Because He is the Son of Man He promulgates a new edict concerning the Sabbath, relieves the day of the anathema the Jews had placed upon it, and makes it the minister of the noblest perfection by converting it into the sphere and occasion of purest well-doing. Like a king, also, He dispenses pardons that men may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins; and as such rules in His church: for, when after His ascension He appears on behalf of His kingdom to Stephen, Paul, and John, it is as none other than the Son of Man. The name is, then, fully vindicated and explained by the records of His life. He is our elder brother; and lifted up into fellowship with Him, every member of the race is comforted with a sympathy warm as a mother's love, lasting as the eternal hills, and hopeful as the promises of God. Nothing that is human is alien from Christ. The normal man has raised the dignity of the entire family, sanctified the relations of society, consecrated the lowliest walks of life, made Himself the dear companion and friend of the poor and suffering, and the bright and attractive type of what we should seek to be. Jesus! Saviour! teach us that we may know thy manhood, and help us, that, following thee, we may be more truly men!

The transition is easy from the consideration of the more personal name of Jesus to the official description in the statement that Jesus is the *Christ*. This, His second name, indicates His relations to the expectations and hopes of Israel, and to the unconscious prophecies of the heathen world. In the thought of the best men of that time the word Christ imaged a heaven-commissioned prince, the deliverer of the oppressed people, appearing with satisfactory credentials, and conducting the men of his choice to dignity, freedom, and happiness; a prophet divinely inspired to interpret the mysteries of the past, settle the disputes

of nations, respond to the profoundest questions of the human heart, lift the veil from life and illumine earth and time with the glories of heaven and eternity. All that, Christ claimed to be and do. All that, John declares He was and did. From the first the Nazarene youth was familiar with the idea of His Messiahship, and gave no indistinct signs of the force with which it possessed Him. On His acceptance of the office of Scripture-reader in the synagogue of his native village He claimed the Messianic words of Isaiah as descriptive of Himself. To the Samaritan woman He made known His character, and affirmed that He was the Messiah expected by the people; and such was the beauty of His life and the power of His words, that after He had been but two days in Sychar many said to the woman, "Now we believe not because of thy saying, for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." Nor did Jesus hold back His claim or speak about it with reserve, except when political fanatics were likely to infuse their misconceptions into His words, and by using them for their own narrow and earth-born ends, frustrate the spiritual work He came to perform. No feature of the Saviour's history is more impressive than the transparent honesty with which He encountered every one who was bold enough to canvass His claims to the Messiahship set forth in the Old Testament Scriptures. He cheerfully submitted to their interrogatory sallies, and occasionally condescended to reply to men who only questioned to deride, and inquired to betray. Deception He abhorred, and the temptation thereto shot from off His pure mind as a steel point from the polished surface of a diamond. Secrecy He rarely sought in His ministry; never from fear of inquiry. Impostors court darkness. Honesty and reality love the light. Deceivers work in shade and gloom. Truth stands forth to be seen, handled, and tasted as the word of life. Charlatanry makes its fervid appeals to impossible tribunals, and asserts its claims on criteria that no one can examine. Christianity goes at once to the highest court that is in existence at the time of its appearing, and is content to stand or fall by its arbitrament. Workers in magic put out the light and then usher themselves and their legerdemain on the stage. Christ floods

the whole scene with the light of His presence, and then proclaims with unshaken confidence, "Search amongst my witnesses! Look at my works! Investigate their worth! For which of them do ye stone me? Weigh my character! Who of you convinceth me of sin? Criticise my claims! Look into your Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and I affirm that their ungarbled testimony is clearly for me."

John the Baptist having been in prison for several months, and becoming anxious concerning the establishment of the visible dominion of which he supposed he had been the pioneer, sent two of his disciples to Jesus with the question, "Art thou He that should come, or look we for another?" The reply of Christ claimed the Messiah's office and character on incontestable grounds. "Tell John," said He, "my miracles are wrought amongst the poor in spirit and in goods. I give gladness to the desponding, and joy to the sad. I am the messenger of glad tidings to the people, and blessed is He who is not offended at the mode in which I work, or repulsed by the strongest evidences of my anointing of God." Those works were real, objective, well-attested facts. In gathering crowds they followed the earliest portions of His ministry. Fresh from the conquest of Satan in the wilderness, the proofs of the greatness of His victory accumulated in His repeated destruction of Satan's works. The Jews admitted the reality of His miracles as they did that of the light, were irritated by some of their accidental features, as they might be with the intense heat of a burning sun, and had a rough and sensual method of accounting for the prophet's power, as dishonest men always have of shunting off the line of an uncompromising difficulty. The idea of denying that "mighty deeds did show forth themselves in Him," never entered their minds. They readily confessed His facts, but stoutly quarrelled with His logic. Nevertheless Christ always taught that His miracles were intended to prove that He was sent by the Father, and that they vindicated His claim to be the Messiah. This was His uniform judgment of the value and office of the supernatural in His ministry. Can we allow that claim? Is that judgment just? Let us see. If God the Father sent a being here, endowed with extraordinary powers, and charged to



use them in His name and for His glory, what would be the characteristics of their exercise? Our answer must depend upon the idea we have formed of God. But taking the conception dimly beheld by Abraham and David, longed after by the heathen mind, and fully revealed in the Son of God, viz., that of a perfect, powerful, and loving Father who cares for the creatures He has made and works unceasingly for their good, we should at once conclude that such supernatural capacity would meet these three conditions in its action:—(1) it would be purely benevolent and unselfish; (2) would strike at the roots of evil in man's nature; and (3) whilst compassionately alleviating the sufferings of the hour, would aim chiefly at conferring the most solid and lasting benefits upon all mankind.

Now the miracles of Jesus never bear the slightest coloring of that blackest vice of the human race—selfishness. His divine prerogative is not, for so much as a single moment, turned out of its beneficent course to gratify any personal vanity, or secure any personal pleasure. The marvel of Christ's self-restraint in the exercise of His irresistible power has impressed most candid minds. And when His omnipotent energies are exerted, they aim with unerring directness to annihilate those fertile sources of human misery—the worship of Satan and distrust of God, to deliver men from the sophistry of the devil's delusions, and to unite them with the Saviour and the source of eternal life. Brethren, is not this the Christ? Do not these marks of His use of supernatural power prove that He was anointed and sent by the Father? If ever Christ should come, will He do more miracles, or different miracles from what this man did?

But this was not with the Jews the final court of appeal. They possessed the oracles of God. The most distinguished privilege of their theocracy was the exclusive claim they had to the "word of the Lord." They guarded it with extreme jealousy as the *Magna Charta* of their liberties, and the imperishable glory of their decaying nationality. This was the annual register of their worthies, the album of their warriors, judges, and kings, the literature of their wisest and holiest men, and the sustenance of their spiritual life. No Scripture could compare

with this. Other writings were, but this was *the* writing. Other songs were sung, but these were *the* songs. Other laws had been given, but this was *the* law. No authority could reverse its sentence. This was the judge that ended every strife. Ten thousand miracles were but as the dust in the balance if Moses were set aside in the slightest degree. Every new claimant to popular regard must meet the irrepressible inquiry, What saith the Scripture? Christ took them on their own ground. "You appeal to Moses. I take you at your word, for Moses wrote of me. My character is his antitype. I am come to fulfil the law he announced, and the prophecies his successors declared. Search your Scriptures. Spread forth your sacred roll, and you will see my name written on innumerable pages, for there the lineaments of my life and work are distinctly portrayed. David's song is concerning me. Will not his music soothe your irritation, and his hymnody charm away your unbelief? Isaiah foretold my appearance, my sufferings and glory, my poverty and greatness. Is not his witness of value? Micah described with geographical minuteness the place of my birth. Compare his map with the facts. Cannot that dissuade you from the rejection of my message? Daniel pointed to the figure on the clock of time at which I should arrive, and lo! at the predestined moment angels sang my advent song. Will not this suffice? Search the Scriptures, and you shall find, if you are not blind as death, that they testify of me."

For the Jews this was all that could be desired. A false Christ dared not have done it. The lie would have been given him in a moment. The true Christ found by it an open door to thousands of Jewish hearts. Renan says concerning miracles, "A single miracle at Paris before a body of competent philosophers would put an end to all doubts;" thereby most uncritically neglecting the conditions of the age in which Christ appeared, and the change which has taken place in the ultimate bar of appeal since the beginning of this era. Miracles were then untested by science because science did not exist. The competent philosopher was not born. And the question of the judges of that day was not, Is this a miracle? but, does the miracle-worker agree with or destroy Moses and the Prophets?

and Jesus took that standard, and proved that He agreed with it in every demand it made; just as He would have gone, so at least we think, before a Parisian body of philosophers, and raised a man from the dead with all the palpableness of a professor discoursing on anatomy if only that Parisian board had then been the supreme arbiter, and had professed as much honest desire as some of the Pharisees for the discovery and love of the truth. Jesus was the Christ. A fair interpretation of the Old, and the admission of the faintest outline of truth in the New Testament, drive off the vultures of doubt, and leave us to enjoy the life of faith. The paradoxes of prophecy exactly fit the paradoxes of His life and ministry. The mysteries of Isaiah and David reappear in an embodied form in His character. The ages rung with the promise of His name and the prophecy of His coming. The scrolls of time pointed to Him as the Desire of all nations; and when He did arrive, men so quickly read His character that they clasped hands with all the joy of a realized hope, and said, Verily, "we have found the Messiah, which is being interpreted the Christ."

We must advance one step further. Jesus is the Son of God. He who could claim to be in so supreme and distinguishing a sense the Son of Man without deserving the charge of insanity or over-weening self-conceit, and to be the Messiah, the anointed Prophet-King of the Most High, without refutation from the cleverest and bitterest of His foes, need not hesitate to urge His right to be regarded as the Lord, the Jehovah, the Son of God. We must form the antithesis to the Son of Man, and what can that be but the Son of God? The circumstances of the case therefore imperatively demand and fully justify the triple name so dear to us, Our *Lord Jesus Christ*. Is it at this point of the discussion that we are told that the supernatural is impossible, and the idea of the Son of God in the sense contended for contrary to reason and science? We briefly reply to the statement by asserting (1) that the denial of the supernatural necessarily leads to blank atheism and gross materialism; consequences we are scarcely prepared to accept, (2) that it is also extremely unscientific. May not a gifted successor of Owen or Huxley possibly discover the higher law of these miracles? Have not

men found what they call "laws" where they least expected them? Let not the men of science assert too soon! Is there nothing occurring at this moment which if suddenly placed on the table of the positivist would not have to be regarded as an interference with the succession of phenomena? Surely it may be so, for science is not quite omniscient. (3) Supposing the supernatural is banished from Christianity, is it then gone from life? Has man no affinities for that which is above him? no yearnings for the Divine and Eternal? If he has, can they be fully accounted for by natural causes? (4) But finally, is not God omnipotent and free? We cannot believe either in His feebleness or His slavery; and therefore we hold to the possibility of the supernatural. Its reality is positively declared by Christ, and necessitated to explain the accounts of His life and character. When Peter twice confessed, in the presence of others, that His Master was the Son of the living God, the confession was not only received, but attributed to the spiritual revealing of the Father. The Teacher declared to men who were seeking His life to destroy it, that God was His own Father, making himself equal with God, and he was sentenced to death by *all* the members of the Sanhedrim, without a dissentient voice, because He claimed the incomparable and (as they judged) impossible dignity of equality with Jehovah. As from the first He boldly took that course, so to the last He persisted in it, and died a malefactor's death because He could not speak "with bated breath and whispering humbleness" about His Divine Nature. And we must crucify the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame, if we will not bow before him as our God. The divinity of His person is the only key that fits all the wards of the evangelic history. Nothing but this explains the mystery of His birth, accounts for the significant voice and appearance at the baptism and on the Mount of Transfiguration; gives the starting point and elucidates the fierce malignity of the Tempter in the wilderness; disrobes His sayings of the garb of arrogance and self-assumption; makes His supernatural works feasible, because only the blossomings of His supernatural character, interprets the charge of blasphemy upon which he was crucified; justifies the immense atoning value attached to

His death by Himself and His disciples; prepares us for His victorious resurrection from the garden-grave; and solves the appearance of an original type of society which under His guidance is to beatify every relation of human life. Jesus Himself, and not the raising of the dead, is the most stupendous of miracles. The gigantic interruption of the uniform successions of causation is not the change of water into wine, but the revelation of the Divine will to men through the Incarnate Word. If natural causes can explain Him, can illuminate the grandeur of His unique character, unravel the mysteries and paradoxes of His nature and teaching, and account for the overwhelmingly great influence He has exerted from that throne of contempt and despoliation, infamy and death in Jerusalem, over these two thousand years, then we give up the question at once. For the miracles, ordinarily so called, we would not in such a case contend for a moment. Christ is Christianity. The gospel of the grace of God is essentially the manifestation of a Person, a divine Person, in whose existence, attributes, and actions, all religious teaching and all religious power are concentrated. Christianity does not rest on a measure but on a Man; not on a creed but a Person; not on a book but on the living God. It is said by Stesichorus, that the heroine of Grecian Story, Helena, was never carried to Troy at all, and that the Greeks and Trojans fought about a mere image or figure of the far-famed beauty; so it is declared that the historians of the life of Jesus have given us not the truth as it is in Jesus, but as it was represented by their fond affections in the chamber of imagery, and that, by consequence, all the conflicts of the friends and foes of Christianity have not been about the real founder of the Kingdom of Heaven, but concerning a sublime but very incorrect image manufactured by four of the first warriors, and carried on to the field of battle by them. If that be so, we may give up our weapons and our joys together; but even such a surrender will not deliver us from all difficulty. Robbed of the reality, there is still left us the transcendent conception of the most perfect Man of all history wrought out in a biography of unutterable beauty and grace by four men supremely unfit for such a task. This

miracle is not a whit less than the former. The conception is as supernatural as the reality. It is infinitely easier to believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that the evangelists saw Him for themselves, or reported what others saw of Him, and wrote down facts, than that the Jewish mind in its lowest decay created such a character, ethics and plan, which were fixed by these writers in narratives, unparalleled for simple purity and every genuine excellence. The light of the world cannot be a spark of man's kindling.

At noonday we do not demand proofs that the sun is in the heavens ; nor when the character of the Lord Jesus fills the view of the soul, need we inquire for further witnesses to His Divine Person. It is therefore essential to the completeness of our argument that we cite this. The life is its own testimony. Three features in the gospel-portrait of the Redeemer strike us as absolutely new ; the perfect balance and equilibrium of its numerous qualities, the complete absence of defect, and the grandeur and grace of His Spirit. Every excellence of mind and heart met in Him in a transcendent degree, without any single trait gaining the least noticeable predominance. Peter embodies in His life an impulsive ardor that leaps at difficulties without measuring their force, frets against restraint, but finally softens into a patient hope that waits in trial for an unspeakable glory. John becomes the pattern of exuberant love. James of careful consistency and Paul of self-consuming zeal. But in Christ nothing is supreme but harmony. Even virtues that seem incongruous in ourselves are woven by Him into a garment of loveliness, of such uniform texture that whoever examines the fabric is more impressed with the pattern than with the course or color of any single thread. He is as gentle as He is strong, as calm as He is energetic, as cosmopolitan as He is filial, as holy as He is compassionate, as mighty as He is sympathetic, and as wise as He is good. Patient as the meekest of women, He is capable of an indignation so strong and severe that haughty men quake as they feel the thongs of His sarcasm, and wince with pain as His rebukes like scorpion stings poison their peace. He is as tranquil as an ice-bound sea, and yet urged along the ways of duty and suffering by an inextin-

guishable fire of enthusiasm. Lovely by a lowliness of spirit that outstrips the humblest suppliant, He blends therewith such majestic dignity as forces us to confess Him the Kingliest of men. Resting in God with the simple unquestioning faith of childhood, He labors and suffers with the patience and fortitude of a hero. With unmatched self-possession and unshaken strength He steadily holds the balance of His moral and spiritual nature, so that its equilibrium is never in the slightest degree disturbed.

In vain we search for defect. The strongest microscope does not reveal a single stain. He was holy, harmless, and undefiled. His youth was as sinless as His manhood was beneficent. Though born amongst Jews, and trained by Jewish parents, and educated in Jewish modes of thought, nationality left no impress on His character, no trace in His life. A villager for many years, He nevertheless escapes the errors and mistakes of the village-formed mind. Though associating with hard, captious, and disputatious men, He is as free from their faults as the angels. As in Him was no sin, so there was no deficiency. He was innocent without ignorance, generous without injustice, tearful without penitence, patient without pride, joyful without frivolity, firm without harshness, zealous without unwisdom, fond of solitude without being an ascetic, mighty in intellect without depreciating spirituality, a King in goodness without disparaging mind, as truly without fault in the sight of God as He was free from blame before the bar of men. Immeasurably superior to all men in the number and range of His moral excellencies, He successfully avoided the failings which attach themselves to the best, and thereby rendered Himself the complete revelation of the perfections of the Father, and the crown and glory of the human race.

But who shall describe the grandeur and grace of the spirit of Christ? Who shall portray the inner beauty of that harmonious life and lay bare to the sight of mortals the source of that incomparable virtue? What foot may tread within the precincts of this holy of holies, and come forth with words lawful to utter in the hearing of men? Language fails to convey

the impression made on the mind by the devout study of the Saviour's character. Reverently we stand without and hear the voice of the High Priest saying in tones of heavenly sweetness, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work." "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." "If it be possible, let this cup of suffering pass from me, nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." And as the words sink into our hearts, we feel that therein is revealed to us the formative principles of the life of Jesus, and the first and last lesson for the sons of men. The secret of the greatest miracle of history lies in the direction of His full and unreserved surrender of Himself to God, and the fact that He won that, to us, impossible victory, with such completeness, is the strongest testimony, this side the cross, that He is the Son of the Highest. He, the product of His times! That divine character, the offspring of the age, and such an age! Why, brethren, if we combine in one all the notable excellencies of His most distinguished predecessors and contemporaries, of David and Isaiah, of Shammai and Hillel, Nicodemus and Gamaliel, and reproduce them in one person, we are still as far from realizing this prototype of humanity as the chemist is from creating a living man by shaking together hydrogen and oxygen, phosphorus and iron, and the other elements found in the human body! Jesus is not the Son of Judaism, but of God. The fragrance and aroma of His name are not wafted from the philosophical schools of Alexandria, but from the land that is afar off, and the home of the holiest and best. His intellectual parentage is not to be discovered in the "great soul of Philo," but in the everlasting God, the Creator of the ends of the earth. The full-orbed glory of His character is not the radiance of myriad nebulae gathered into a solitary star, but the brilliance of the Central Sun! Verily, He is the Incarnate Word, God over all, blessed for ever!

We now inquire concerning the plan of this Person: John wrote his gospel that men might believe, and that believing, they might have life. This word "life" strikes the key-note for all accurate investigations of the plan of Jesus, and is the echo of the thought of Christ expressed in the exposition He gave of



His intentions to His querulous enemies when He said, contrasting himself with other teachers, "I am come that men may have life, and that they may have it more abundantly." Nor do we depend for this information exclusively upon the author of the fourth gospel. Matthew delineates the main features of this plan quite as vividly and only less frequently than John. Writing for Jews he adopts Jewish modes of thought, and on a natural and obvious principle, selects those sayings of Jesus which were cast in a Jewish mould, but when we have separated the form from the substance, the drapery from the figure, we instantly come face to face with the same dominant idea. In his narrative, Luke describes the universality of sweep given to it by Christ during His ministry, showing that He compassed the interests of all men, independently of any national considerations. Mark illuminates the means and instruments adopted by Christ in the accomplishment of the work He had undertaken, by describing the effusions of His healing power and grace upon the diseased and suffering. The Acts of the Apostles, Epistles of Paul and John, contribute in broadening the basis on which the conclusion rests that Christ Jesus regarded the spiritual life of man as rooted in Himself, and His sole work to render it available to all who were willing to receive it. Such was His aim from the first; and his ideas concerning it were as definite, clear, and complete at the outset, as at the close of His ministry; nor did he ever waver in His judgment of its importance, doubt its triumph, modify its details, or materially change His method of action in seeking its execution. It was His "Father's business" which roused the ardor of His youth, and satisfied the consecration of His manhood. The Prophet of the village moves along the same grooves as the famous and eagerly-sought teacher of the metropolis. Starting with the declaration that He was the friend of the meek and of the poor, He finished by sacrificing His life for the salvation of the world. Never does He falter or change. He will not retract though all Jerusalem be against Him, for he is "One who brings a mind not to be changed by place or time." His is the "unconquerable will and courage never to submit or yield, and what is else, not to be overcome." One supreme purpose is developed in His ministry,

and only one, though its forms are various, and the means of its unveiling different at different times.

It has been suggested that circumstances were his master, shaped His arrangements, and governed His destiny. The records not only do not support the statement, they positively contradict it. His hour was as fixed as His plan, and He saw the exact time when the latter would be perfected by His death, and spake and acted as one who knew that men and devils combined in vain to destroy Him till that time arrived. What! He begin as a political enthusiast, and when thwarted by the people turn spiritual teacher! Why nothing is more opposed to the evidence; no dream is so manifestly visionary and self-destructive. His first sermon is an overwhelming refutation of so disparaging and baseless an insinuation. He close His career with the excitement of a fanatic, and the folly of an amiable but miscalculating revolutionist! Why nothing could be more uncritical in interpretation, more absurdly false! He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many, and He left us having made a sacrifice of Himself in a spirit of dignified repose, calm fortitude, and uncomplaining love which has made Him the world's ideal of suffering greatness ever since.

To give life, then, was His plan, always His only plan. There is nothing in the account of Christ which justifies the assertion that His chief work was to offer a pattern of integrity, goodness, and submission to the will of heaven. That is as insufficient as if we were to omit both head and heart in a scientific description of man. It is merely travesty to the documents we ought to elucidate to say with Renan that Jesus is the founder of a society of free intelligences, without any fixed doctrines of belief and special modes of action; and it is certain that we *may* ignore some of the fundamental truths of Christianity if we rest satisfied with the picture of Christ as a legislator establishing a new theocracy and issuing His edicts of universal love, forgiveness, and mercy. The Saviour started from the fact of the spiritual death of men, and His gospel became necessarily the proclamation of spiritual life. He knew that He was not come to those who were whole, but to the sick; that His was a Phy-

sician's office, and a Physician's power. He had not to teach the perfect, but to deliver the fallen, unite the soul to God, give it the gladness of filial joy in His presence, and the strength and purity of conformity to His character. His unalterable conviction of man was that he is lost, and His inflexible purpose to seek him out in the mazes of sin in which he had wandered, and give him salvation in the paradise of God. Life, therefore, according to the plan of Jesus, primarily means the restoration of man to God the Father in trust and love, growing into joyful communion with Him, and resulting in an increasing assimilation to His adorable nature, and comprises, in the experience of the soul, the awakening of faith and penitence, the forgiveness of sins, the delight and strength of "rest in the Lord," the quickening of conscience, the feast of divine love, the fruits of holiness and philanthropy, and an abundant entrance into the kingdom of God's dear Son. Christ came to give that life, and to give it not to one here and another there, but to myriads who should form the living nucleus of a new society which should gather into itself all who are "of the truth," and finally become as comprehensive as the family of man. Such a conception is itself worthy of a God. Think you! was that learned from Judas the Galilean who led a bootless insurrection against the Roman power during the boyhood of Jesus? Did the doctors of the law give Him His magnificent plan? Will natural causes sufficiently explain that phenomenon? Look at it closely! Here is a Syrian peasant, trained amid the "crabbed and confined" notions of a retired village, rarely brought near the skirts of a lofty civilization, uneducated in the lore of the schools, and unacquainted with politics other than Jewish, not yet thirty years of age, but producing as His purpose in life the uplifting of the world from its degradation and decay, the infusion of new moral force into the hearts of men, the eradication of vices strong in their antiquity and universal in their ramifications, the birth of virtues hitherto impossible to man, the sway of benevolence and bliss, and all this to be accomplished without the patronage of statesmen, the learning of scholars or the genius of philosophers, and by means, first, of the attractions of His cross and sacrifice, and secondly, of the power of that spiritual life

He has put in the possession of His few disciples. Is that new type of legislation a miracle or is it not? Does not that plan glorify the person? Is not the Godhead of the person necessary to solve the mystery of the plan? Brethren and fathers, we cannot but feel that the idea of such a work lifts the Saviour as far above the wisest and best of mankind as God himself is above us.

But has this extraordinary plan been accomplished in whole or in part, or is it merely a Utopia whose brilliance first pleased and then deluded the credulity of men? The history of the church and the present condition of Christendom supply the answer. The annals of the Christian society are but the lengthened story of His power, and the "foundation of Christendom is Christ." It gives life, and life is always its own witness. It is above all logic, and free of all reasoning processes. Though its secrets answer no man's call, its reality all confess. Creation is alive, and the play of its life bathes the flowers with perfume and clothes them with grace, decks the green earth's sod and fills the air with the warbled song of merry choristers, gilds the crests of spreading landscapes with glory and floods their spaces with loveliness, beams out in the radiance of suns and flashes in the light of stars, tips the brow of the mountains with grandeur, and covers the vales with ears of corn, that golden at the bidding of the sun and rattle in the autumn breeze. Life is the electric fire which is so freely coursing around us, conducting messages of wisdom to our hearts, banishing our doubts by its intensity, and fitting us to praise Him who is its unfailing source. In its freshness and fulness is the charm of youth, the tranquil attractions of home, and the unfading pleasures of heaven. Verily, of all pleasant things, none is more so than for the eyes to behold the teeming abundance of life, and the heart to feel the impulses of its throbbing force; and of all useless acts none could surpass that of constructing arguments to prove its presence, and vindicate its reality.

In like manner the spiritual life bestowed by Christ is always its own competent proof. We may point to its sphere and describe its features, but not argue for its existence. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself, and

this is the witness that God has given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." The man who is alive from the dead has a record in his heart which he rarely misinterprets and never mistrusts, for its testimony is clearer than the wisest reasonings of men, and stronger than all the books of evidence ever written. In vain do you discover objections to his Teacher. Rejoicing in the new-born pleasures of sight, he replies with an air of conscious triumph, "One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see." Says Dr. South, "To feel a thing in one's self is the surest way of knowing it," and this is the knowledge of which he boasts and in whose certainty he confides. With the demons of selfishness cast out of him, with a pure satisfaction for his daily feast, with the constraining love of Christ in his heart, and the Holy Ghost perfecting his fitness for the inheritance of the saints in light, he feels that he is a new creature in Christ Jesus, and in the new creation itself has an invincible weapon to ward off every assailant of the reality of his Divine Lord.

And this individual is a specimen of what He is able to do for all men, and has been doing for thousands "since the day of his showing unto Israel." The church at Jerusalem in the first century was full of His life, and though many defects and vices have stained the annals of the universal church's history, yet we are warranted in saying that by means of that church Jesus is still at the heart of all that is good, and true, and self-denying in the Christendom of to-day. Modern civilization, so far as it is virtuous, and philanthropic, and high-principled, was born in the stable at Bethlehem, and reared in the land of Palestine. The secondary consequences of the Christian religion have penetrated far beyond the boundaries prescribed by ecclesiastics, and not a few who reject the Christian name owe their best treasures to the Nazarene's hand. Society, stricken with moral paralysis, is touched by the Physician, and though made whole and rejoicing in the exhilarating pulsations of a newer life, is yet, like the man at the pool of Bethesda, unaware from whence the healing comes. Christianity is in the air, and men breathe it and are braced for duty and trial by it, unconsciously as children inhale the oxygen of the atmosphere without knowing its rela-

tion to their continuous life. Christ Jesus has gone forth with His blessing to the home of the poor and the mansion of the rich, lightened the burden of the oppressed and multiplied the joys of the glad, sustained the heart of the bereaved and filled with praise the living, woven His name into our literature and toned the talk of the street, sanctified our science and corrected our philosophy ; prepared light for youth, power for manhood, and comfort for old age, raised woman from the slave to the equal of man, ennobled character and transformed nations, eradicated some vices and limited the growth and area of others, begotten new virtues and given to all virtue a grace and attraction the disciples of Zeno and Seneca never saw. Is this an age of induction ? Are we told to collect our facts ? Give us induction ! We crave no more. By its results we will abide. For if anything under the sun can stand that test it is the glorious gospel of the blessed God.

The plan of Christ is then largely an accomplished fact, but not entirely so. The life spreads and multiplies, but death abounds notwithstanding. The golden age of Christianity is yet to come. The "world's future" will be more glorious than its past or present. Redemption is not an isolated and incomplete act, but a continuous and ever-perfecting work of the Redeemer of Men. We are not orphaned, nor can we be. He is an ever-living Comforter. The Divine King is not dead, nor has He left the work of His hands. What He has been to His church, he will be for all coming time. He is the same to-day, yesterday, and forever. Let us not fear, but hold fast the beginning of our confidence to the end. The leaven works secretly but surely. Sorrow may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning. Though our enemies come in as a flood, and make sad havoc with the church of the Lord Jesus, we will not, we dare not, despair. The living Redeemer is our defence and our victory, and He will assuredly render all opposition contributory to the more secure accomplishment of His final purpose. I have seen the delicate and fragile flower called the *Nomaphila* closing its blue and white tinted leaves amid the thickening shades of evening, and I have found in the sparkling sunlight of morning a larger development and a softer beauty ; so the church of

the Saviour may veil her glories before her foes, and in fear conceal her treasures, but at morning-time it shall be light, and then in ampler proportions and with diviner grace shall she appear the fairest and loveliest of all the offspring of God.

Reviewing the whole statement, the appropriateness of the Divine Person to the perfect plan, and of the plan to the Person, and of His resurrection to both, and of the subsequent changes in the condition of humanity to these three facts, must strike every mind and form a consolidated and irrefutable argument. Fitness reigns supreme. Take the plan without the supernatural character, and "chaos and old night" come back nine times more dark and chaotic than ever. Accept the person and deny His purpose, and the disorder is only less great. Every mode of viewing the subject which rejects either element is confused, illogical, and inconclusive. The historic portraiture is a living organism of which the supernatural is the spinal column, and the life-giving plan the direction along which it acts. Logical and moral consistency compels us to refuse any rudiment of certainty which eliminates either the nervous centre or the channels for its operations. The modern historians of Christ must be narrowly watched, for it is both unjust and uncritical to analyze the gospels, precipitate the rudimentary ideas, and then take hold of one and bear it aloft as though it were the synthesis of the whole. Analysis is necessary and is useful, for we never can have more than imperfect notions of Christ, and these examinations will tend to make each notion more distinct; but when the process of uniting all the parts together begins, it is unscientific and base to leave behind even the least of the principal elements. But worse than this is the modern critical Chemistry. Obtaining a certain re-agent, its professors draw the character of Christ they desire, having left in solution all the facts which testify to the supernatural. Against this procedure we protest, as well in the name of reason as of Scripture, for these things were written, the *whole* of them, that we may believe not only that there was a Jesus and that He was a sort of Messiah, but also that He was the SON OF GOD, and that believing we may have life through His name.

We rejoice, therefore, to be assured again that the gospel

does not demand the death of reason in offering itself to the acceptance of man, but boldly appeals to his judgment, simply requiring that he shall judge righteously and with a desire to discover the will of God. Christianity is not the foster-mother of credulity. Christ is not the Lord of unreason. Intelligence confirms our faith and justifies our hope. Examination reveals the solidity of the rock on which we build, and shows that the gates of hell cannot prevail against it. Inquiry attests the validity of the gospel facts, and proves that we have not followed a cunningly-devised fable in trusting to the power and looking for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. We know *whom* we have believed, how divinely strong, how humanly tender, and we are persuaded that He is able and that He intends to keep those sacred interests we have committed to Him till the day of judgment.

Christ is our life, and the world's only hope of complete regeneration. No need of the sons of men at this moment is so pressing as that of spiritual life, and no want of the church so deplorable as that of more of the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. Revered fathers and brethren, must we not confess this? Sin abounds. Our Christian lives are poor and low and selfish, and in every way too much unlike our Lord's. Death is holding high carnival in the world, and secretly plucking some of the loveliest flowers of the church. Toiling in the towns and villages of our land, or groping in the dense darkness of heathenism abroad, are millions who are perishing for lack of the knowledge of Christ, and yet, *you* believe, I believe, there is an overflowing abundance of life for them in Him and only in Him. Material progress attains its climax without raising in the smallest degree the moral nature of man. Money rolls in upon us with unprecedented fulness, but does not drive out sin. Ritualism battens upon the evils of a sensuous age, and yet men do not live. Theories of brotherhood, the direct offspring of Christianity, prove their utter powerlessness in heart-rending facts when without Christ. Wise as the age is, and no age ever was wiser, it cannot dispense with Jesus. Strong as men are in their union—and when were they stronger?—they are but chaff before the wind without His arm for their defence. Self-reliant as they are—and could they be more so?—their valor and courage are a



broken staff in the night of trial without the words and help of the Son of God. Brothers, with a faith that knows no fear, and a boldness that does not bate a jot of steadfastness to truth, and a tenderness born at the cross, that weeps o'er the self-wrought woes of men, let us go forth hazarding our lives to tell them of the love and sacrifice of the Redeemer of the world. What are we doing to convey this treasure to the hearts and homes of our needy brethren for whom Christ died? Permit me, for Jesus' sake, to urge this question! Do we care for men as our Saviour did? Is our earnestness sincere, and our fervor born of God? Is there an enthusiasm of Christ burning within us with such intensity as to reduce to ashes our envy and selfishness, and lifting us above the rule of mere routine make us stand forth as living witnesses for Him? Does the spell of His matchless love hold us to Himself, and cause to ring in our ears amid the surging billows of life, in the church and in the home, in the study and in the market, the memorable truth, "Ye are not your own, ye are bought with a price"? Can we say to this talking age as we look into our motives and examine the character of our acts, "We do not only speak great things, we live them," and do men respond to our words with a force that shows their doubt is vanquished, "The Lord is risen indeed, see how these Christians live and love"? We have great interests committed to our charge; let us not be recreant to our trust. Powerful memories urge our activity, memories of fathers and mothers now before the throne. Let us not resist their influence. Bright visions allure us. Quickly let us march towards our goal. The Lord Jesus is still with us to assure us that all power is given unto Him both in heaven and earth. Let us not fear, but preach the gospel of His love to every creature, and pray day by day that His kingdom may come, and His will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

O Son of Man! we, beholding thy glory and thy power, are ashamed and penitent for the weakness and folly of our lives, but looking up to thy perfections and pity, desire to cherish the hope that thou wilt make us more manly, truthful, strong, and good! Anointed Messiah, teach us that we may comprehend the significance of the past, and help us that we may use it to

“finest issues” in the work of the present! Son of God, we cling to thee as the dearest possession of our hearts, and fervently trust that thou wilt raise us to be partakers of thy divine nature! Gracious and life-giving Lord, visit thy church in all thy fulness; fire her sons and daughters with thy sacred enthusiasm that they may more earnestly serve, and more worthily magnify, thy holy name. “Come forth out of thy royal chambers, O prince of all the Kings of the earth; put on the visible robes of thy imperial majesty, take up that unlimited sceptre which thy Almighty Father hath bequeathed thee, for now the voice of thy bride calls thee, and all creatures sigh to be renewed.”

---

## ART. II.—RECREATIONS AND AMUSEMENTS.

When the disciples had returned from one of their preaching tours, and reported to their Master “both what they had done, and what they had taught,” he said unto them: “Come ye yourselves apart and *rest awhile*; for there were many coming and going, so that they had no leisure so much as to eat.” Christ called his disciples originally, and he calls them now, to *labor* in his service. His language to them is: “Go *work* in my vineyard. But when they *have* worked, until the necessities of nature require relaxation, he then permits and requires them to *rest*. It is as much their duty to rest, under such circumstances, as it is to work, under others. It is as really a sin to over-work in the service of Christ, as it is to under-work. It may not be so common a sin. It may not be one into which in this lazy, trifling world, we are so likely to fall; still, we have no more right to violate the laws of our being,—which are the laws of

God,—one way, than the other; and the violation of them in either way is sure to bring its penalty along with it.

In the example above cited, we have the authority of our Saviour for *seasonable rest*, and his teachings on this subject are in strict accordance with those of the Scriptures generally, and with those of nature. The God of nature has not only made work an indispensable condition of living comfortably in this world, but he has made abundant provision also for rest. Every morning has its evening, and every day its night, when weary mortals are constrained, by the very necessities of their nature, to seek repose. Every six days is followed by a seventh, which is appropriately called a *Sabbath*—a *rest*.

Rest may be total, as in quiet sleep; or only partial, as in gentle, agreeable relaxation or diversion. When our Saviour required his disciples to turn aside and rest awhile, he did not intend, probably, a total rest. He did not wish them to go to sleep. Certainly, He did not limit them to such a rest as this. What he intended was that they should take time, after their protracted labor, to recreate, to recruit, to invigorate and strengthen their wasted powers, and thus prepare for greater usefulness.

Recreations then, of the right kind and within proper limits, are not only permitted to us, but enjoined upon us. They are enjoined by the very necessities of our nature. They are enjoined by the authority of our Saviour. They are as really our duty as prayer, or praise, or hearing sermons, or anything else. Thus much, we think, may be safely said, in behalf of needful recreations.

May the same be said in behalf of *amusements*? This will depend on the meaning to be attached to the term. Many people regard amusements and recreations as the same. They use the words interchangeably, and though we do not quite accord to this view of the case, yet, for the sake of putting amusements upon the best possible footing, we are willing to accept it in this discussion. We will consent to use the words in the same sense. We will consent to say that amusements, and recreations, of the right kind, within proper limits, and when indulged in for the right ends, are not only allowable but useful. They are not only permitted to us, but enjoined upon us.

We have said that our recreations should be of *the right kind*, and there is need of wisdom in forming a judgment here. All persons do not require the same recreations; what would be a relief to some would be a weariness to others. For example: the person of sedentary habits and pursuits requires physical exertion—strong muscular exercise—such as is permitted by athletic sports, or some kinds of manual labor; while the weary house-wife or husbandman requires no such thing. They must be recreated in some more quiet way. The tired student needs to have his mind diverted, as well as his body exercised. He must engage in something which shall withdraw his thoughts from the exhausting subject, and fix them upon other things. While he, whose muscles are more wearied than his head, may refresh himself with those very things which the tired student should avoid. As to the *kind* of our recreation, therefore, every one must be guided very much by his own particular circumstances and necessities.

And the same remark may be extended to the *measure* of our recreations. Some persons require more, and some less. Some kinds of labor are so agreeably diversified, that they carry their own recreation with them; while others are so monotonous and fatiguing, that no one can bear them continuously for any great length of time.

In estimating the needed amount of recreation, the great *object* and *end* of it is to be kept constantly in view. This is not to kill time, as it is sometimes said. Time is too precious to need killing in any way. Neither is personal gratification to be regarded as the chief end. We are rather to aim at continued health, recuperated strength and vigor, and a preparation for increased usefulness. Recreation may be lawfully pursued until this,—which is its appropriate object,—is gained; *i. e.*, if it is likely ever to be gained in this way;—and no further. Pursued farther than this, the recreation or amusement changes its character. It becomes unnecessary, unlawful, selfish, dangerous.

And how many of the votaries of pleasure are blinded and deceived precisely here! They plead for amusements as things which are necessary to their health and usefulness, and profess to pursue them with this object in view, while at the same time

they know, or may know, that such is not their object, and that this result is not attained. Ask that young man, who was out almost the whole of the last night at the ball or the biliard room, or at some other place of amusement, and who got up late this morning, with parched lips, and a fluttering pulse, or an aching head, whether he went there for the purpose of recruiting and restoring exhausted nature, and whether such has been the effect of his debauch upon him. He will tell you, if he is honest, that the powers of nature, so far from being recruited, have been wasted; and that he had good reason to expect before hand that it would be so. He went to his amusements, not to be recruited and strengthened, but to be pleased. He went for the enjoyment of it,—from motives of personal gratification.

And the young lady who danced till four o'clock this morning, will, if she is honest, confess the same. Her amusement, she knows, did not recruit nature, but exhausted it. It did her no real good, physically or morally; nor did she expect beforehand that it would. But she went to be pleased. She went from motives of personal gratification. She is entitled to be called, therefore, a lover of pleasure, more than a lover of God.

Among the additional regulations to which our amusements or recreations should be subject, we mention the following:

1. They must be such, both as to their nature and circumstances, as not to violate any plain and positive command of God. This is very obvious. The law of God requires that we love our neighbor, and seek his good. If, then, under pretence of recreation, we contrive to injure our neighbor in any way, or expose him to personal inconvenience or suffering, we are no longer excusable, but criminal. The law of God requires that we use all suitable means to preserve our own life, health, and reputation. If, then, we indulge in recreations which go to expose life, or health, or reputation; if we engage in hazardous experiments, or are out at unseasonable hours, or frequent the company of evil men; our recreations are no longer innocent and salutary, but injurious. The law of God also requires that we remember the Sabbath day, and keep it holy; and this cuts

off at a stroke all Sabbath recreations,—except such as are found in the delightful duties and services of religion.

2. Our recreations must not be such as to interfere with more important duties. Recreation, within proper limits, we have said already, is a duty; still it is not one of our more indispensable duties. Certainly it is not so, in all circumstances, and at all times. What I mean to say, therefore, is, that we are so to order our recreations, both as to their nature, their amount, and the times in which to indulge them, as not to interfere with duties of more importance. If we find, at any time, that our recreations are encroaching upon the more necessary duties of life, or tend to make these duties irksome; or if we find that they interfere with our religious duties—the devotions of the family, the closet, or the social circle, giving us a disrelish for such duties, or crowding them out of place; if such is the result of our recreations, we may know that they have passed the prescribed limit somewhere. The great object and end of recreation is, to make our duties *more* pleasant, not less so,—to prepare us to engage in them with a greater zest, and to better account, and not the more to trifle with them, and neglect them. Hence, when we find that our recreations are having this latter effect upon us, we may know that they are out of place and proportion somewhere, and that they require to be examined and regulated anew.

3. Our recreations, as a general thing, ought not to involve any very considerable *expense*. Most of the popular, fashionable amusements are very expensive. It has been estimated that, in our large cities, they cost more than all the schools and seminaries of learning, and all the religious institutions. Now this, surely, is a disgraceful record. It is pushing the matter of amusements incomparably too far. In these times, when there are so many ways in which property can be turned to good account, not only for the relief of poverty and suffering, but for advancing the interests of Christ's kingdom in the world, no considerate person, and certainly no Christian, can think of running to the same excess with the fashionable and pleasure-loving around him. He will not think of spending large sums for

the mere purpose of recreation. He will contrive to recreate himself in some cheaper way.

4. In choosing our recreations, we are to avoid such as are peculiarly liable to *abuse*, and more especially such as *have been abused* to such a degree as to become scandalous. We hold this to be a very important rule, and one which cannot be safely disregarded. Some kinds of amusement are so captivating, so engrossing, that, if resorted to at all, they are very likely to be followed to a ruinous excess. They will be followed beyond what the purposes of recreation require—followed for the mere pleasure ; and thus they change their characters and become sinful and pernicious. Now such amusements should either be avoided altogether, or should be indulged in with great caution, and with a vigorous and prayerful self-control.

There are also amusements which are not only liable to abuse, but which actually *have been* and *are abused* to such a degree as to become scandalous. The devil and his agents are in full possession of them and will not give them up. Sober people cannot engage in them without disgrace, and without countenancing their multiform abuses and evils. By engaging in them, they will be likely to lead others to ruin, though they may escape the ruin themselves. We will not stop here to name these dangerous recreations, a moment's thought will enable any person to fix upon them, or at least some of them ; and less than a moment's thought will satisfy every serious Christian that all such indulgences are to be scrupulously avoided. If we would not be identified with their guilty votaries ; if we would not be accessory to their ruinous results ; if we would not be partakers of other men's sins ; if we would not bring reproach upon the religion of Christ ; they are, as we have said, to be scrupulously avoided.

The principles which have been laid down may help to settle the difficult question of amusements, which has to be talked over every few years, and which is strongly urged upon the attention of Christians at the present time.

We have said that this question of amusements,—what amusements are to be allowed, and what not,—is a *difficult* question. It is a question of difficulty, however, to only a few professing

Christians. The Apostle Paul had no difficulty with it; neither had Richard Baxter, or President Edwards, or David Brainerd, or Dr. Payson. The great body of ministers and Christians in our evangelical churches have no difficulty with it at the present time. The very spirit which they have imbibed and which they desire to cultivate, connected with inspired suggestions such as these: "Be not conformed to this world,"—"Set your affections on things above,"—"Whether ye eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God,"—"avoiding even the appearance of evil,"—these are enough to settle all questions respecting amusements with the more serious and godly members of our churches.

But there is another class who *have* difficulty on this subject, and the difficulty breaks out every little while: "What hurt can there be in dancing and playing cards, at least in our parlors? What hurt can there be in theatres, and billiards, and other fashionable games of chance? Can not these and the like pastimes be reformed and regulated, so as not to be offensive to serious minds?"

The class who thrust these questions upon us,—among whom are some ministers, as well as private Christians,—are in general those who have a horrible dread of Puritanical strictness, and of being "righteous over-much;" who, instead of forgetting the things which are behind, and reaching on to those which are before," are studying to know how little religion a person can get along with, and yet retain his credit as a Christian, and his hope of heaven. They fear that the standard of holy attainment among us is becoming too high for this advancing age,—so high as to be discouraging to those who are without; and are thinking that if it could be lowered somewhat, possibly more might be induced to enter the fold of Christ.

Now we would hope that the principles which have been laid down may be a relief to some minds which are in this peculiar state. We have admitted that recreation of some sort is needful for us, and that, when placed under proper limitations, it is even a duty. We have stated what some of these limitations are. Our recreations must be of the right kind, and must be pursued in the right measure, and for the right ends. They must not be



allowed to interfere with more important duties ; and all such as, by continual abuse, have become scandalous, are to be avoided. When pursued from the right motive, and under the limitations which have been prescribed, there is no danger in recreations. Our own consciences will approve them, God will approve, and the results, we may hope, will be continually happy. But if the rules which have been given are transcended or neglected, and we venture upon courses of self-indulgence in the pursuit of pleasure, and for mere pleasure ; they then become sordid and selfish, offensive to God, and destructive to the best interests of the soul.

As to certain amusements being reformed, so as to become unexceptionable, this is out of the question. The thing has often been attempted, and we have no hesitation in saying that it has always failed. A reformed theatre, a reformed dancing hall, a reformed gaming table,—such things have never yet been realized, and they never will be. The chief patrons of such amusements do not wish them reformed. Reformed so as to become acceptable to serious Christians, the lovers of pleasure would no longer frequent them. They would as soon hear a sermon, or go to a prayer-meeting. There is but one way of reforming sin, and that is to abandon it. To gloss it over under false appearances, and then cling to it, and persist in it, is of all paths the most certain to ruin and to death. We could tell of parlors into which cards were first introduced as a genteel amusement ; and now estates are won and lost in them, and the night is worn away in the most exciting and pernicious gambling. We could tell, too, of parlors into which dancing was introduced, under the same pretence ; and now, in the rudeness of their pastimes, and the lateness of their hours, they are not unlike the public dancing halls. The only safety in regard to such amusements, is to *let them alone*.

And as to letting down the standard of Christian morality, with a view to please worldly men, and entice them into the fold of Christ, such a policy, I am sure, can end only in defeat and misery. It was a policy such as this which fatally corrupted the church, in the third and fourth centuries, and led on to the great Romish apostasy. To conciliate the Pagans, the church consented to borrow their rites, and adopt their festivals ; and

in this way, the Christian temples soon became little better than those of the heathen.

This same corrupting policy is urged upon Christians at the present day. We were sorry to hear a proposition advocated a year ago,—which we are glad to know has since been repudiated,—to introduce cards and billiards into the rooms of the Young Men's Christian Associations; and all this for the purpose of drawing in a class of young men who otherwise would not come there. Now such a plan could only have tended to corrupt and ruin these Associations, and defeat the noble object for which they were instituted. And much as we approve their object, and much as we are concerned to help it forward, rather than that such a proposition should be adopted and executed, we would prefer that all Young Men's Christian Associations in the country were dissolved and their rooms closed forever. For what is the use of keeping them open, to initiate unsophisticated young men into practices which would be likely to ruin them? And what is the use of taking a noble institution which God has raised up and spread over the land, and turning it into an engine of Satan, to further his vile purposes and do his work.

In speaking as we have felt constrained to do on this subject, let no one charge us with moroseness, severity, or indifference to the happiness of our fellow-men. We are not indifferent to the happiness of our fellow-men, and especially of the younger portion of them. So far from this, we seek and prize their happiness; and it is because we prize it, that we have made the distinctions; and engaged in the discussion which has been presented. What source of happiness, allow us to ask, has our heavenly Father opened to us, in his works or in his word, which we have not left open? What sources of personal gratification but such as he has prohibited, have we closed up? In the enjoyment of friends and of social intercourse; in the enjoyment of all that variety of good which is set before us in the outer world; in the enjoyment of appetite and sense even, so far as they can be indulged to the glory of God; in the possession of those higher enjoyments resulting from the pursuit and acquisition of knowledge and the right performance of duty; indulged also with the multiform

diversions and recreations of life,—all that the necessities of nature and our own best good require;—with such sources of happiness spread out before us, and urged upon us; what ought we as rational beings to desire or to ask for more? And why should we complain of religion, or the ministers of religion, because they interdict to us a class of pleasures which are, in their nature, sinful, and whose influence can only be to degrade and injure us?

What do those who rely so much on their sinful amusements and pleasures expect to do with themselves in heaven? Cut off from all their present sources of happiness; having no pleasures but those which are social, intellectual, moral, spiritual, will not heaven be to them a gloomy place, where they will find little to enjoy, and from which they will desire if possible to escape?

Let all who read these pages remember, that we were sent into this world, not for sport and amusement, but for labor; not to enjoy and please ourselves, but to serve and glorify God, and be useful to our fellow-men. This is the great object and end of life. This is that for which life was given us. In pursuing this end, God has indeed permitted us all needful diversion and recreation. He has consulted our happiness in a thousand ways. He has so connected our duty with our happiness, that there is no such thing as being solidly, permanently happy but in obedience to his will.

But the great end of life, after all, is *work*—work for God—work for the advancement of his kingdom, and the best good of our fellow men. The Christian fathers have a tradition that John the Baptist, when a boy, and when requested by some other boys to join them in their play, replied: “*I came into this world, not for sport.*” Whether the Baptist ever said this, we are unable to decide. But whether he did, or not, it is a memorable saying. It is a *true* saying; however cutting may be the reproof which it carries to some of us. *We* came into this world, not for sport. We were sent here for a higher and nobler object. Let us, then, not forget this object. Let us seek to promote it by every means in our power. Then, when summoned to meet our final Judge, we may hope to hear him say, “Well done good and faithful servants; enter ye into the joy of your Lord.”

### ART. III.—THE ANTI-SLAVERY RECORD OF THE FREEWILL BAPTISTS.

During the latter part of our great struggle for national independence, another was opened which sought the prevalence of a more spiritual and scriptural religion. A nation and a denomination were born in those struggles, and both the United States and the Freewill Baptists were the offspring of freedom. Slavery was not then fully understood, though its victims were found in every state of the Union. It was soon banished from New England, and compelled to retire gradually from other northern states before the onward march of liberty. The "ordinance of 1787" excluded it forever from the upper valley of the Mississippi, and when the Constitution was adopted, almost every one believed that it would ultimately disappear. Consequently the people gave their attention to the pressing wants of a new country; and, while the state was perfecting its government and developing its resources, and the church was caring for the local and general interests of religion, all were unmindful of the growing power of slavery. It is true, there were horrid dreams of the wrongs it was committing, and sad forebodings of a coming retribution; but what to do, no one was prepared to say, and all seemed waiting for time to work a cure or develop a remedy. The people of the free states were once more than half aroused by the danger of slavery extension, but the "Missouri compromise" allayed their fears, and the dark night of their quiet slumbers continued as before.

It was the clarion voice of Garrison, in 1830, that broke the long repose, when he uttered that simple but startling truth, "*Immediate emancipation is the right of the slave and the duty of the master.*" Slavery then held more than 2,000,000 of human beings as chattel property, and the number was increasing at the rate of 30 per cent. every ten years. These men, women and children were bought and sold, torn away from friends and kindred, fed and clothed, as the interest or caprice of their masters might dictate, driven by the lash to their daily tasks, in-

tionally kept in ignorance, and allowed "no rights that white men are bound to respect." Slavery had indeed become a power in the land, and this power was exercised for its perpetuity and extension. Six new slave states had been admitted into the Union, and slaveholders had filled the Presidential chair thirty-four years during the forty-two years since the Constitution was adopted. And in nearly the same proportion had all the prominent places of trust been filled by men identified with the interests of slavery. Instead of believing slavery to be an evil that must retire before the increasing light of Christian civilization, as the founders of our government believed, statesmen and divines were beginning to claim that it was a blessing to the race, both white and black, an institution of the Bible and approved by God. Such was slavery in fact and pretension, when Garrison and a handful of abolitionists entered upon an uncompromising warfare against it. After suffering imprisonment in Baltimore for Christ's sake, he returned to Boston and established the *Liberator*, whose weekly utterances led to earnest discussion. The light began to shine, the wrongs of slavery were exposed, and the responsibility of its continuance was charged in part upon the North as well as upon the South.

Opposition was at once awakened ; abolitionists were denounced, and their scheme of emancipation was declared to be folly and madness. But the agitation went on, gathering strength and numbers to the cause of freedom. The people generally were not then interested in the question, but individuals of every class, especially Christians, were discussing its merits. Not satisfied with individual effort, they began to take counsel together and unite their strength ; and in 1833 the American Anti-Slavery Society was organized. One of the noble pioneers in that organization was a Freewill Baptist minister, who was afterwards a frequent contributor to the *Morning Star*. From that time onward, the denomination began to take an increasing interest in the cause of emancipation.

No sooner did patriotic and pious men begin to look into the institution of slavery, to ascertain its social and moral bearings, than the slaveholders began to show their alarm. "Let us alone," was the cry from the South, and "Let us alone," was the

democratic echo from the North. Investigation was absolutely refused, and all inquiry into the subject was regarded as insulting. No person of anti-slavery utterances could remain in the South, and continued threats and open abuse deterred others from going there. In this state of affairs, the first and the only work that could be done was to enlighten the people on the subject of slavery, to create a public sentiment against it, to give expression to that sentiment, and to induce the people of the free states to withhold from it all countenance and support. Succeeding in this, it was believed that slaveholders would be persuaded or compelled to listen to reason, accept the right, and free their slaves.

Anti-slavery men very naturally looked to the American church for co-operation; but here they were met by some who were the devotees of slavery, and claimed that it was a political institution, acknowledged and sustained by the Constitution and laws of the nation. The frightful cry of "politics—abolitionists are meddling with politics," kept many cautious Christians from identifying themselves with the anti-slavery movement.

Because a few Christian pulpits and a few religious papers were recreant to the great principles of liberty; and because many churches and ministers did not come up at once and fully to the line of duty, radical men in the anti-slavery cause took ultra ground, and were unjustifiably severe in opposing what they were pleased to call "the church and clergy." Pro-slavery men took advantage of this also, and, applying the language of extremists to all emancipationists, called them "infidels," and charged them with the design of overthrowing the government and the institutions of religion. Pious men, and clergymen especially, unwilling to be classified with Garrison and Phillips, Wright and Pillsbury, in their sweeping denunciation, stood aloof from the enterprise, though timidly desiring the abolition of slavery.

Under these circumstances, the troubled waters of public excitement became so deeply agitated that every religious journal was constrained to notice the spreading agitation, and take its position on the question. About three months after the organization of the Anti-Slavery Society—Feb. 27, 1834—the

*Morning Star*, a weekly paper, owned and controlled by the denomination, came out with a leading editorial headed "*Slavery and Abolition.*" That the record we are now giving may be a faithful one, enough will be quoted from that first utterance of the *Star* to show its spirit and purpose. After admitting that slavery is an evil to society, and after stating the views of abolitionists, the *Star* says,

Now many things appear plausible in theory, and, viewed in an abstract manner, seem perfectly just and right, which, nevertheless, are found false and injurious in practice. Such, it is apprehended, is immediate emancipation. Abstract justice would say, "liberate the blacks immediately." But sound practical jurisprudence would first inquire whether the blacks would be benefited by immediate emancipation—whether this, under the existing circumstances, would most effectually promote their happiness. If not, some other course would be preferable. The present state of the blacks, their intelligence, their habits, their relation to the whites, past and future, in case of emancipation, would render them incapable of providing for their own happiness—they could no more do it than an insane person. Now who would think it expedient to allow insane men personal liberty? . . . . But some abolitionist will probably say, "you advocate slavery." True sir, we prefer slavery to that which is worse. We prefer servitude, if it makes the community more happy than liberty. Yet we hate slavery, and wish to see it abolished; though not abolished under such circumstances as would make the remedy worse than the disease. . . . . The course pursued by some emancipators is greatly to be regretted. It is feared that the cause of freedom will be more injured by their rashness than it can be benefited by their good intentions. We wish them success in doing good, but their motto should be changed, if they intend to have it regarded in practice.

In conclusion we would say, let the slaves be liberated as fast as they can become prepared to use their freedom in promoting their own happiness, without injuring the community; and let all who have been partakers in the affair, be equal partners in preparing them to enjoy liberty, and in effecting their emancipation.

If it is humiliating to read the above extracts from the first utterance of our denominational organ on the anti-slavery agitation, it is gratifying to know that then, and then only, was the

light of our *Star* darkness. A few weeks after the publication of that well-meant article, the author,\* who was the office editor, was removed by death. In supplying the vacancy, the Publishing Committee, with Rev. David Marks their agent, at once committed the *Morning Star*, in *outspoken* language, to the cause of freedom. Objections were made by some of its patrons, but in June following, the New Hampshire Yearly Meeting, the largest and most numerously attended meeting of all our annual gatherings,

*Resolved*, That we highly approve of the proceedings of the Publishing Committee and Book Agent, who have charge of the establishment, and recommend to all our brethren and friends to patronize the *Morning Star*.

From that day to this, the organ of the Freewill Baptists has been one of the most bold and uncompromising anti-slavery papers in the land, as we shall hereafter see by the confession of both friends and foes.

As the spirit of the Reformation manifested itself in different countries of Europe at about the same time, and as the fires of American patriotism were a kind of spontaneous combustion in 1776, so there was a readiness on the part of Freewill Baptists, in almost every free state, without consultation or comparison of views, to rally for the slave, as soon as the banner of freedom was unfurled. This was a coincidence worthy of note. The Bible doctrines of free will, free salvation and free communion, had been fondly cherished, and it was very natural that the denomination should at once declare its faith in the freedom of man.

The anti-slavery agitation began among us in the family circle, in social interviews, and by the wayside, as friends met or journeyed together. This kind of interest necessarily preceded all public declarations. But the pulpit could not be long silent after its occupants had become convinced that slavery was a sin, and one for which the people were responsible. The ministry did speak, and the word took effect. It would be hardly just and proper to specify individuals in this connection, as so many entered the field at about the same time to labor and suffer in the

\* Samuel Beede.



cause. It required both moral principle and decision of character to stand up, in those days, and talk, preach or pray against slavery. And, fortunately, the leading men of our ministry\* were not wanting in these qualities.

Many of them were entreated by their friends to refrain altogether from the discussion of the subject, and among the prominent reasons assigned were these: Your pockets will suffer; your social standing will be lowered; your influence will be injured; your preaching will be fruitless; you will divide the church; and the union will be dissolved. These arguments prevailed with only a few.

In 1834 a clergyman of the Farmington Quarterly Meeting, in Maine, gave notice that he intended at the next session to introduce some anti-slavery resolutions. Several of his brethren, both ministers and laymen, besought him most earnestly to do no such thing, as it would destroy the harmony of the meeting and result in no good. The resolutions were introduced, and a brother minister went forty miles to assist in defending them. After a long, earnest, and Christian discussion, they were adopted without a dissenting vote. In March following, the Rockingham Quarterly Meeting,

*Resolved,* That we will, as Christians, and Christian ministers, use our influence to promote the doctrine of immediate emancipation; in doing which we wish to treat the oppressor and the oppressed in the spirit of the gospel.

In 1835, Rev. David Marks, Agent of the Printing Establishment, attended the annual meeting of the New Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society, and reported the speeches for the *Morning Star*. The publication of these speeches encouraged the friends of freedom, but exasperated the sympathizers with slavery.

The next week after the Anti-Slavery meeting in Concord,

\* At the risk of seeming invidiousness we will here record a fact, viz.: The Freewill Baptist ministry, as a body, has been one of the most self-sacrificing classes of men in the Christian Church. In the early history of the denomination they travelled and preached, but received almost nothing as a pecuniary compensation. In the early history of the anti-slavery cause, their stipulated salary was from *fifty* to a *hundred* per cent. less than that of other ministers, and yet they would lose their all rather than be silent when the cries of the oppressed filled their ears. And since their salaries have been increased, they have given to the various causes of benevolence, as almost no other class of men has given.

was the New Hampshire Yearly Meeting, in Lisbon, a rich farming town above the mountains. It was expected that Rev. Dr. Cox, of London, and Rev. Amos Sufton, a returned English missionary from India, would be there. Also that our first missionary to India, and one to the Mississippi valley, would there be ordained. These circumstances called out such numbers as had never before attended a Yearly Meeting. They came up from every hill and glen of the Granite State, and both Maine and Vermont were largely represented. In that great meeting of unprecedented missionary interest, the poor slave was not forgotten. The following resolution was submitted, and the earnest and eloquent discussion which followed, was listened to with the most profound attention.

*Resolved*, That the principles of immediate abolition are derived from the unerring word of God; and that no political circumstances whatever can exonerate Christians from exerting all their moral influence for the suppression of this heinous sin.

In support of this resolution, offered by Rev. Mr. Marks, he said substantially;

It is entirely proper for this Yearly Meeting to speak in behalf of the Africans who have a natural right to freedom. By the law of God, also, they are free. But the laws of nature and of God have been violated; and the great Lawgiver has said, "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." We can all do something. We can give our influence, whatever it may be, to change public opinion on the subject, and bring the church and the nation to see and feel the guilt of our position. Yes, Brother Moderator, the church in America is guilty of the sin of slaveholding, because she has never come up and borne a firm and united testimony against it. Men tell us to be still, and wait a more favorable opportunity. We have been still for half a century until half a million of slaves have increased to two and a half millions. No, brethren, we must not be still; we must wash our hands from the guilt of this sin; we must preach, and pray, and labor to have slavery abolished in the District of Columbia, and its principles condemned throughout the Christian church.

Rev. Jonathan Woodman said:

I agree with brother Marks that the church is guilty of the sin of slavery, and it becomes us to wash the stain away. There

is a God who will take the part of the oppressed. He did in Egypt, and he will in America. He will scourge us for our sins, and I have long trembled for my country, while I have remembered that God is just. Do men ask, "What can we do?" We can do away slavery in the District of Columbia. We can pour in our memorials till the floors of Congress shall groan under the weight of our appeals. The South will not stir; New England must. With our high professions for free grace, equal rights and gospel liberty, can we, as a denomination, be indifferent to those in bonds? Are we parents, and yet without sympathy for those bereft of their children, and left with nothing to desire but death? Dare we, as Christians, approbate this sin, and then ask God to bless us? If so, it is an abomination. Our hands as a people, are full of blood, and God will send us curses instead of blessings. I second the resolution.

There were other speakers, and another resolution added, and when the question was taken, the two resolutions were not only adopted *unanimously* by the Yearly Meeting, but almost the whole congregation rose in their support. The record says :

While the subject of Slavery was before the meeting, the greatest attention was apparent. Deep sympathy for the poor degraded slave was expressed by many a swelling bosom and falling tear.

Similar resolutions were adopted by Yearly Meetings in Maine, Vermont, and New York; and the action of these bodies, published in the *Star* with the above sketch of the speeches, all endorsed, was a virtual commitment of the denomination to the Anti-Slavery cause. The actual commitment was by the representatives from all the Yearly Meetings in General Conference assembled at Byron, N. Y., in October of the same year. For the first time did the denomination then speak in calm but decided condemnation of slavery, by the unanimous adoption of the following resolutions :

(1.) *Resolved*, That slavery is an unjust infringement on the dearest rights of the slave; an unwarrantable exercise of power on the part of the master; a potent enemy to the happiness and morals of our slaveholding population; and if continued, must ultimately result in the ruin of our country.

(2.) *Resolved*, That as Christians, patriots, and philanthropists, we ought to exert our influence to induce all slaveholders to

use their best exertions, in their respective states, to procure the abolition of slavery.

(3.) *Resolved*, That a candid discussion and mutual interchange of views, on the best method of abolishing slavery, are loudly called for by the present crisis.

(4.) *Resolved*, That it is the duty of Christians to frequently and fervently *pray* that the evil of slavery may be removed from our beloved country.

The entire unanimity with which these resolutions were adopted, after a full and free discussion, was a matter of surprise to all; and another was added, expressive of a truth that will call upon us to "rejoice evermore." It was in these words:

*Resolved*, That we have abundant cause for gratitude to God that, as a denomination, we are so generally united in our views on the distracting subject of slavery.

This action of the denomination may seem unworthy of comment; and indeed it is, when viewed from our present standpoint alone. But we must go back to those exciting times if we would appreciate its importance, and the difficulties under which it was taken. Let it be remembered that the Anti-Slavery Society had just raised \$6,000 at a single meeting in Boston, and \$15,000 in New York, and then had sixty lecturers in the field who were carrying light and truth throughout the land. The guilty slaveholders were alarmed; and, in their exasperation, indicted abolitionists, offered bounties for their heads, and threatened them with the halter if caught in the South. They haughtily called upon the good people of the North—upon business men, if they would retain southern trade; upon Christian men, if they would not see a bloody insurrection; upon political men, if they would be true to their party and its pro-slavery interests; upon State Legislatures, if they would contribute to the peace and prosperity of the country,—they called upon all classes of men to frown down the abolition movement, and stop, as they said, "these wicked agitators."

They called upon Congress to do it, and threatened to dissolve the Union if it was not done. Timid and selfish men, especially politicians, took the alarm, and did what they could to arrest discussion; but every effort only strengthened the abolitionists,

because God was with them. The iron-willed Jackson was then in the presidential chair, and by message and the exercise of almost absolute authority, attempted to check the fires of freedom. Congress refused to the people all right of petition on the subject, and by pro-slavery legislation sought to extend and perpetuate the institution. The mails were searched, and abolition papers and documents taken out and destroyed. Postmasters and state officials were usually active, and there was not a school district in all the land, that did not have its quota of abolition haters. Mob-visitation, imprisonment and death had been the fate of some who "remembered them that are in bonds as bound with them;" and others were threatened with a similar retribution.

It must not be forgotten that no religious body, representing any one of the great denominations, had then declared itself in favor of the Anti-Slavery cause. If not in sympathy with slavery, most of them were opposed to agitation. No minister could speak against oppression in sermon or prayer, without displeasing more or less, and in every congregation were some who would tolerate no expression of sympathy for the slave. Friends became alienated, social relations were sundered, churches were divided, societies rent in twain, and many a faithful pastor was left without competent support, or dismissed on short notice. Such were some of the circumstances under which the Freewill Baptists unanimously took their position on the side of immediate emancipation in 1835.

If it were necessary to show that the above named anti-slavery action was a triumph of principle over policy, we find the proof of it in the fact that, while those resolutions were under consideration, the Trustees of the Printing Establishment were instructed to procure an act of incorporation from the Legislature of New Hampshire—a state whose dominant party was so strong, and so closely allied to pro-slavery interests, that it was called "the Gibraltar of Democracy." Policy dictated a conservative position, but principle called for the decisive action then taken. The consequences of that action, and of the positions subsequently taken in opposition to slavery and the fellowship of slaveholders, by which the denomination was denied its

rights and privileges, and was prevented from receiving large accessions to its numbers, will be shown in the following pages.

It was one thing to adopt strong anti-slavery resolutions when together, cheered and strengthened by each other's words and presence, and quite another thing for the delegates to defend and sustain them, single handed and alone, in their respective churches. They were continually meeting some new phase of opposition, and could we know the perplexing difficulties intentionally thrown in the way of the faithful abolition pastors, not one of them would be found without his trials, and few of them without persecution.

In justice to the memory of those noble men who early placed the denomination in the front ranks of anti-slavery volunteers, and for the information of all who would know the historic facts, it may be proper to speak yet more in detail of the trials they encountered, and the tempting propositions they spurned in their fidelity to God and their fraternity to man. Looking at the dark side of this picture we find disaffected persons in the church and out of it, who denounced the ministry for keeping up this everlasting agitation about the negro. Some of them had been active Christians, and the warm personal friends of the pastor. Such retired into the background of Christian labor, and soon lost all interest in religion. A very few ministers, even, were grieved with the anti-slavery measures of the denomination, and greatly strengthened the disaffected ones in the laity. Political papers called upon the church-going people, opposed to abolitionism, to "starve out the negro preachers." And so effectual was this counsel that many withheld their support, or left the meeting altogether.

In 1836 \$15,000 were due the Printing Establishment for books and the *Star*, and many pro-slavery debtors refused payment. The Trustees were then personally responsible for a debt of \$6,000, and said in their Report, "We petitioned the New Hampshire Legislature for an act of incorporation, but our prayer has not been granted." The times were unparalleled for pecuniary embarrassment. Money could not be hired, even at extravagant rates; and failures in business were of daily occur-

ence. In every mail came requests, sometimes vile and abusive, for the discontinuance of the *Star* because of its anti-slavery character. And so numerous were these requests that, for two years, the subscription list was gradually decreasing. The Board of Trustees was understood to be divided on the expediency of pushing yet farther the anti-slavery agitation, and a meeting was called for the express purpose of considering that question. To avert from the denomination the public odium heaped upon abolitionists, and to reconcile the disaffected members; to secure an increased circulation of the *Star*, and an act of incorporation for the Trustees; and, more than all, to prevent the utter failure of the Printing Establishment, a pause in our anti-slavery progress, if not a retraction of our strong sayings, was demanded. Not a few in the connection thought some modification of our position was essential to prosperity; and from without, a still greater pressure was brought to bear.

That was a dark day to those who looked upon passing events in the light of expediency, and a time of trial to those who would do their duty and trust in God. Then did the denomination come to a crisis, and it was left with eleven men to carry it through. Had they stifled the anti-slavery voice of the *Star*, the consequence to the denomination and the freedom of the slave, we never shall know. That meeting of the Board was an important one, and the discussion continued through the day; nor did it cease with the expiring twilight. Through the live-long night they considered the question with an interest, equalled only by the consequences that hung upon the decision. It was not till the radiant beams of morning light were streaming in upon that wakeful, wrestling Board, that a vote was attempted. The question was then submitted: "Shall the *Morning Star* pursue its present anti-slavery course?" Every answer was in the affirmative, save one. Righteous decision! Joyful intelligence to the friends of the oppressed!

It has already been said that the Trustees of the Printing Establishment failed in their first effort to secure an act of incorporation, and two leading journals of the party that controlled the Legislature, tell us the reason of that failure. The *Dover Gazette*, the very next week after the rejection of the bill, said:

It was securely progressing through the customary stages, when it was mentioned among the members that this establishment had become the vehicle of abolitionism; this produced an instant inquiry into the truth of the suggestion, and the result was that the bill was, on Wednesday, refused a third reading by an overwhelming majority.

The *New Hampshire Patriot* reported the action of the House on this bill, and said:

The chairman of the Committee on Incorporations had heard that it (the *Morning Star*) was an advocate of abolition, and he felt no disposition—that the Legislature should lend its aid to publications, which the Legislatures of our sister States were entreating us to suppress.

He then read extracts from the paper, proving its anti-slavery character. After speaking of other objections to the bill, the *Patriot* says:

The principal objection to its passage, however, was the fact that the *Morning Star*, a paper advocating the doctrine of the immediate abolition of slavery, was owned by and published under the auspices of the Society proposed to be incorporated; and that the granting of the charter, authorizing and legalizing such a newspaper, would be construed as favoring the designs of the abolitionists.

The bill was finally rejected by a vote of 188 to 34.

This refusal of a favor—a right, we might call it—so just and reasonable, did not affect the course of the *Star*. It continued to speak for the oppressed, and soon after had a department headed SLAVERY in the which the subject was constantly and freely discussed. The Trustees were thus true to their convictions of duty, and, at the same time, annually sought for incorporated rights. They were constantly meeting with an increase of favor, and once might have received a charter with this provision: “If the Trustees of said corporation shall publish, or cause to be published, any books, tracts or pamphlets, upon the subject of the abolition of slavery, the charter shall be void.” Thus did the denomination humbly petition for corporate powers, and thus were they always refused for *ten successive years*. The anti-slavery position of the Freewill Baptists was beginning to affect the politics of the State, and in 1846, by the noble assistance of Hon. John P. Hale, George G. Fogg, and others, an entire change



was effected, and an act of incorporation was immediately granted. To show who were instrumental in effecting this political change, "our enemies themselves being judges," we insert from the *New Hampshire Patriot*, the leading democratic paper in the State, the following extract.

During many years, the *Morning Star*, at Dover, has labored indefatigably to spread among the Freewill Baptist denomination of Christians the conviction that the democrats were a pro-slavery party. This has been the tendency of its course. It has held up the evils of slavery, in the darkest features of atrocity, and the democrats have been, if not by express charge, by implication, denounced as the upholders of these evils. A portion of the clergy of the same denomination have pursued a similar course. In the pulpit, and by the fireside, they have preached abolition, raised sympathy, excited strong feeling, and prepared the minds of a great number of the people to believe that they must abandon all other things, to resist the denounced encroachments of the slave power.

In 1837 the Home Mission Society petitioned the New Hampshire Legislature for an act of incorporation, and the Baptist Register, printed at the capital, said the principal objection urged against this bill, was the expectation that the Society would send forth "missionaries to preach abolitionism." Never discouraged in a good cause, the petition was pressed for three years, and a charter obtained.

The denomination met with this same pro-slavery spirit in all localities. The friends of Education in Ohio petitioned the Legislature of that State for the incorporation of Geauga Seminary, and pro-slavery men interested themselves in its defeat.

Failing in this, they procured the insertion of a clause by which all persons of color were excluded from the School. This charter was indignantly rejected, and the next year, after great effort, one was obtained in accordance with their desires.

It was in that dark season of pro-slavery proscription, intensified by financial embarrassment, that the General Conference assembled at Greenville, R. I. in 1837. As the great body of the loyal people stood undismayed through the darkest gloom of the Great Rebellion, so did the Freewill Baptists stand in the earlier manifestations of Slavery's cruel power. It was unanimously

*Resolved*, That Slavery, as it exists in our country, is a system of tyranny; a tyranny more cruel and wicked than the oppression and wrong practiced by any other civilized nation in the known world, upon any class of its citizens. That it is a system, murderous in his nature, its tendencies and actual results. That it is a system of robbery; robbery most aggravated; robbing man of all his rights, personal, civil and domestic; his rights corporeal, intellectual and spiritual; and robbing God of souls whom he has created, and for whom Christ has died.

*Resolved*, That American Slavery is a sin of such exceeding enormity and magnitude, that every minister of the gospel should loudly testify against it, and every Christian should decidedly rebuke it.

*Resolved*, That we concur in the principles of the American Anti-Slavery Society, as expressed in its declaration of sentiments, (see *Morning Star*, Vol. XI, No. 29) and in its measures for the removal of Slavery, as those measures are set forth in its Constitution.

The next General Conference, at Conneaut, Ohio, in 1839, was one of surpassing interest on the slavery question. A communication was received from New Hampshire, signed by four clergymen and as many clerks, in behalf of their respective churches, asking the opinion of Conference on a resolution of the Rockingham Quarterly Meeting, and expressing grief because the *Morning Star* had become a political paper. Most of these men, with others—eleven in all—had signed a “protest” against the resolution above mentioned, which was published in the *New Hampshire Patriot*. One of the signers had been a member of the Publishing Committee, and as the appearance of said “protest” caused no little excitement at the time, we give a copy of it entire :

Whereas the *Morning Star*, a religious paper, published at Dover, N. H., under the direction of the Freewill Baptist General Conference, is sent abroad in the world as containing the sentiments of the denomination,—and whereas we believe slavery a moral and political evil, and to be very much regretted that it should ever have been countenanced on Columbia’s free soil; yet we, as a religious community, can never consent to digress so far from the cause we have espoused, as to lend our influence to any Society that we think has for its ultimate object the dissolution of the Union, or that will create dissension in the moral and religious community.

Therefore we the undersigned, professing ourselves to be Freewill Baptists, beg leave, through your columns, to enter this, our protest, on the following subjects which are propagated in your columns, [the *Star*.]

1. We disapprove of the measures 'of the Anti-Slavery Society, which is [are?] propagated in the *Morning Star*, and do not feel ourselves bound to sustain the vote passed in the Rockingham Q. M. in relation to said Society, and also feel and believe the paper may be filled with matter more edifying and interesting to a religious community.

2. We disapprove of a religious paper descending so far below the object for which it was intended (agreeably to the Prospectus) as to meddle with the political contentions of the day, which has been done by the *Morning Star*.

3. We disapprove of the doings of the last General Conference in the encouragement and inducement to preach by note.

The communication laid before Conference was but a repetition of this famous "protest," and it was referred to the Committee on Slavery, who, not having before them the resolution referred to, reported the two following resolutions which were unanimously adopted :

*Resolved*, That this Conference, believing the Anti-Slavery cause to be the cause of God, recommend to every Christian, and every Christian minister to use all proper means to promote its interests.

*Resolved*, That this Conference highly approve the decided and straight-forward course of the *Morning Star* on the subject of slavery.

Dr. William Housley, of Kentucky, a member of the Calvinistic Baptist church, and a licensed preacher, held a public correspondence with the editor of the *Star*, and, having received satisfactory answers to his inquiries, came to the Conference, proposing to unite with the Freewill Baptists, and receive ordination at their hands. In his statement before Conference he said, "a large number of the Baptists in the southern country are with you in sentiment, and should you plant a mission in Kentucky, probably you might gather into your connection, from that state alone, 20,000 members within three years." A newspaper in southern Ohio noticed the fact that Dr. Housley was on his way to the General Conference of the Freewill Baptists, with which body he expected to unite, and then said, "On his

return to Kentucky he will carry with him all those Baptist churches that believe in free salvation."

A council of five members from the church at Conneaut, with which he had already united, and an equal number from the Conference, were chosen to inquire into the expediency of his ordination. The relation of his Christian experience and the statement of his doctrinal views and call to the ministry, were satisfactory. The examination was progressing favorably, till it was ascertained that he was a slaveholder, and that fact led to a most thorough investigation of the subject. The substance of his answers may be thus stated:

Slavery is a great moral evil, a scourge and a curse; and yet, I am a slaveholder, owning property in a mother and her three children, to the amount of \$2,000. If I could believe that the condition of my slaves would be improved by immediate emancipation, I should be as glad to have them liberated as you would; but they are ignorant, and unprepared at present, to take care of themselves. Your question, as to its being morally and religiously right to claim property in our fellow beings, circumstances being as they are, is a difficult one, and I choose not to answer it directly. And should you give bonds that my slaves shall have three years of instruction in a good New England school, and be otherwise qualified for useful lives, I should not consent to give them up without remuneration. And should I now see them passing here, on their way to Canada, I should arrest them and claim them as my property.

When the facts of Dr. Housley's connection with slavery were whispered abroad, and before the decision of the council was known, Judge M., a man of great influence in Northern Ohio, called on the chairman and entreated him not to report against the Doctor merely because he was a slaveholder. Said he, "Do it, and it will be destructive to the Freewill Baptist interests in all this country." A prominent man in the ministry said to one of the council, "Do you think the denomination will make slaveholding a test of Christian fellowship?" "I do," was the reply. "Then," said he, with great emphasis, "I am no longer a Freewill Baptist."

As the Conference opened the next morning, a crowded house was anxiously waiting for the council's report. It was soon pre-

sented, short and to the point, in these words: "As Dr. Housley claims property in human beings, we cannot ordain him as a minister, nor fellowship him as a Christian."

The discussion that followed was exceedingly sharp and earnest. All the speaking talent of Conference was called into action, and many brethren, not members of the Conference, several ministers of other denominations, and lawyers even, were permitted to participate in the debate. The report was opposed as being in advance of public sentiment, uncharitable, impolitic and wrong. But the Conference finally voted unanimously, that "the decision is highly satisfactory." And in that vote were buried all the bright visions of denominational accessions from Kentucky.

There had been Baptist churches in North and South Carolina for more than a century. A majority of them united with the Calvinistic Baptists many years ago, but those of free sentiments declined, and in 1827 they heard of the Freewill Baptists in New England, and opened a correspondence with them. The result was, they at once called themselves by the same name as their brethren at the North, published their proceedings as "The Minutes of the Freewill Baptist Annual Conference of North Carolina," continued their correspondence, sent us their "Minutes," purchased our books, and at one time, took nearly five hundred copies of the *Morning Star*. They were visited by Rev. Elias Hutchins, and found to be in union with the Freewill Baptists of the North, both in doctrine and usage, but had never been recognized as a part of the denomination, any farther than the insertion of their statistics in the Register, though there was every prospect that the union would soon be formal and complete, when the Anti-Slavery agitation commenced. Mr. Hutchins proposed to discuss the question of slavery with their leading and most influential ministers, but they declined the proposition, saying, "the state of feeling is such in the south that it will not be prudent to do so." The two Quarterly Meetings, 45 churches, 36 ministers, and 3000 members, were all pro-slavery, and there being no hope of their reform in this regard, it was voted "that in the future, the North Carolina Conference be not inserted in our statistics." And thus,

the same Conference that said to slaveholders in Kentucky, you cannot come into our fellowship, said also to those in Carolina, you "are not of us," and may go out.

But one inference can be drawn from the action of 1839, as above stated, and that is, no fellowship with slaveholders. But the Conference would not leave the public to *infer* its position, and therefore it was

*Resolved,* That it is equally evident that slavery is contrary to the law of Moses, to the gospel of Christ, and to every moral obligation.

*Resolved,* That, in view of these undeniable facts, the man who will not examine the subject impartially, or who examines it and still advocates the continuance of slavery, is not worthy to be esteemed a disciple of Christ; and, after due but unsuccessful admonition, ought not to be fellowshipped as a Christian.

It was a bold and unprecedented act for the Freewill Baptists to sunder the cable of Christian fellowship, that bound to their free bark the old scow of oppression, and sail out before the world with this inscription on their unfurled banner—"Separate from, and opposed to Slavery." They had prayerfully and deliberately considered the subject, and were, under God, prepared to meet the privateers of slavery, whose excursions were all planned and executed for the pleasure of slaveholders. The struggle was often fierce and obstinate, but they were always able to say, "having obtained help of God, we continued unto this day, witnessing both to small and great." that neither hope nor fear, flatteries nor frowns, worldly favor nor public scorn, shall divert us from our pledged opposition to slavery. Others may stand by Slavery, or they may vary with the changing winds of popular opinion, and box the compass in finding their position; but, like the needle to the Pole, our fidelity to liberty and liberty's God, shall be steadfast and persevering.

A large number of the Freewill Baptists in Maine and New Hampshire, had been firmly allied to the Democratic party. Those who still adhered to the party were bitter in their feelings towards the abolitionists. Between 1840 and 1850 this feeling was so intense that a serious division was threatened. Disaffected persons, both ministers and laymen united

in their protests against some of the practices and measures of the denomination, prominent among which was the Anti-Slavery action. "Associations" were formed, and quite a number of ministers and churches became alienated, and joined them. In 1843 a newspaper was established at Saco, called "The Freewill Baptist Repository," conducted mainly by Dr. James M. Buzzell, the leader of the disaffected ones. Conventions were held by them, mostly in western Maine, in 1845 and 1846, at which they were very severe in their denunciations of the great body of Freewill Baptists, because of their abolitionism, and for other things. These conventions were also addressed by ministers who defended the anti-slavery measures of the denomination, and the other positions that were assailed. These "Associations" and conventions scarcely checked the progress of anti-slavery sentiments. The publication of the Repository was continued for several years, but it was never very violent in opposing anti-slavery men and measures. A progressive spirit was awakened among *them*, after a few years, and the paper and the organization were soon numbered among the things of the past.

There are times in moral, as well as civil warfare when a bold dash, a decisive blow is demanded. And such was the state of the Anti-Slavery conflict in 1841. Slaveholders had foreseen that their "peculiar institution" was in peril, and, in their desperation, were cursing the entire North. To calm their anger, and to secure peace, learned divines went to their rescue. They accepted the southern claim, and transferred to the Bible as its basis, this hellish institution, all drenched in the blood of its victims, and vocal with their groans. They clothed the defenders of slavery with patriarchal authority, and then charged abolitionists with the guilt of fighting against God. Christian men everywhere rose up and protested against such impious audacity, but it was left for the Freewill Baptists, as a denomination, to rebuke this insult to the Author of the Bible and the God we worship. It was done at the General Conference in Topsham, Maine. A large and able Committee devoted much of their attention to the Bible argument on Slavery, and their Report, which was lengthy and exhaustive, covered the following points :

*First.* The servants of the patriarchs were not slaves.\*

*Second.* The Old Testament, instead of supporting slavery, saps the foundations on which it rests; since the moral law is the death warrant of the system . . . the kidnapper, slave-trader and slaveholder are all alike denounced with death . . . no man, by the law of Moses, could be held in service against his will . . . the rights and privileges of the servant under the patriarchal and Mosaic system, show that they were not slaves . . . they were not forced to work without pay . . . and the Old Testament strictly forbids oppression, without which slavery cannot exist.

*Third.* That while the New Testament nowhere countenances slavery, it condemns it in the most effectual manner; therefore,

*Resolved,* That we look upon the attempt to impute slavery to the Scriptures, as moral treason against God's Holy word; tending directly to the overthrow of all confidence in the Bible, and to make infidels of the rising generation.

So abhorrent is American slavery to every sentiment of reason and humanity, that many persons would sooner renounce all faith in the God of the Bible, and feel compelled to do so, rather than believe that he approves the vile system. Recognizing this principle in our nature, and believing that there is no power in the universe that can sanction and sanctify the right of property in man, as claimed by slavery, that Conference, in language not entirely free from criticism,

*Resolved,* That if the Bible upheld slavery, it would uphold a system of the most atrocious wickedness, and could not be confided in as a holy book.

Thus did the denomination scale the strongest ramparts of slavery—its Biblical and Christian fortifications—and hurl down upon its wicked defenders the burning truths of reason and inspiration. Higher ground could not well be taken, and every succeeding Conference re-affirmed its abhorrence of slavery, and openly committed itself on the side of freedom in every new issue. In 1844, it was

*Resolved,* That this Conference believes it to be the duty of all Christian voters to act on anti-slavery principles at the ballot box. And in 1847, it was

\*The proofs of all these positions, are omitted in this article.



*Resolved*, That the unparalleled sinfulness and cruelty of American slavery demand of the Freewill Baptist denomination to make the adoption and practice of anti-slavery principles a test of Christian fellowship.

As the Lord "hates robbery for burnt-offering," the Foreign Mission Society early voted to receive no contributions from slaveholders. In 1841, the Executive Board agreed that it could not solicit books and tracts for gratuitous distribution of Societies that are managed in part by slaveholders, and that send collecting agents among slaveholders, thus putting into their treasury "the price of blood;" lest the receipt of such donations, and the co-operation with such men, might be considered as having "fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness." And thus, while Christianizing the heathen abroad, they rebuked the system of heathenizing Christians at home. And the Home Mission Society adopted the principle many years ago, that it would appoint no missionaries, and aid no churches that were not anti-slavery in their sympathies. And the Education Society also, has always been equally adverse to slavery; the Theological School having been always open to candidates for the ministry, irrespective of color and the Professors having always taught the doctrine of universal liberty.

In 1842, a denominational Anti-Slavery Society was organized, and half a day was annually devoted to the cause of emancipation, in connection with the Anniversaries of the other Benevolent Societies. The speeches at these meetings were reported in the *Star*, and thus the fires of freedom were kept burning on the altar of every true Freewill Baptist heart. Of all the Anniversary exercises, prior to the time when slavery was constitutionally abolished, no one exceeded this in interest or attendance. In 1848, an Anti-Slavery Convention was held in Boston during Anniversary week, in accordance with arrangements made at the previous General Conference.

The fact that Freewill Baptist ministers were generally accustomed to "remember them that are in bonds as bound with them" at the ballot box, as well as at the throne of grace, created no little prejudice against them among politicians of the old

parties. They were gratuitously advised by pro-slavery men to keep aloof from all political questions and not descend from their high calling, and injure their influence, by going from the pulpit to the ballot box. This tender regard for clerical reputation most usually came from men whose deference for the Christian ministry was an attempt to suppress the votes they could not control. When the Liberty ticket was first brought out, a majority of the clergymen absented themselves from the polls. But Freewill Baptists soon said, "we pray for the slave, and why not vote for men who will legislate for him where they constitutionally can!" They also said, "we were men before we were ministers, and are we any less responsible for the discharge of our duties as men, because we are ministers? The exercise of our elective franchise, we ask not as a favor, we claim it as a right." It was an honest conviction of duty that called them out on election days, and a very large majority of the voting members of the denomination cast their ballots with reference to the suppression of slavery.

Congress had been refusing all abolition petitions during a period of fifteen years, and scorning every word and act in behalf of the slave, when, in 1850, it undertook to legislate in behalf of the master. Slavery then claimed equal protection with freedom, and for nine months the floor of Congress was often a scene of the most intense excitement. And during all those months, a Spartan band to freedom pledged, stood unmoved for the right; and noble were the words they spoke, and manly were the acts they performed. But might prevailed against right, and the Fugitive Slave Bill was proclaimed to be the law of the land. It authorized the slaveholder, or his agent, to go into any State in the Union, and seize the fugitive from slavery wherever he might find him, and, without judge or jury, but before a commissioner, who received a double fee for a decision against the fugitive, the helpless victim might be dragged back to hopeless bondage. And the claimant was empowered to "summon and call" to his aid all bystanders within sight or hearing and it said, "all good citizens are hereby *commanded* to aid and assist in the prompt and efficient execution of this law."

In just fourteen days after the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law, the General Conference assembled in Providence, Rhode Island. The Committee on slavery had been appointed, but before they were ready to report, a minister of Him who came "to preach deliverance to the captives,"—a man who was himself a fugitive, and pastor of a colored church in the city,—inquired if Conference would approve the purpose of the fugitives, who were resolved to use all the means that God and nature had given them, in their own defense against kidnappers. This question before Conference called forth an explosive outburst of sympathy and indignation that seemed almost terrific. Before those Christian men stood their own brother in the ministry, liable at any hour to be torn from his family, his friends, and the people of his charge, as one had been in New York a few days before, and they themselves were liable to be called upon to assist in his arrest. In view of such facts, a law so disgraceful to the nation, so wicked to man and so insulting to God, could find no favor, and the feeling of condemnation was irrepressible. After discussing the question for an hour or two, it was referred to the Committee on slavery.

When the day and hour arrived, on which the Committee were to make their report, the capacious house was densely crowded. The report specified the particular nature and requirements of the law, and closed with these resolutions :

*Resolved*, That we deliberately and calmly, yet earnestly and decidedly, deny any and all obligation on our part to submit to the unrighteous enactments of the aforesaid Fugitive Slave Law. Also, that, regardless of unjust human enactments, fines and imprisonment, we will do all we can, consistently with the claims of the Bible, to prevent the re-capture of the fugitive, and to aid him in his efforts to escape from his rapacious claimants.

*Resolved*, That, as "we ought to obey God rather than men," (Acts 5: 29,) in disobeying a cruel and wicked human law, and patiently submitting to its unrighteous penalties for such disobedience, we are "subject unto the higher powers—the powers that be," (Rom. 13: 1,) in the highest and holiest sense of that command; that is, in the same sense in which the apostles, primitive Christians, and subsequent Christian martyrs obeyed it, when they disobeyed the Jewish, Heathen and Popish laws.

*Resolved*, That we do most deeply sympathize with those who,

after having escaped from human bondage, are now in great fear, anxiety, and distress, on account of the passage of the Fugitive Slave Bill. We also recommend them to use all the means to preserve their liberty, that religion, conscience and reason will justify, under their harassing and distressing circumstances.

The report was discussed for nearly four hours by gentlemen from eight or ten different States, and unanimously adopted.

The crowded audience that had, at times, hung in breathless anxiety upon the lips of the speakers, and then again breathed the indignant sigh, as the revolting features of the law were presented, was called upon for an expression of opinion. With scarcely an exception, that immense throng approved the report.

This action of the Conference did not originate in any disloyal or disorganizing spirit, but in an impressive conviction of duty. It was a purpose to "obey God, rather than men," that led the denomination to say, in the language of one of its deliberative bodies, "the only obedience we will render to the Fugitive Slave Law, shall be to suffer its penalties." The people, by a very large majority, acquiesced in the Compromise of 1850, because, they said, it will give quiet to the country. But anti-slavery men of the North *could* not accept such a proposition of peace, and the "fire-eaters" of the South *would* not, as it did not give to slavery all that they claimed. For a time there was comparative quiet, save when the arrest or kidnapping of colored people under the Fugitive Slave Law, produced the most intense local excitement. But Satan could not rest as things were, and the whole nation was soon boiling with agitation by the repeated encroachments of the slave power. The opening of Kansas to slavery, and the effort to plant it there; the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the Dred Scott Decision, and some less important measures by "the powers that be," removed the agitation almost entirely from the Christian pulpit to the political forum. But the same principle that led Freewill Baptists to take prompt and decisive action against slavery as Christians, led them as citizens to vote against it. And from the time that James G. Birney was first before the American people, till Abraham Lincoln—blessed be his memory—was triumphantly elect-

ed, no denomination was more generally found on the side of freedom. And when the gathering clouds of secession lay dark and threatening all along the Southern horizon, where the flag of treason was already unfurled, and the sword of disunion already unsheathed, when earnest efforts were made to conciliate the traitors by farther compromises and concessions, there was one denomination whose anti-slavery position gave its members no access to rebel sympathizers, and all that they could do was to pray that God would confirm and prosper the right. And when the war actually began, a more loyal class of the people was not to be found. An effort to ascertain the number of clergymen, and the sons of clergymen, that volunteered in the Union army was not altogether successful, but the names of fifty-eight ministers, and two hundred and eleven sons of ministers stand in the roll of honor on the minutes of the General Conference. And not one in a hundred of those ministers at home, but was an outspoken and faithful laborer in the Union cause. Their patriotic sermons and unceasing prayers, their sympathy for the soldier in the field, and with the disconsolate families at home, were in keeping with their former action against oppression.

When the slaves began to come within the lines of our army for protection, we were ready to contribute to their wants and aid in their instruction. Resolutions to arise and help them were at once adopted in all the Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, of which the following is a specimen :

*Resolved*, That the physical relief and religious instruction of the men and women who have come to us, and may yet come to us, from the house of bondage, are objects which specially commend themselves to Freewill Baptists for sympathy and co-operation ; and we gratefully accept the opportunity for which we have long waited and toiled, to enter the field of active labor in behalf of the poor and despised, for whom we have long lifted up the voice.

In June, 1863, the Home Mission Board agreed to establish immediately, a mission among the Freedmen. The appointment as missionary, was accepted by a prominent minister in Maine, but a most distressing sickness in his family detained him at home till the winter following. In the meantime, a missionary and his wife were sent to Roanoke Island, N. C., where they labored for nearly three years.

In Jan. 1864, Rev. Mr. Knowlton received his commission as General Missionary Agent to the Freedmen, and soon left for the south. He went to Virginia, North Carolina and South Carolina, where his labors in that enervating climate, as summer was approaching, were too much for his health. After an absence of three months he returned home little thinking that his general prostration, and continued sickness would suspend his active labors for a period of two years. But his mission was a success, and the result may be stated in the concluding words of his own report. He says,

I have travelled about 3500 miles, attended 38 religious meetings, preached 25 sermons, visited and addressed 7 Sabbath Schools, with 1570 scholars, and 28 day and common schools, with 3930 scholars. I baptized 35 colored persons, and organized two churches, leaving them with an aggregate membership of 208.

These churches were in South Carolina, where another was soon after organized. To supply the church at Beaufort with a house of worship, an appeal was made to the denomination, and \$1800 were immediately raised, with which all the necessary materials for a house 40 by 60 feet, were purchased in Portland and shipped in October.

The Mission to the Freedmen became an important work, and in it the denomination was most deeply interested. The Home Mission Board took the Shenandoah valley as its field of culture, and in that garden of Virginia concentrated all its labor. Schools were soon established in all the important towns from Harper's Ferry to Lexington, and under the direction of Rev. N. C. Brackett, as Superintendent, they were a blessing of untold worth to the colored people. A Committee was organized in the west for collecting funds and carrying on a distinct part of this work under the General Agency of Rev. A. H. Chase. Cairo, Illinois, is their centre of operations, and this department of missionary effort has rendered most efficient service. The aggregate efforts of the denomination to benefit the freedmen, at the time of our writing, (Jan. 1868) may be stated thus: Thirty-three ordained ministers have been employed as missionaries, and sixty-six pious and well educated persons as teach-

ers, and \$40,000 have been raised in the churches and expended for their support. Twenty churches have been organized, and two Normal Schools are now in successful operation, where colored persons are fitted for teaching.

Knowing the interest of the Freewill Baptists in behalf of the freedmen, John Storer, Esq., of Sanford, Me., a benevolent man not formally connected with the denomination, though deeply sympathising with its spirit and policy, proposed to give \$10,000, provided we would add an equal amount, for the establishment of a prospective college for the colored people. More than the required amount has been raised, and \$6,500 have been received from the Bureau for the Freedmen. A charter has been obtained in west Virginia, and Storer College is located at Harper's Ferry.

In surveying the field of anti-slavery action, on which has been won many a hard fought battle, the record of the Freewill Baptists is found to be honorable, and one of which future generations will not be ashamed. But they have done only their plain and imperative duty. That duty, however, was often performed when the way seemed dark and the struggle severe. But the Lord was with those faithful men, most of whom now rest from their labor, and, during those years of trial, there was great denominational progress. Since the commencement of the anti-slavery struggle, the denomination has greatly enlarged its borders and increased its strength. During the ten years of warmest conflict,—from 1834 to 1844—it nearly doubled its numbers. The list of subscribers to the *Morning Star* has increased, since 1832, from 1300 to about 13,000; and the *Christian Freeman* a weekly journal, has been established at Chicago, to meet the wants of the west. The interest in the various causes of benevolence, and the donations to Missions and education, have increased a hundred fold. In view of this prosperity while laboring for the oppressed, and in view of the abolition of slavery and the enfranchisement of the freedmen, we all have reason to exclaim, “What has God wrought?”

## ART. IV.—CHRISTIAN GROWTH.

People often look back towards the first centuries of Christianity with a reverence that seems to recognize there the model of all excellence ; to believe that every departure from the characteristics of the church of that day is an apostacy, and to desire nothing higher for the churches of the future than that they may become what those were which John and Paul and Peter planted.

It is natural—this admiration with which we turn to the past. Men climb mountain tops to see the sun rise, not because the sun has more glory or displays greater power then, but through the earthly vapors that diminish his life and hold back the noon-day splendor, they can look undazzled upon his face, they can see him scattering shadows from the valleys and gilding the clouds which he will afterwards drive away.

So it instructs us to study the early ages of the Christian church, not because Christianity displayed more of its power or beauty then, but because we see it contrasted with the darkness of heathen night on which it is dawning, with the clouds of ignorance and persecution, which it is struggling through and dispelling.

The apostolic letters in the New Testament are most valuable to us, not as a testimony to the strength and the purity of the primitive churches, but as a warning against their disorders and corruptions. The inspired prescriptions for their moral and social infirmities set before us the laws and conditions of Christian life and growth.

The human mind has not only a natural tendency to reverence the past, but also to regard whatever has been known as an object of interest, whatever has been contemplated with enthusiasm or affection as superior to what has not been so known. This tendency, uncorrected by instruction or experience, makes every one regard the country in which he lives, the age and state of society in whose spirit he sympathizes, and the institutions by which he has been influenced, as superior to all others. Hence he is naturally averse to change. The customs he has



learned to love, like the cause of the Medes and Persians, are deemed susceptible of no improvement. So the Jews though taught by prophecy to look for a new dispensation, anticipated in its effects only an extension and aggrandizement of their cherished systems of government and worship, little dreaming that it could bring any fresh significance to their ideal of Jewish institutions; still less that it could dispense with them altogether. And the first Christians, appreciating the blessings which the Gospel brought to them, and filled with wonder at the effects of its power, could not suspect, until taught by revelation or experience that the state of the church signalized by miraculous gifts, of tongues, prophesyings, interpretations and healings, was only a defective and immature one, out of and away from which it must gradually pass, as a child grows into manhood. But Paul plainly taught them that those very gifts which they were regarding as the highest evidence and most precious result of their religion, the possession or which they practically declared of more importance than the exercise of charity, and the lack of which condemned a brother to the very smallest degree of esteem and influence, were yet to be laid aside, even as a man puts away childish things.

In this declaration, he hints at least, that the plan of God for the development and salvation of the human family, though finished from the foundation of the world, is unfolded gradually and employs new methods as it progresses, leaving old ones, even though as much coveted and as influential as the gift of tongues, to pass away with the period to which they belonged.

This truth, which finds expression in not a few of his utterances, may be enunciated in the following propositions:

- I. The human race was made for growth, but
- II. The race attains this and only as God acts upon and in it.
- III. The human race requires, and the plan of God provides, different instrumentalities at different stages of its development.

1. Every thing which God has made seems to possess not only the capacity but the necessity for growth. When April showers have fallen and May suns fructify the earth, not a root or seed can sleep in the ground; every bud swells with new life

and the trees expanding, thrust out on every twig a fresh shoot, and a tassel of green leaves. There is but one other state than this, and that is death. During all the seeming deadness of winter, vegetation is preparing for the glory of vernal bloom, and frosts and snows toil together to fit the earth for yielding her strength while the decay of former growth is furnishing both the room and the material for the coming splendors of the new.

Yet even here growth has its conditions. Every flower that smiles by our pathway, in order to get the material for its use or beauty, sent all its root-fibers searching after moisture, and opened a myriad mouths in every leaf to drink the air and the sunshine. Yet nothing reaches its highest perfection and largest results spontaneously, but only under assiduous culture continued through successive seasons and generations. Still more in that higher department of God's work, where the gift of intelligence with capacity for emotions and purposes, has made life a conscious and responsible thing, are there necessary conditions of growth and a demand for culture. But man can shut himself out from the opportunity and pervert his capacity for culture. He may make himself like those naturally fertile districts of Syria and Egypt, which are now covered by drifting sands, through which no moisture penetrates and where no seed takes root. He may convert the heart-soil which God made naturally fertile for virtue into a barren waste or a putrid fen where genial showers and summer sun evoke only noxious growths and deadly exhalations. The laws and forces for man's growth are all from God and are sure as the sunshine and the rain, but the answering quality in him is no blind affinity, no irresistible instinct, it is the hearty and consenting exertion of the human will. Man is not only "God's husbandman" in the cultivation of humanity, he is also "God's husbandry," the field which God tills, and the harvest is himself.

2. That the human race was made for growth is inferred from the general conviction and aspirations of mankind.

Pagan Antiquity was not without this conviction. Her corrupt mythology did not wholly destroy the faith in purer times and better generations of men. Her Altar fires that from bloody

sacrifices gleam along the ages, all flash forth the conviction that men ought to have been better than they were. Her best literature proclaimed man's capacity for a state of society far more noble, free and virtuous than any which real life afforded. Thus her poets sang even while seeing around them society grow more corrupt instead of purer, its forces weaker instead of stronger, and when they could find no period for the realization of that pure and perfect condition, the possibility of which, genius could not question, save by looking backwards along the line of some distorted and dimly preserved tradition of the primitive Eden. Thus has poetry, in its fictions of a golden age whose return it prophesies, in the ideal of humanity which it portrays, and in the longings for a better life which it voices, borne witness that man was capable of growing to a better condition than any he had yet realized. There are, it is true, most significant intimations that the actual condition of the human race has been one of perpetual decay, in the wailings that resound through all literature, over youthful aspirations that lead only to disappointment, over death blighting human hope and endeavour, over promising characters that develop into rottenness instead of ripeness, over institutions that blossom with largest promise but die in midsummer or live to bear only apples of Sodom.

But though history affirms and poetry laments that human institutions are ever declining, though revelation declares that all men have corrupted their way; though conscience tells many a man that virtue in him is declining, that his moral worth is less than it once promised to be, that he is sinking toward the brute or the fiend; and though wicked men, through the medium of their own decaying manhood, imagine that they see all men and all institutions growing worse; yet all these unite in testifying against this decay as something unnatural and contrary to what ought to be expected. Like Moloch among the fallen angels they cry out.

“In our proper motion we ascend. . . . descent and fall to us is adverse.”

3. But the conclusive evidence that the human race was made for growth is found, if found at all, not in human expectations, aspirations, or disappointments, but in the fact of growth.

Is progress clearly discernible on comparing the ages with one another?

Uninspired History tells us in reply, how nations have corrupted themselves, how civilizations have run down, and empires have died. Sacred History informs us why they died. They forsook God who is the giver of life. They turned away from the Fountain of living waters to slake their thirst at the poisoned pools of an earth-born philosophy or a hellish idolatry. No heavenly charity was abiding in their institutions, but only earthly selfishness. This has made them perishable. This it is that has thrown them in the path of the destroyer, marking the stages on the march of time by the skeletons of extinguished nations. Long since would mankind have reached the last decay of civilization and the extinction of society, had not God been acting in and upon the race with a power as real if not as apparent as that displayed in the work of creation.

#### THE METHOD.

God gave us through Moses a vision of his progressive method in forming the earth. Science he has given as its interpreter. In the prophets, He gives a vision of his work in the development and redemption of men, and of that, history is the key. Deciphering by the aid of science the inscriptions left on the rocky strata of the earth's crust by the skeletons of extinct animals which were entombed there ages before man existed, we find that each of the æonic days of creation was distinguished by a peculiar type of animal or vegetable life, and, that whole races, genera as well as species, gradually deteriorated in form and finally became forever extinct. But the new orders of beings by which the creative fiat distinguishes each successive day were of a higher organization than any that preceded. In like manner does history declare that, since the earth became the abode of man and the theatre of redemption, as successive forms of human civilization have been obliterated by the attritions of time or fossilized in history, God has replaced each defunct and buried institution by something more excellent in kind, or more effective in power.

Despite all the sad decay that smites man and his institutions,

despite the croakings of that unwise philosophy which from the days of Solomon to the present, begins its inquiries by taking for granted, that the former times are always best, History is declaring with ever increasing distinctness that the better developments of the human race, in science, government, society and religion, are successively higher. The tree of humanity grows, individuals, tribes and dynasties are its leaves, often sickly and most of them falling before maturity blighted from the bud, and the fruit, when not poison, has been at best meagre and unsatisfactory, but it acquires from age to age, at least in all lands where the sun of the gospel shines, more of the flavor of virtue and happiness. Though the jaundiced-eye that looks only for deterioration and ruin can always discern in the present an appalling sum of miseries and corruptions from which to infer worse horrors for the future, though there is never a lack of disappointing calamities and stupendous growths of wickedness to overwhelm with despair the mind that cannot, either by the lamp of faith or the lamp of history, look beyond the present; nay, though no year ever "swept in kindly change of seasons over the earth" so brightly that it did not bring enough of individual distresses to drive a man, were they presented to his imagination with vivid poetic power, "raving mad," yet whoever with unbiased vision, looks clearly enough into the past to measure the present by it, discerns that "the evil and the sorrowful recede, and the good and the joyful advance." However small may seem the degree, the statistics of civilization demonstrate that crime and misery are on the whole diminishing; the life of man is becoming longer; the range of his aims and hopes is rising; the circle of his joys is broadening.

#### THE REASON OF THE METHOD.

Few minds are strangers to the inquiry, Why has not the human race received from the first more efficient assistance? Why must this planet, like a prison ship loosed from its moorings in night and storm, and drifting with its despairing victims into an unknown waste of waters, float with its darkly sinning millions through four hundred dreary centuries waiting for the incarnate coming of its Redeemer? In one aspect at least, this

question is not unlike that which every child puts to himself, if not to his parents. Why cannot I receive the privileges and enjoy the independence of the man? And our nature gives the same answer to each. viz.: Training alone gives value to privilege. The child cannot be profited by the university until he has passed through the primary and preparatory institutions. But this answer only provokes another inquiry. Was it best that we should be created with natures that must grow, and growth come to the race and to the individual only amid so many risks and difficulties? is the old question ever recurring yet never tolerating any but an affirmative reply. To answer it otherwise is either madness or atheism: not only because by right reason

“Of systems possible, it is confessed,  
That wisdom infinite must form the best;”

but because candid reason may discern that only with such a nature could man experience the happiness that attends the development of his faculties, the glory of being the builder of his own character, or know the happiness that flows from the self-guided exercise of free powers which distinguishes spiritual enjoyments from those of the unprogressive and irrational brute.

The knowledge of a finite being must all be relative. If such a being could be created perfect he would have no knowledge of any other state with which to compare his own and therefore would be unconscious of its perfection and indifferent concerning it. Such a being also to be absolutely secure from sin and fall must be made incapable of any voluntary change of character, and then he would be also as indifferent to all his future as he would be ignorant of the perfection of his present moral condition. To be capable of development in virtue and happiness or even of learning what these may be—in a word, to be capable of forming a character, a finite being must have a time when character is all unformed, a time of weakness out of and away from which to grow. So a race of finite beings made for progress must begin in a condition of infancy with its attendant weakness and uncertainties. From this point it must totter on, gaining strength and knowledge as it advances.

To some men of large understanding and deep insight into the word and works of God, it has appeared so plain that to be made capable of growth was the best possible,—indeed the only possible, plan for finite beings who are to possess character, that they have not doubted but that the angels had a period of probation, and hence an infancy of weakness, involving the danger, perhaps the certainty, of fall—and the necessity of a scheme of redemption. And though God manifest in the flesh, came not to succor angels but the seed of Adam, yet in some other manifestation he extended to them a helping hand.\* All who held by that were lifted up to glory and honor in eternal virtue; all who rejected it were cast out of heaven to that place prepared for the devil and his angels. But however this may have been, we know that the human race had a point of beginning, when all positive elements of character remained to be acquired, when innocence was without value and without strength because untested and unconfirmed. We know that this forming of character in a state of probation involved not only responsibility, but danger—danger that the Maker had foreseen and provided for. We are bound to believe that the fall of man through the seduction of the Tempter was no surprise, half thwarting the plan of Jehovah in creating man, but that he saw it best to create finite beings who should be capable of progress even with the certainty that to know good they must also know evil, and who could not begin a career of progress without the danger of fall and the need of restoration,—a need which is fully met by the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, by the Light which coming into the world, lighteth every man. But what of those who reject that light, repudiate all help of God, barter their birthright of growth in virtue and happiness for the gratifications of the present,

“ And with reversed ambition strive to sink ;”

and whose sin makes existence a thing so hopelessly and eternally dreadful that it would have been good for them, as the Saviour himself says if they had never been born ?

This at least may be said ; no man of candor and intelligence can believe that positive holiness or happiness is possible for a

\* Hebrews 21 ; 16.

finite being except through probation ; therefore it is reasonable to believe that the creation of man for development destined to form his own character, and so liable to sin, will be the occasion of a surplus of human felicity, above all misery resulting from such a system inconceivably greater than all happiness possible in any other imaginable scheme of creation. Who can say that the work of redemption shall not go on until over the whole earth the ideals of Christianity shall all be realized in government, in religion, in social and domestic life, and until the successive generations that shall grow up under its fully developed institutions and be gathered to the paradise of God, having done the work of earth with sound minds and pure hearts in healthy bodies shall swell the millions of the redeemed till they shall be to the entire number of the lost as the stores of the well filled granary to the scattered kernels plucked by the birds on the harvest-field ?

But does this view doom some of the human race, for the felicity of the rest ? By no means. God's help is for all. He that, rejecting that help, fails to attain the end for which he was made and probation given him, receives only the reward of his own doings. While God says of him,

“O that thou hadst hearkened unto me, then had thy peace been as a river”—an ever deepening stream. Again when standing incarnate among men, he testifies with a pity and sincerity which falling tears and perspiring blood attest—

“I would have gathered you but YE WOULD NOT.”

#### THE MEANS.

The old Testament is a record of the methods which God was using and of the forces which he was putting into humanity to fit it for the school of Christ.\* He gave Adam and his sons a promise, and taught them worship though they forgot the one and polluted the other. Then the flood washed them away. But God remembered Noah and with him all that believed the promise. He gave them most abundant reason to rely on his care and preserve his worship. When the sons of Noah went away from Babel to apostatize from God, as the children of

\* Gal. 3 : 24.



Adam had done, and by adoring brutes and demons or deified lusts perverted their worship, so that, instead of drawing them near to God in reverent and grateful dependence, all its power tended to sink them to a level with the objects of their adoration, then He chose one nation as the depositary and radiating point for his truth. To preserve Abraham and his family from the surrounding idolatry he led him out from among his kindred and allowed him no fixed abode, perfecting his faith and that of his sons by special instructions, given through revelations, visions and preserving interpositions. To keep his posterity from becoming incorporated with nations of idolaters, and to create in them the spirit of unity and nationality, he sent them to Egypt. He bound them together by the cords of bondage and brought them into one spirit by the pangs of a common affliction. But when they were in danger of becoming content in servitude and of accepting the idolatry of their masters, then by redoubled tasks He made them cry out for deliverance.

By ten plagues he confounded all the idols in which they saw their masters trusting, and terrified their oppressors until, for self-preservation, they thrust the Hebrews out towards the land of liberty. There God gave them a divine law, and taught them to love and worship him, preserving them from their foes and feeding them out of his own hand during forty years, until all the disobedient and unbelieving who had been tainted by the idolatries of Egypt were dead, and a new generation, taught at Sinai and reared up among daily miracles of the most wonderful kind, was set to the work of extirpating idolatry in the land which had been promised to Abraham. And there, governed and instructed by inspired prophets, disciplined by judgments and deliverances, God made the little nation a central point for history, a light to the world for a thousand years; and when, with religion decayed and government corrupted, they still longed after the idolatry of the heathen, he banished them among all the nations, both to show them how abominable is idolatry and to compel them to proclaim to all people the promise of the Messiah. Then, when the nations had heard the promises as well as felt the need of a great deliverer, when every civilization that had grown up in idolatry was passing into decay or

petrification ; when even heathen philosophers could discern that the race was dying out in its devastating wars and festering corruptions, and must receive an infusion of better blood or surely become extinct. Then lo! on the plains of Judea the voices of angels proclaim the advent from heaven of that which earth was found to lack "Good will to men."

#### THE INCARNATION BEGINS A NEW AGE OF DEVELOPMENT.

Divine benevolence is now to act on men from a standpoint among them. An era commences grand enough to justify all the previous preparation from the foundation of the world. Herod killed all the babes in Bethlehem, and doubtless flattered himself that he had destroyed the infant Saviour and secured a kingdom to his family. So from that day to the present many a critical and scientific Herod has imagined that he was removing the name and gospel of Jesus from the attention and faith of men. The stilettos of their criticism stab faith in many un-instructed souls but the Divine One is above their attacks, still reconciling the world unto Himself, gradually lifting the nations into his likeness and fellowship, by and by to receive the homage of a redeemed world. Does any one feel tempted, on looking only at the progress yet attained, to despair of the prophesied result? Let him remember that it is the achievement of Him with whom a thousand years are but as yesterday, and that it is analogous to what we observe in others of His works.

In the formation of the material world the first command was, "Let there be light." And under this light grasses sprung up, creeping things came forth, but not until the fourth day did the great center of that light appear ruling day and night. So in the culture of the human race. God, dimly manifest "from the things that are made," borne witness to by conscience, had been, from the beginning, nourishing whatever of good the world enjoyed, but now forever the Sun is established in the heavens ; the fountain is open for a world's defilement.

#### THE CORRUPTION OF CHRISTIANITY A THING TO BE ANTICIPATED.

That the divine light did not flood the whole earth at once, that it became obscured by clouds, and during a long age of

darkness was transmitted through media that greatly hindered its life-giving efficacy, seems to have been a natural result of the benign provision which made man to be a co-worker with God in redemption; a result inevitable unless the course of nature and Providence had been entirely changed to one of perpetual miraculous interpositions. In morals as well as in physics, action and reaction are inseparable. When the disciples went forth miraculously equipped to battle with idolatry, we find that they were unable to lift up any of the churches fully to their own level, and then, when these churches spread abroad to elevate tribes and nations, these were only brought up to a level lower still. Thus after the period of distinctive conflict with idolatry one of internal purification was required.

As the Israelites, even while Sinai was quaking with Jehovah's presence, mingled idolatry with the worship which He was teaching them, and died in the wilderness, leaving to their children the work for which they were not fit, so converts from paganism to Christianity brought superstitions accumulated from ages of paganism and which only protracted education could eradicate.

A mind judging according to the laws which ordinarily regulate the results of influences and looking only at the humble origin and outward insignificance of Christianity, would have come inevitably to the conclusion which seems to have been that of the Roman statesmen and men of letters, that, when engaged in a warfare that could aim at nothing less than mutual extermination, with those gigantic systems of paganism on which the civil and social fabrics of the world rested, its power would be spent and dissipated, with as little permanent effect on the idolatrous beliefs of the world, as could be made on a mountain by smiting it with a pebble. That this result did not follow; that this incomprehensible enterprise of an obscure carpenter aided only by a few illiterate fishermen and belonging to a nation just ready to lose not only its last shadow of civil power but even its local habitation, did not have this result, is a demonstration of its divine origin.

If in the conflict with selfishness, corruption, superstition and cruelty enthroned in every heart and in every institution of so-

ciety and government, it had been wholly overwhelmed and lost from view, that fact would have admitted of explanation on natural principles. But that instead of this, it should become a perpetual fount of power to purify the hearts of men and control the destinies of nations, is a fact far more wonderful than that its waters, flowing through corrupted channels such as depraved imaginations, languages, customs and art, all of which were filled with the putrid *debris* of idolatry, gathered corruptions which greatly hindered their virtue and from which as they flow, they are becoming clear.

#### THE LAW OF PROGRESS STILL PRESERVED.

It is true that the so called Christian institutions of many regions have become so saturated with human corruptions that they have perished, or are perishing, to give place to others that convey in greater purity the Spirit of the gospel; but this proves only that, so far, Christianity conforms to the method of growth, everywhere discernible in the works of God. It will also be seen that the corruption of Christianity in its early ages was no abrogation of the law of progress, when we consider that even the lowest and most erroneous form of religious instruction that ever taught men to call Jesus Master, and his word the truth, did ineffably more for the liberty and happiness of men than any form of idolatry which it displaced. However pernicious and worthless is Romanism, for example, when compared with the pure and simple truth of the gospel; though mere devotion to its forms may have left thousands of hearts as vile and sordid as they would have been in heathenism, yet the truth that remained among its errors has brought to thousands of others, as it did to A'Kempis and Fenelon, a hope and a cure such as no idolatry or atheism ever afforded. That which nourished the self-denying heroism of a Xavier, the piety and the holy fervor of a Faber and of Madame Guyon expressed more truly than all the literature of classic ages had done, the world's need and its help when it taught devout worshippers to say—though with sad perversity, in a dead language—

“ O Jesus King most wonderful!

When once Thou visitest the heart,  
 Then Truth begins to shine;  
 Then earthly vanities depart;  
 Then kindles love divine.

Thee may our tongues forever bless;  
 Thee may we love alone;  
*And ever in our lives express  
 The image of thine own."*

Despite all the perversions which the blindness of men and the craft of the adversary who enjoyed the homage of the world, introduced into the forms of Christianity to rob God and give his praise unto another, there were developed within it the forces for its own reform, and the purification of religion has produced the renovation of society, leading to reforms in government, to the revival of literature and to the increase of domestic virtues, hopes and joys. Considering these things, and especially when we consider through what mutations it has endured, against what persistent and confident opposition from nations and individuals, from false religions, sciences and schools of philosophy, it has pursued its way, making its continued existence the standing miracle of the world; when we consider, farther, that it is exhibiting fresh vigor with each generation, and that it is imparting added power both in all material things and in all that can bless man's moral and intellectual nature, to every nation in which its manifestation is approaching to clearness or purity,—while the nations that have rejected and despised it, barren of progress, philanthropy, virtue or liberty, are rather the decaying corpses of nations than vital nationalities,—we cannot doubt that it is through Christianity alone that God has provided for human development.

#### THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY NOT YET COMPLETE.

Its influence hitherto upon mind and morals, upon liberty and happiness is, let us trust, but a harbinger of what it will yet do for all nations. We are, so it is pleasant to believe, in but the morning of the Messianic day. Its sun is glancing through morning clouds as, ascending the horizon, it flings its light farther and farther among the nations. Its rays will yet reach them all, hast-

ening the decay of whatever is hopelessly corrupt, and quickening into growth institutions whose leaves shall be healing and whose fruit shall be joy. Since the Star in the East heralded the morning eighteen centuries ago, the light has passed half round the planet. Scarcely two hundred and fifty years since it touched the eastern points of this continent, and already it flashes along the Pacific coast. Even now it is beginning to gild the eastern mountains of Asia, and morning twilight struggles with the darkness in the jungles of India and along the rivers of China.

GROWTH APPARENTLY SLOW.

It need not be denied that the progress of the gospel hitherto appears to have been slow. Looking on benighted nations waiting, like the palsied man at the pool of Bethesda, where no healing abides, we cry out, "O Lord, how long" shall human unfaithfulness and indifference conceal the fountain of Thy mercies? But there have been darker times than ours, when there was less, O how much less, with which to answer skepticism or enlighten honest doubt!—in the dark ages when the gospel locked up in cloisters had hardly given man's intellect sufficient quickening to enable him to doubt. The period of doubt and of revolution was a progress from that, and was a time to take courage. So all the attacks of skeptics to-day, whether honest doubters or malignant disbelievers, are, so far as the truth is concerned, so many tokens of encouragement. Just as during the struggle for the vindication of truth and loyalty in our country, so long as a disregard of justice, a wish to preserve hoary wrongs and a willingness to seek an unjust and dishonorable peace were marring the successes and multiplying the defeats of the loyal arms, reverses neither brought surprise nor discouragement to those who seeing clearly the right, were persuaded that the Providence which permitted was also overruling the contest, for they saw as clearly in defeat as in victory a means of bringing the right into recognition and power. So they who recognize in the gospel the power as well as the truth of God have no fear that any attacks upon it can have any other result in the end than to vindicate its verity and promote its triumph.

Our judgments are only relative, and though we regard the progress of Christianity as slow, is it not simply because its plan is so far above us, its orbit so broad? because our powers of observation are too restricted to comprehend all the results towards which it is tending, or to scan the eternal cycles by which alone its movement is gauged. A bat's flight across our field of vision at night is pronounced swift, while the evening star, appearing night after night in nearly the same part of the horizon, is deemed slow-moving or stationary; while in truth it is whirling through space a score of miles every second. When one approaches Niagara and from its lofty bank looks down on the waters that, having leaped the cataract, are shooting on toward the sea, he is surprised at their apparently slow and placid movement. He imagines that one might stem their current. But when he descends the bank to the level of the stream and looks from its margin, he is amazed at the swiftness of the mighty tide. Precisely so, infidel philosophy, from its transcendental heights, has looked upon the apparently slow movement of Christianity, and said, "I will stop its flow, with the wand of my historic criticism will I smite it, and coming generations will wonder that such a stream ever ran." The wand has been uplifted, with hideous mirth and air of haughty triumph it has thrown in the rushes of its "reason" and its "encyclopædia" to obstruct the current, but it is still sweeping on, and where are they? Infidelity is taking new positions to repeat the attempt, but the stream that could not be stopped when it was a tiny rill, will not be checked now that it is flooding continents and sending rivulets into all lands. On the vantage ground of coming ages will not the seeming slowness with which the gospel has won its way among men be forgotten, in wonder at the Mercy that planned it, at the vastness of its power and the glory of its results? This at least preserves our faith in its final triumph, that in the present it is not and gives no signs of becoming either retrograde or stationary. Protestantism in the time of Wesley yields far more of the beauty and fragrance of love than in that of Luther. We would not exchange the Christianity of the Present for that of the Puritans with all its stalwart virtues. If it has neither more of faith nor

of firmness, not more hope or ecstasy, it has much more of that which will abide forever—charity. The truth which, stamped on the very front of civilization, every true heart may read with gratitude and courage, and which neither literature nor statesmanship can afford to ignore, is that the gospel, bearing the protestant nations onward in freedom, knowledge and virtue, and acquiring influence over other peoples, by all events whether of peace or war, and through all the channels of human enterprise, by science and commerce as well as by philanthropy, is steadily unfolding according to the plan announced by its Author—“first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear.”

There were four thousand years of preparation before the seed-corn was cast into the earth. It has been germinating scarcely two thousand. Yet now we seem to discern signs of the bursting forth of the ear. We see them in the marvelous increase of knowledge and of the means of communication among men, in the unprecedented and general agitation about education and equal rights, in the multiplicity of philanthropic enterprises and the promotion of reforms, in the actual or prospective overthrow of slavery among all Christian nations, in the going forth of missionaries to renew the battles against idolatry and carry the gospel to every creature, in the decay and threatened dissolution of those apostate powers—Popery and Moham-medanism, and in the increase of Christian unity and co-operation among protestants, as though the ranks were forming for an onward movement along the whole line of conflict between the powers of sin and Anti-Christ and those of Christian love.



## ART. V.—MURPHY'S COMMENTARY.\*

The amount of time, talent and learning which has been expended upon Commentaries intended to bring out the meaning and impress the teachings of the Bible, singles out that volume from all other books, and constitutes a striking confession of its importance and its power over the minds of men. To sneer at a volume which has so stirred human thought and left its traces upon the civilization and literature of every age, betrays only the weakness of presumption or the audacity of irreverence and recklessness. And the testimonies of this sort are steadily multiplying and gaining in power. Never before was there so much of eminent scholarship devoted to the object of making the Bible appear a plain teacher, an authoritative exponent of the law of human life, and a pledge of God's presence and inspiration in the submissive and believing soul. And the intense effort made by those who would, if possible, undermine human confidence in the sacred volume, now in one form and now in another, indicates the importance which skeptics are attaching to the question whether the Bible is to be accepted for what it purports to be, or stripped of its sanctity and reduced to the level of mere human composition. The superior value of modern Commentaries over the earlier expositions, appears largely in two features. They are based upon a fuller understanding of the text; and they often yield us the fruit of much patient study over some specific and limited portion of the Divine Word, to which the author has devoted special attention, and to the interpretation of which he brings a special adaptation of powers.

Dr. Murphy has not mistaken his sphere in giving himself to the study and exposition of the Pentateuch. He comes to it with a true critic's analysis, with a ripe scholar's learning,

\*A CRITICAL AND EXIGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF GENESIS AND EXODUS. With a new translation. By J. G. Murphy, D. D., T. C. D. Professor of Hebrew, Belfast. With a Preface by J. P. Thompson, D. D., New York. Boston: Draper & Halliday. 1867. Two vols. Octavo. pp. 585, 385.

and with a devout believer's heart. He has read Colenso, and seen and felt the full force of what Colenso has urged in the form of difficulties and objections against the ancient narrative. But he finds far more serious difficulties in the way of accepting the Bishop's denials than in assenting to Moses's declarations. He admits the alleged variations in style, but is compelled by critical considerations to reject the theory which makes the Pentateuch only the crystallization of floating historic and legendary fragments into a sort of regular narrative, without authority and self-consistency. He sees in Moses a distinct person, and not a mere myth or name; and he recognizes him as an inspired historian rather than an unskilful and inartistic compiler. He admits gratefully the noble achievements of science; but he does not believe that all the wisdom was born or is likely to die with the geologists. He has carefully read what the students in the department of Antiquities have to say, and the deductions of the physiologists have never been dismissed with a sneer; but he argues strongly for the generally received chronology, which makes the creation of Adam date back only about four thousand years. He sees and rejoices in a general and comprehensive order, along whose line the great work of Providence proceeds, making the higher life succeed the lower, and interpreting the idea of progress by the march of events; but he is no believer in the theory of Development as it has been lately brought forward, and he holds most tenaciously to the doctrine of special interpositions, and to the reality and the need of miracles. Few men discern more frequently than he a deep spiritual meaning in the external history of the chosen people, or in the exceptional work of Divine power among men; but he finds something more than allegory in the reported talks of God with men, and he will not barter his faith in the doctrine of a personal God, who is real Ruler among the nations, for any poetic parody upon the ancient life, however beautiful or ingenious, which makes the laws of nature stand in the place of the Hebrew Jehovah, or puts pantheism instead of Evangelical Christianity.

The theological views to which the commentary of Dr. Murphy lends its support can be readily inferred from what has been

stated. But the chief merit of the work does not appear in its mere orthodoxy. The author has a stalwart vigor in his mind, a philosophical clearness and comprehensiveness of statement, a style remarkably clear, compact and forcible, a capacity to condense a mass of suggestive thought into a brief paragraph and make an epigram hold the germ of a treatise, and when occasion requires, can employ a wit which really illuminates his discussion, and wield a quiet satire without detracting at all from the gravity of his theme, or the manliness of his method. His translations are sometimes eminently literal, and he bestows special attention upon such passages as contain either verbal or grammatical difficulties, and they denote a critical acquaintance with the latest results of philological and hermeneutical study. He deals with the geological difficulties which are alleged in opposition to the Mosaic account of the creation and the deluge, and adopts, in the main, the theory so ably argued by Dr. J. Pye Smith,—which regards the language of Scripture the language of the people of common life and of appearance, and which supposes that the creation, described in the first chapter of Genesis, and the deluge of Noah, are local in their area, and are only parts of the great work of upheaval and renewal which has been carried forward through all the geological ages. He supposes that the writer, here as elsewhere, “presents each change as it would appear to an ordinary spectator standing on the earth,” and suggests that “it was not the object or the effect of divine revelation to anticipate science” on the points over which geologists have sought to make up an issue with the record of Moses. And he has laid down a very important principle, deserving of regard and calculated to suggest caution to not a few audacious critics, when he says: “We cannot found the slightest inference upon a passage which we do not understand, nor affirm a single discrepancy until we have made all reasonable inquiry whether it really exists, and what is its precise nature and amount.” The new translation, while sometimes intensely literal that the reader may see just precisely the philological grounds upon which a given interpretation rests, is generally made to approach as nearly as “practicable to the common version and suggests a revision of that version quite as

much as anything else. The author translates and expounds as a scholar, though he makes no secret of the fact that he is a Christian believer, and avows the fact that his critical study has both vindicated and fortified his faith. He does not belong at all to the rationalistic school of criticism, and he is manifestly disinclined to join any Broad Church into which he cannot carry his thoroughly evangelical convictions and have them respected.

On the whole, we have seen no commentary on the first two books in the Pentateuch which may be more strongly commended than this for its ability, its fairness, and careful analysis, its eminently reasonable and common sense expositions, its rigid confinement of itself to its own legitimate work, its suggestive hints, its manly tone, its mingling of reverence with fearlessness, and especially for its vigorous and attractive style. It appears at an opportune period. It will fittingly rebuke the flippant tone which superficial minds are inclined to employ when speaking of the Old Testament Scriptures, by unfolding the meaning of that special providential training to which God subjected the Jewish people, and by its repeated exposure of the blunders into which an untaught but egotistic criticism has been led. One feels braced up in mind and heart by an hour's study of these volumes as the use of a wholesome tonic or the breathing of mountain air in August braces the nerves. Light will be found falling upon many an obscure passage, and the difficulties which have hung around an incident or a statement will lessen or disappear, as the author's explanations are studied; but especially will the mind itself be put into a more vital sympathy with the writer and with the narrative as the work is appropriated by the reader, and so the soul itself will become in part the interpreter of the record made for the purpose of perfecting its life.

The method of exposition adopted will at once commend itself as being philosophical, natural and effective. The general arrangement and division of topics in the book are first brought forward; then, at the head of each section a few prominent words are quoted and briefly expounded for the benefit especially of persons who may have some knowledge of the Hebrew;

the translation then follows ; and at last comes the commentary, aiming to explain the facts recorded, indicate their moral bearing and unfold the great principles of ethical and theological truth to which they stand especially related. In this orderly way the work of the author is carried forward ; and the strength is expended upon the real difficulties instead of being used up in emphasizing what is obvious and undisputed.

A few extracts from the volumes will indicate the qualities of the work which Dr. Murphy has done, and exhibit the vigorous and epigrammatic style in which he is capable of writing. The following paragraphs which deal with the first verse in the Bible,—“ In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth”—are in their way very admirable, and give us words worthy to be spoken over that great sentence with which the Scriptural revelation opens.

It assumes the existence of God ; for it is he who in the beginning creates. It assumes his eternity ; for he is before all things ; and as nothing comes from nothing, he himself must have always been. It implies his omnipotence ; for he creates the universe of things. It implies his absolute freedom ; for he begins a new course of action. It implies his infinite wisdom ; for a *kosmos*, an order of matter and mind, can only come from a being of absolute intelligence. It implies his essential goodness ; for the Sole, Eternal, Almighty, All-wise and All-sufficient Being has no reason, no motive, and no capacity for evil. It presumes him to be beyond all limit of time and place ; as he is before all time and place.

This simple sentence denies atheism ; for it assumes the being of God. It denies polytheism, and, among its various forms, the doctrine of two eternal principles, the one good and the other evil ; for it confesses the one Eternal Creator. It denies materialism ; for it asserts the creation of matter. It denies pantheism ; for it assumes the existence of God before all things and apart from them. It denies fatalism ; for it involves the freedom of the Eternal Being.

This verse forms an integral part of the narrative ; and not a mere heading as some have imagined. This is abundantly evident from the following reasons. 1. It has the form of a narrative, not of a superscription. 2. The conjunctive particle connects the second verse with it ; which could not be if it were a heading. 3. The very next sentence speaks of the earth as al-

ready in existence, and therefore its creation must be recorded in the first verse. 4. In the first verse the heavens take precedence of the earth; but in the following verses all things, even the sun, moon, and stars seem to be but appendages to the earth. Thus, if it were a heading, it would not correspond with the narrative. 5. If the first verse belong to the narrative, order pervades the whole recital; whereas, if it be a heading, the most hopeless confusion enters.

In commenting upon that great event in the life of Abraham, when he was called to offer up his son, and recorded in the twenty-second chapter of Genesis, he exhibits his insight, and shows us his ability to generalize facts and deduce broad principles from individual experiences. Thus he crowds meaning into brief statements :

With the nineteenth verse of this chapter may be said to close the main revelation of the third Bible given to mankind, to which the remainder of this book is only a needful appendix. It includes the two former Bibles or revelations,—that of Adam and that of Noah; and it adds the special revelation of Abraham. The two former applied directly to the whole race; the latter directly to Abraham and his seed as the medium of an ultimate blessing to the whole race. The former revealed the mercy of God offered to all, which was the truth immediately necessary to be known; the latter reveals more definitely the seed through whom the blessings of mercy are to be conveyed to all, and delineates the leading stage in the spiritual life of a man of God. In the person of Abraham is unfolded that spiritual process by which the soul is drawn to God. He hears the call of God and comes to the decisive act of trusting in the revealed God of mercy and truth; on the ground of which act he is accounted as righteous. He then rises to the successive acts of walking with God, covenanting with him, communing and interceding with him, and at length withholding nothing that he has or holds dear from him. In all this we discern certain primary and essential characteristics of the man who is saved through acceptance of the mercy of God proclaimed to him in a primeval gospel. Faith in God (ch. xv.), repentance towards him (ch. xvi.) and fellowship with him (ch. xviii.), are the three great turning-points of the soul's returning life. They are built upon the effectual call of God (ch. xii.) and culminate in unreserved resignation to him (ch. xxii.). With wonderful facility has the sacred record descended in this pattern of

spiritual biography from the rational and accountable race to the individual and immortal soul, and traced the footsteps of its path to God.

In the closing paragraph in his second volume we have a still more striking example of this generalizing power, and a fine statement of the moral significance of this separation of the chosen people and of their departure from the midst of Egypt, to find, through peril and strife and hardship and a faithful but wise and loving discipline, a possession and a rest.

The nations of the earth are no longer visibly one on the momentous question of allegiance to God. The holy nation has publicly come out from the world. The great body of mankind has become gradually more and more estranged from the true and living God. Four hundred and thirty years ago, Abraham has been called to separate himself from his father's home and land in preparation for this sad event. And now, when the process of human ungodliness is come to a head, a little nation sprung from him stands forth as a witness for God, a light in the midst of darkness, and a salt that is yet to preserve the earth. This little people is itself the type and germ of all coming stages of the kingdom of God on earth. Cradled in persecution, it yet escapes to the wilderness, and is fed with manna from the sky and water from the rock, by the omnipotent word of God. Its conscience is awakened by the promulgation of the moral law, and then led from the despair of guilt to the calmness of peace with God through the symbolic propitiation of the tabernacle. In the infancy of its mind it is wisely and kindly trained by the use of appropriate symbols to grasp the transcendent thoughts of mercy and truth, of righteousness and peace, of atonement, of redemption and regeneration. The roots of bitterness again and again burst through the soil and shoot up into a baneful luxuriance. Nevertheless, the planting of the Lord has taken root, and has been growing and gathering strength again after many storms, and amidst many thorns through all the course of time. If Genesis tells of that first disobedience that brought death into the world of mankind, Exodus speaks with cheering hope of that suffering but surviving obedience that brings eternal life to the returning penitent. These two books, then, contain the pith and marrow of the ancient gospel; Leviticus and Numbers being subsidiary, and Deuteronomy a recapitulation.

Not by any means are the entire utterances of the work of

this marked character, but these specimens of thought and style suggest a mind of strong grasp in its thought and of unusual power in its ability to make itself felt as a stimulant upon the spirit of a reader. One may be certain that such a mind will never appear feeble or utter itself in mere commonplace. The two volumes are most valuable, timely and significant additions to our exegetical literature, and every studious pastor will find himself not a little enriched who obtains and uses them freely, both for the purpose of elucidating the meaning of single texts and of extended and frequent perusal. They will aid in answering many questions raised by the critical intellect but they will do still more in quickening the heart into that sacred sympathy with the early Scriptures which makes faith at once vigorous and vital.



#### ART. VI.—THE PERVERSIONS OF THE GOSPEL A PROOF OF ITS DIVINITY.

A young infidel was scoffing at Christianity, in the presence of Dr. Mason, because of the misconduct of its professors. Said the Dr. to him, "D'd you ever know an uproar to be made because an infidel went astray from the paths of morality?" Upon his admission that he had not, Dr. Mason replied, "Then don't you see that by expecting the professors of Christianity to be holy, you admit it to be a holy religion, and thus pay it the highest compliment in your power?" By this retort the mouth of the opposer was shut.

Skeptics and opposers of the gospel of Christ, have ever been disposed to judge of its claims by the lives of its professors, and as they have had no difficulty in finding a vast amount of hypoc-



risky and immorality among those nominally belonging to the number of Christ's disciples, they have laid all to the charge of the gospel itself, and have appeared glad of such an excuse for rejecting it. In this judgment, they have shown either positive dishonesty or criminal recklessness. They have either known the conduct of these false professors, on whose account, they reproach the gospel, to be contrary to the principles and precepts of Christianity, and therefore not to be laid to its charge, or, they have not taken pains to examine the system which they oppose, to learn what it does teach, and what are its requirements. The first is reckless dishonesty, the last dishonest recklessness. Undoubtedly to all those who have fought Christianity on a large or small arena, both might be justly attributed. Hume confessed that he never read the New Testament with careful attention, and the ignorance of the sacred writings exhibited by Voltaire and Paine and other infidels is well known.

The dishonesty, or at least the extreme unfairness of the practice of judging Christianity by the perversions of it in the false systems and false lives of its pretended friends is most apparent. If we had no written word of ultimate authority, embodying the principles of the system in infallible statement, and were compelled to trust tradition for our knowledge, and to look to those who call and have called themselves Christians for our acquaintance with Christianity, then it might be acknowledged a fair procedure to form opinions of it, wholly by what appears in the lives and systems of those professing it. But Christianity does not so come to us. It comes offering certain sacred writings claiming to be inspired of God, and to contain his will and his truth made known to man. Doctrines are taught, and precepts given, which are to be received of men and wrought into their lives, ere they can be acknowledged Christians. Those, who do thus receive the truth and the influences of the gospel, become, it is taught, new men, and are henceforth actuated by motives and governed by principles holy and right. Supreme love to God and equal love to man form the basis of the law of Christianity. This we find by the study of the divine word. This newness and purity of life, the gospel claims as its fruits. Shall the sincere inquirer reject the claim of the gospel to be

divine, because the lives and systems of its professed friends, in a great multitude of cases, fail to agree with the standard and teaching of the sacred book? Shall the gospel be rejected because of the perversions of it by imperfect and by wicked men? On the contrary these very perversions ought to be, and to the candid, sincere inquirer will be an additional proof of the divinity of the original. That the inconsistencies of professed believers in Christianity may be turned into proofs of its divinity, may appear a paradoxical proposition, but to us nothing on earth is more obvious, and we do not hesitate to charge it upon skeptics that had they exercised the honesty, care and candor which they profess, they would have acknowledged it rather than have sought to use these inconsistencies as weapons with which to assail the gospel.

That the ideal Christian character of the New Testament is perfect will not be questioned by any one whose study of it has been sufficient to entitle him to an opinion, and that the embodiment of such character, we have presented us in the record of the life of Jesus, we all know.

It is equally true that the moral teachings of the New Testament are free from every vicious tendency and embody every virtue and every excellence. The departures from this perfect ideal and this high standard, which we observe in the lives and systems of professing Christians we know to have been the work of men, many of whom were false in heart, but to multitudes of whom, we must in candor attribute honesty of desire and purpose to realize the truth in belief and practice. If then man, with all the light of the sacred Word shining on him and aiding him, has formed such evil or imperfect systems and allowed such evil or imperfect conduct, how could he be the author of so pure and holy a system as the Christianity of the New Testament? Let it be borne in mind ever that the gospel most positively claims to be of divine origin, and then the more minute and detailed the examination of the various errors in doctrine and practice, which have assumed the Christian name, the stronger will grow the conviction, by the comparison of the false and the true, that while these errors are recognized as the work of man, the words of the apostles and prophets, are "not

the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." To this study and comparison then we would not hesitate to invite the skeptic, and if he will but treat the subject fairly, he will be compelled to acknowledge that those very things, which he has been accustomed to regard as the reproach, and an evidence of the falsity of the gospel, do instead furnish a most convincing argument for its divinity. The perversions of it by man, and the almost universal tendency to pervert, or at least abbreviate it, will prove to a candid mind, that it did not originate with man.

#### THE PERVERSIONS OF THE ROMAN CHURCH.

To examine them with any thoroughness would require a volume, we may only briefly note some of the main features. We see then a church professedly Christian which for centuries held wide sway in the civilized world. Its doctrines and spirit have been fully exhibited, and can be studied in the history of many generations.

We cannot nor are we disposed to deny that in her creed are presented many evangelical doctrines, or that within her fold and through her ministry a vast amount of moral and spiritual good has been effected, but with this we have not now to do. We look upon the darker side of her history. We see her claiming to be supreme upon earth, to hold exclusively the keys of heaven and hell and to have within her fold all that are to be saved. In her priesthood, beginning with the lowest priest and upwards through the ascending grades to bishops, arch-bishops, cardinals and pope, resides the power to grant absolution to sinners, on confession, or for reasons which seem to them fitting, to withhold the favor and consign to eternal perdition. The head of this hierarchy, the Pope, is Christ's Vice-gerent on earth, and is infallible. He can remit sins or permit them, and his pardons and indulgences have been purchased with money.

Thus, through this consecrated line of apostolic successes in the priesthood, grace comes to man as a sinner. Those who yield assent to this system and seek salvation within the fold of the church, are promised life, but if any refuse, the church claims the right to coerce to conformity, or to deliver the rebellious into

the hand of the tormentor or executioner. History teaches to what extent this right has been exercised. The swords of the faithful have reeked with the blood of heretics, the scaffolds; the flames, the dungeons and galleys, and the secret chambers and vaults of the Inquisition, have received thousands and tens of thousands of the incorrigible.

But how has the church instructed those that have acknowledged her authority? She has taught them to look to her priesthood alone for spiritual knowledge. She has shut the Bible and forbidden them to read, lest they be destroyed by heresy, and then has fed them on such doctrines as transubstantiation, auricular confession, priestly absolution, penance for sin, and purgatorial purification, and has taught them to adore the Virgin, to pray to saints, to reverence relics, to acquire merit by repetition of *pater-nosters*, to observe fasts and holy days, and cross themselves with holy water. If in these things they are faithful, common vices and immoralities of life, venial sins, do not hinder them from being good Christians. Such are some of the marked characteristics of the Roman Church. And though better doctrines and teachings and lives have been known within her communion, yet her history for centuries abundantly verifies the description given. The skeptic studies this history as did Voltaire, and exclaims, Is this system of priestly power and ambition, this tyranny, intolerance and cruelty, this merchandise of sin, this mass of superstition and ignorance, Christianity? Then I reject with scorn such a gospel.

But we call on the skeptic to pause. We put into his hand the New Testament and bid him study Christianity as Jesus has taught it and as it appeared in the apostolic age, and compare it with this perversion of Rome. What a contrast does he behold! In the place of priestly power and ambition, a fraternity of humble men, bound together by a common love to Christ and his truth, all equal in the sight of heaven, and all priests unto God; in the place of tyranny, intolerance and cruelty, mutual service, kind instruction, patient persuasion, gentleness and love; instead of the traffic in sin, the most severe purity of heart and life demanded as service to God; instead of a superstitious worship of the Virgin, the invocation of saints and adoration of

relics, an enlightened worship of the living and true God in spirit and in truth, and the seeking of salvation from the power and consequence of sin through Jesus Christ the only Saviour. Here is true freedom, true morality, true worship. Who can look with a candid and sincere mind upon such a contrast without feeling constrained to say, This system of worldly pomp, power and policy shows man's authorship, that system of heavenly truth and wisdom is from God? The human perversion, only the more irresistibly compels us to acknowledge the divine origin of the true. If after centuries of study and elaboration, in which work wrought many whom we must confess to have been wise men, and Christian men, we witness as the result such a degeneration from a perfect system of truth and worship to the system of popery, we cannot avoid the conviction, that that system itself, the pure and holy gospel of Jesus, established in an age and among a people of greatest corruption of doctrine and manners, must have been conceived by higher than human wisdom and human virtue. To the same conclusion shall we be led, if we contrast with the pure gospel, the perversions of the Greek church and the other Eastern churches. These show us what are the gospels which man's wisdom and goodness have framed even from such materials as the New Testament has put into his hand, and prove him incapable of originating the gospel.

Let us now turn our attention in an opposite direction, to view the perversions of Christianity by

GERMAN PHILOSOPHERS AND PHILOSOPHY AND THEIR FELLOW  
THINKERS AND WRITERS OF OTHER LANDS.

These are men of highly cultivated minds, who claim to be farthest removed from superstition. They have undertaken to remodel Christianity, to free it from errors and crudities which they have discovered in it as at first delivered. And what have they given us? systems which, for their greater simplicity, sublime truth, and purer morals, command our ready assent as improvements on the gospel? Far from it. On the contrary, the more they have diverged from the simple gospel, the less worthy of respect have their emendations become till for

fancifulness and absurdity they equal the dreams of a sleeper. We find them attempting to explain the miracles of Christ on natural principles, or resolving his power into that of a mesmerist and conjurer, or reducing his history to a mere myth, or allegorical fiction, in which the church embodied their ideas moral and spiritual. We find them teaching Christianity to be a development of human reason, which progresses from age to age, and they hesitate not to lay aside many of the teachings of Christ and his apostles respecting the character and destiny of man and the method of redemption. They loosen the bonds of morality, make little or nothing of faith and repentance and prayer, and substitute some general philosophical ideas of the beautiful and the true for the holy, and the cultivation of the intellect for the piety of the heart. And these systems, a combination of philosophical speculation, literary criticism, fanciful theories, with some elements of religious truth, they denominate Christianity, but they are utterly powerless to affect the hearts or renovate the characters of men.

The gospel of Christ is emphatically a religion for every class, the poor, the ignorant and the savage, as well as the rich, the wise and the enlightened, but these amended gospels of philosophers, either require a life of philosophical study to apprehend them, or are so fanciful and puerile as to cause a smile of derision when announced to any man of good sense, whose mind has not been sophisticated by philosophical speculations. There is nothing in them, which has power over the spirit of man, which has grasp upon his conscience, and with authoritative words direct him to duty.

From these perversions, it is a relief to turn to the pure gospel, and after viewing these fruits of human wisdom, it is with an increased conviction that they are not of man, that we study the pure and holy teachings of revelation. Is it not a proof of its divine origin, that when learned men, with the teachings and experience of eighteen centuries before them, undertake to improve upon the gospel, as given in the New Testament, they do so invariably fall into puerilities, or plunge into monstrosities, or float off into wild vagaries and transcendental theories?

But while these works of man appear on the stage of the world for a little while and vanish with their authors from remembrance, or are kept from perishing only as they are referred to for illustration of the absurdities and extravagancies of the human intellect, the gospel in its simplicity comes down unchanged from age to age, and ever finds hearts and mind to accept it and live by it, and give up all for it and the hopes it creates. So the human perishes but the divine endures.

Again we may draw an argument for the divine original of the gospel from the various perversions of

#### THE UNEVANGELICAL SECTS.

We have reference to those systems which repudiate, or by their modifications of them render null, such fundamental doctrines of the gospel, as inherent Depravity, Regeneration and Sanctification by the Holy Spirit's power, Redemption by the vicarious sufferings of Christ, and Future Eternal Retributions of the righteous and the wicked.

Multitudes there are in Christian lands who adopt such perversions of the gospel for the truth, and claim that it is the Christianity of Jesus Christ. Many do it honestly having set out with a wrong bias of mind to investigate truth, many have willingly given up their judgments to be moulded by prejudice and desire, many have perversely sought not to know the real truth, but to bend scripture to their preconceived and chosen opinions. But whatever the influences that have led men, they have variously departed from the truth as it is in Jesus, and have adopted a mutilated gospel in the place of the true.

These systems are but particular illustrations of the almost universal desire and disposition of man to seek for some modification of divine truth, instead of receiving it as given, in humbleness and submission. It is a fact, that the doctrines of Christianity do not suit the natural heart of man. His pride of intellect and station, his perverseness of heart, and love of sinful objects, his disrelish for true godliness, all are opposed to these divine truths, and so the unsanctified mind longs for some way of avoiding them. Left to himself and his natural likings, man would never have framed such a system as Jesus Christ has

taught, and the modifications and abbreviations of it, which so abound wherever the gospel has come, shows this most strikingly, and compels to the belief that this word is not of man. Man unguided by divine wisdom would have formed a system less offensive to human pride, less severe in its restraints on human desire, and less humbling to human reason. The stern purity, the sublime mystery, the elevating character of the doctrines of Christianity, so humiliating the natural man and so exalting God, when compared with those of unevangelical systems prevalent make it clear, that the latter are "the words which man's wisdom teacheth" but the former "the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth."

It is not, however, in these perverted systems or in those that hold them alone, that we discover evidence of that opposition of the natural heart to true Christianity, which proves man not its author.

We see the same among

#### EVANGELICAL SECTS.

The doctrines accepted by these, may be, in general the true teaching of Christ and his apostles, and the principles of morality inculcated may accord with the inspired precepts, but there is still room left for the natural mind to show whither are its tendencies. Very few are they, if any, whose conceptions of truth come up to the standard of the New Testament teaching, and they who approximate more nearly to it, are persons who themselves most emphatically declare, that they have experienced enlightening from the divine Spirit. They never claim by unaided reason to have attained such understanding of divine truth. Among professed Christians there is a constant tendency to a lower view of truth and duty than that which the gospel plainly teaches.

Take the conception of Christian life and character entertained by the great mass of the members of our churches, and compare it with that which we ought to gain from a study of the precepts and examples of Christ and the apostles, and how great is the contrast.

The form is often taken for the substance, and external duties



performed satisfy, when the devotion of the whole heart and life is required. Multitudes are the professed disciples of Christ, in charity esteemed sincere disciples, who, if brought to the test which Christ has given, and called to walk strictly by the letter and spirit of his precepts, would start back in alarm as if this were altogether too much to be demanded of them. And when they hear the faithful teacher set forth the duties, apply the tests, and delineate the features of true Christianity they are wont to say within themselves, this is a hard saying. Even if they admit the correctness of the representation, they look upon it as very severe, and call it "close preaching," with an air and a tone which mark it as in their estimation unusual beyond what ordinary Christians are expected even to reach after, much less attain. They set their standard much lower. To illustrate more fully let us look at some particulars in which the ordinary conception of the Christian life falls below the divine standard. The gospel requires man to love God with all the heart and to have reference to his will and honor in every act. How many Christians adopt this in all its breadth, so that they inquire in every transaction of business, in every gratification of desire, in every movement of life what is God's will concerning it?

Many seem never to think themselves called to ask for the will of God respecting what they shall eat and drink, what apparel they shall wear, what houses they shall build, what furniture and equipage they shall provide, what journies they shall take, or in what places they shall reside. In many cases we have known them to smile almost derisively at the singularity of the man who had the reputation of going to God in daily prayer for direction in such matters.

And yet does not the inspired word teach, "Whether ye eat or drink or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God?"

Again the Christian principle respecting property makes man a steward, to whom God has entrusted talents to be occupied for him. He is under command to use these possessions and conduct the business assigned him, as an agent for God. In every trade he makes, in every investment, in every labor, in every expenditure, he is to consult the will of the great Proprietor, and to use all his capital for such purposes

and to promote such ends as God desires. If we go to the counting-room, or the workshop, or the farm of the Christian men of business, and present this doctrine, how many will respond, "Yes, this is just the conception I have ever entertained of my calling, and in accordance with which I ever propose to act." Let any one who has doubt try the experiment and see.

The gospel gives as the second great command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." This forbids all exalting of self-interest above the interest of our fellow man, and calls on us in all our transactions of business, to have our neighbor's welfare equally in view with our own, in all our dealings to treat him as though he were another self. Very often do we see Christians attempting to find apology for selfishness and maintaining their right to love themselves better than any beside, but do we often find in them a practical appreciation of the disinterested love enjoined in this command of Christ? Is it not a most palpable fact that the great mass of Christians do, in their conceptions of the Christian life and character, fall far below the standard set up in the gospel?

And they who far excel the mass and rise high in their apprehension of holy obligation, do yet never reach that perfectness of conception, that, as they study more and more the teaching of the sacred pages, they do not find themselves attaining new views and loftier thoughts of true godliness. There are no Christians, not even the wisest and holiest, not even those whom unwilling skeptics are compelled to confess to be godly men, that ever set down contented in the belief that they have sounded the deepest depths, or soared to the loftiest heights of the truths of the divine volume. On the contrary, so long as they live they ever find it a well of living water, from which they can draw fresh supplies of holy thought and knowledge.

How shall we account for this transcendent superiority of the teachings of Scripture over the highest conceptions of even its friends and students but by ascribing its authorship to God himself? We all know that the wisest and best of the church throughout all its history, have made it their study to attain

the highest and noblest conceptions of man's duty and the true principles that should govern his life, and we know that none in all they have written or said, even with all the light of revelation to aid them, have excelled or even equalled the standard of the New Testament, while the mass have even fallen far beneath it, and is it possible for us to believe that man, unaided, in an age and among a people ignorant and barren of great truths and clear thought, could have conceived and established so perfect a system as the gospel? The utter improbability of such a supposition presents itself to us in a most striking manner, when we compare the teachings of Christ and the writings of the apostles, with the writings of Christians in the times immediately succeeding. Writers of this day, with all the light afforded by the works and history of the centuries since Christ came, occupy a much more advantageous position, than did the authors of the New Testament, inspiration aside, but they who wrote in nearly the same times stood more on a level.

And how do the writings of these ancient fathers compare with those of the New Testament? The contrast is most remarkable. The descent from the apostles to the fathers is not by an easy step but by a deep precipice. An almost immeasurable chasm separates them. When the last epistle of the apostles was written, it was most evident that inspiration ceased. No one in comparing with the New Testament the writings that followed, would be in danger of supposing that they belonged to the same class. The latter show plainly the power of the man of that age, the former show divine wisdom.

The gospel itself claims to be divine. The various authors are far from asserting themselves to have originated the system of doctrines they teach, but point us to God as the source of the truth they deliver. "Which things we speak, say they, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." "I certify to you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me, is not after man; for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

For eighteen centuries since these words were spoken, enmi-

ty has sought to prove this gospel a delusion, worldly wisdom and philosophy have sought to improve it, human desire and preference have perverted it into false systems, friendly minds have sought to elaborate it into creeds and systems of morality, and love has striven to realize its conceptions in life and character; but high above all these assaults of enmity, these criticisms of worldly wisdom and philosophy, these perversions of depravity, these elaborate systems of friendly minds, these imperfect lives and characters of professed disciples, the gospel towers in sublime excellence. Is it the work of man, like those of its friends and foes, or is it the work of God? Did Christ teach as a mere man, and are these narratives and epistles the work of the simple fishermen of Galilee and the disciples of Gamaliel, or did Christ teach as the divine Son of God, and apostles speak as they were moved by the Holy Ghost?

---

#### ART. VII.—THE GERMAN PHILOSOPHY\*.

This term is used in this article, to designate a certain class of opinions which appear to have recently originated in Germany, as the French Philosophy about the time of the French Revolution originated in France.

The German Philosophy differs from the French, in this respect, at least, that the French was infidelity, open and avowed. God was ignored, Christ was treated with contempt, and religion was discarded as a worthless delusion, a trammel to genius and a barrier to human enjoyment.

\*Origin and History of the Books of the Bible. By Prof. C. E. Stowe, D. D. Life of Jesus. By Ernest Renan. The apostles. By the same author. American Encyclopædia.

When we consider that the religion of France was Romanism with its intolerance, its infallibility, its claims to universal dominion, its auricular confession, its sacred relics, its home-made miracles, its hatred of general enlightenment, its suppression of the word of God, its inquisition, universal bishop, and priest-ridden masses, and that the French nation knew as little of any other religion as the Japanese twenty years ago knew of America, it is hardly wonderful that they should have regarded piety as another name for priestcraft, and associated all progress with infidelity.

But the German Philosophy is of late origin, started under different auspices and grown in a wholly different soil. The French are frank, brisk, lively and impulsive. The Germans comparatively plodding, dreamy and speculative, conversant not only with the Catholic system, but with the Protestant faith. They better knew the value of religion than the French knew it, in the dawning of their Philosophy—or than they know it now, or are likely to know it for half a century to come, or at least, as long as the Emperor of the French is the special guardian of the Pope of Rome.

We have said the French Philosophy professed to be Infidel. On the other hand, the German professes to be Christian, and claims to regard religion as indispensable to the true progress of society, and as an essential element in the happiness of man. So its masters teach, as we shall see.

Geo. Wm. Frederic Hegel, Professor of Philosophy at Berlin, born Aug. 27, 1770, may be regarded as the father of the system, if it be a system, with which we are dealing. It is true, as his biographers state, that he studied closely the writings of Kant, even in his schoolboy days, and partially followed him. Immanuel Kant was born in Königsberg, Prussia, April 22, 1724. His philosophical writings were independent and profound. But his mind, from early life, had been greatly influenced by the subtle skepticism of Hume, who was but thirteen years his senior.

This bird's eye view of the origin of the German Philosophy, if we have given it correctly, shows us David Hume as its great-grandfather, a man who stands, as we suppose no one will ques-

tion, either at the very head of modern skepticism, or at least second to none of his peers. It shows Kant, also a German Philosopher, to have been its grandsire, concerning whose philosophy perhaps a few words more may not be amiss. When this really profound thinker came upon the stage, he found two popular systems of philosophy—the sensual system of Locke, as it is sometimes called, on the one hand, and the idealism of Leibnitz and other authors of a similar cast, on the other. With both these systems Kant became dissatisfied. They were too dogmatical and uncertain for him ; at least so say his admirers. He therefore commenced by raising such inquiries as these : What can I know ? What is it that I know *originally* ? And what do I learn by experience ? &c. Hume had proved, to the satisfaction of Kant, that our ideas of cause and effect are not derived from experience, but he had settled down upon the opinion that “ They are the spurious offspring of the imagination, impregnated by custom.” From this opinion Mr. Kant differed, and perceived “ The idea of cause and effect is by no means the only one which the mind makes use of with the consciousness of its necessity.” Here he diverged from the philosophical opinions of Mr. Hume. He regarded the metaphysical arguments for and against the immortality of the soul, and for and against the eternal duration of the world, as equally balanced. How much more of *certainty* he gained than he would have done by studying Locke, and adopting his system, may be easily imagined.

And this author is the one who, more than any other, moulded the opinions of Geo. Wm. Fred. Hegel, author of philosophic works, entitled, *The difference between the Philosophy of Fichte & Schelling in 1801*—and who, in conjunction with the latter, published the critical *Journal of Philosophy* in 1802, and who published his *System of Science* in 1807, and who published his *Science of Logic* in 1812, and who, in the course of the following four years, published the other two volumes which constitute his philosophical System. He afterwards wrote the *Encyclopædia of the Philosophical Sciences*, and still later his *Elements of Right, or the Basis of Natural Law and Political Science*. The works of this author are too voluminous to repay

a careful examination by any man, for any ordinary purposes. Of the Hegelian Philosophy, Prof. Stowe says, "I have acknowledged, and here repeat the acknowledgment, that I have no very definite knowledge of it. It stands before me in its bulk, and its unintelligibility, as a huge, shapeless, threatening spectre, most fitly described in the words of Virgil.

'Monstrum, horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen, ademptum.'  
(A monster, horrid, hideous, huge and blind.)

But when I think of the tremendous influence it exerts and the mighty mischief it is making, it assumes to me (in the language of Milton)

'The other shape,  
If shape it may be called, which shape has none,  
Distinguishable in member, joint or limb,  
Or substance may be called, that shadow *seems*,  
For each seems either; black it stands, as night—  
Fierce as ten furies, terrible as hell,  
And shakes a dreadful dart, and what seems its head,  
The likeness of a kingly crown has on.'

We do not give these words as fully expressive of our own opinion of the character of the German Philosophy, but as the opinion of another, greater and wiser and better man, though trained in a somewhat different school.

The illustrious author of this Philosophy, who has acquired a world-wide celebrity, had before him the French Philosophy inseparably associated with the French Revolution, and the reign of terror—men's heads in hundreds rolling from the guillotine into the basket, gutters running with the blood of prominent citizens, whose only crime was that they dissented, or were suspected of dissenting from the predominant party—prisons crowded with haggard victims, waiting their turn to be taken from their place of incarceration to the place of execution, confidence wholly destroyed, distrust and a sense of peril everywhere prevailing, and the infuriated mob shouting the praises of Liberty and Equality, and crying for the blood of all who dared to differ from themselves in opinion. He could not close his eyes to the fact that however corrupt and however puerile the Roman church had become, and however hideous might be the occupant of St. Peter's chair, a corrupted and puerile religion,

which still retained in its theory a knowledge and fear of God, was better for the world than open infidelity. Yet the skepticism he had early imbibed from Hume and Kant, clung to him and influenced him, though imperceptibly, in all his researches and labors. Such at least is, to our mind, the only solution of the problematical life and doctrines of this truly great and amiable man.

The only principles in this philosophy with which we wish to deal, the only features indeed in which we have the least possible interest, are those which bear directly on religion. We care but little for the metaphysics of this great author and his deep thinking speculating countrymen. We care still less for their fine spun theories on solids and fluids, rest and motion, growth and decay, congelation and combustion, electricity, light and caloric, inanimate matter, vegetable life or animal life, or the whole range of science, physical and animal. On all other matters let them speculate and discuss; let them talk and write. They will regulate themselves in time, and no *fatal* blunders will the world make, we trust, in consequence thereof. But it is not so with those notions which pertain to man's duty to his God and his fellow man, or to the faith or unbelief which may affect his eternal future.

The main principle laid down by Hegelian Philosophy, is "*The absolute identity of subject and object.*" This, says Prof. Stowe, is "the great discovery boasted by Hegel and his followers, the great first principle of all truth, the honor of whose development Schelling in vain attempted to dispute with Hegel."

Feuerbach, a doctor of the same school, presents this same principle in its application to Deity thus—"God is only a being of the understanding, a reflected image of the human intellect, projected upon vacancy, not only in his attributes but in his very existence, demonstrable to have no other than this deceitful origination."

Let me for a moment continue the development of this principle which constitutes this wonderful discovery in religion—that the subject and object are identical. Man is the subject, and desiring an object of worship, he projects his own image upon



vacancy or *imagines* an object of worship—imagines the attributes of such a being, one by one, places them side by side, compares them, balances, adjusts and combines them, in short arranges them to his own liking, and imagines them to constitute a real existence, which he calls God; and to which he finally bows down and worships, and calls it the Great Father of us all. Well, so far, if this philosophy be correct, the Christian, like the Hindoo, has created a God and then bowed down and paid to it his homage. God has not created man, then, but man has created God! But this is not all. Has this *subject* invested the *object* with purity, with wisdom, with benevolence, with justice, with omniscience, with omnipresence, with perpetual existence, in the immeasurable past as well as the eternal future? It is because man himself is pure, wise, benevolent, just and infinite, for the subject—man—and the object—God—are the same. They are man's projected image," or as an American disciple of the same school has said, "God is man's pronounced self." To allay any suspicion that might arise that such absurdities are in part deductions of our own, unwarranted by this profound philosophy, we add that this same author himself, in commending and developing this system, says that "It is a delusion to suppose the nature of man a limited nature." "If you think infinity and feel infinity, it is the infinity of thought and feeling, nothing else. The knowledge of God is the knowledge of ourselves, for the religious *object* is within us." God is man's revealed inner nature, his pronounced self. Religion is the solemn unveiling of the concealed treasures of humanity, the disclosure of its secret thoughts, the confession of of its dearest secrets—the relation of man to his own being as to another being." \* \* \* "The *dream of the human soul.*"\*

In this theory the one step between the sublime and the ridiculous has vanished, and they have become as really *identical* as *subject* and *object*.

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me" must now mean, when illuminated by this philosophy, "Thou shalt have no other God but thyself." "For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the (idolatrous) fathers upon the

\* Stowe on the Bible, p. 260 &c.

children unto the third and fourth generations of them that hate me"—means "I, the image of thyself, reflected upon thine own imagination, am a jealous God, and I, thy reflected self, will plague thee and thy children after thee to many generations, if thou shalt not pay thyself divine homage." "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and soul and strength"—is, "Thou shalt love thy projected image, thy 'pronounced self,' with all thy soul, mind and might." If these deductions are not legitimate and absolutely unavoidable, we cannot understand the first principles of this philosophy. What a mighty being must Moses have been in the mountain, and how powerful must have been his imagination to have invested with such glory that shadow of himself, as it passed by him in the rock.

The old apocryphal author, who makes Terah, the father of Abraham, to have been a pagan in religion and a manufacturer of gods by occupation—tells that Abraham, when a youth, entered the god-factory once in absence of the workmen, and made sad havoc among the deities. But this philosophy is a great saving process, by which, cost as well as labor may be saved to all true Christians, as all may create their own gods, carry them in their own imaginations, beyond the reach of harm.

But we hope not to seem irreverent if we inquire of these great men what may be the difference in the process between manufacturing a god and a devil, and what is the real difference between them when produced? Leaving out the doctrine of innate depravity, which of course this man-worshipping philosophy must deny, it must be confessed that there are men, not a few, in this and other generations, whose moral and intellectual image, projected by their own imagination, would produce a caricature of the devil. Ought the *subject* who has reflected such an *object* to bow down and worship *that* and *no other* being, on pain of reprobation? Yet such is the duty unavoidably inferred from these philosophical principles. Angels and all other spiritual beings are of course to be produced in the same manner, and are to be equally wise, holy and infinite as the Deity, as they are the reflections of the image of the same subject.

What becomes of one's responsibility from such premises as these? Of course no one can argue that this shadow-god will sit in awful judgment on the being of which he is only the faithful shadow. By the mouth of the Psalmist, God reproves certain vile and abominable characters, who had cast off the fear of retributive justice, thinking that *God was altogether such a being as themselves*. In terrible terms he reproves and threatens them for such wickedness. But however much such monsters of iniquity had thought God was like themselves, they had probably never imagined that *God was themselves, or their shadows*. If they had, then they, as well as Schelling, might contend with Hegel for the honor of having originated the main principle of his philosophy. By this system there is no moral responsibility except such as a man renders to himself, and no moral influence but that which he exerts on himself. "In willing, loving, feeling" &c., says an advocate of this system, "there is no influence but of ourselves over ourselves." And again, "All limiting of the reason rests on error." Again "*Every being is all sufficient to itself*." Dr. Voight of Giessen, says, that there can be no permanent freedom till the idea of God, and all responsibility to God, is banished from the human mind. That will do. This is where this philosophy must sooner or later culminate.

Bauer who is regarded as an able German Philosopher, and an author of this same school, justifies, so far as we can understand him, these doctrines as we have deduced them from the principles laid down by Hegel. Prof. Stowe gives a literal translation from his work on the Evangelists, which we will copy. And as we were obliged to read it several times before we could dive to the bottom of its pellucid depths, we bespeak for it the undivided attention of the reader. One thing in it however is perfectly clear, viz. that he is a firm believer in the *great principle* that the *subjective* and *objective* are *identical*. The quotation is as follows ;

"The religious spirit is that disruption of the self-consciousness, in which the essential definiteness of the same, steps over against the consciousness, as a power separate from it. Before this power the self-consciousness must naturally lose itself; for it has therein cast its own contents out of itself,

and so far as it can still sustain itself as a me for itself, it feels itself before that power as nothing, so as it must regard the same as the nothing of its own self. Nevertheless the me as self-conscious cannot entirely lose itself—in its subjective, secular thought filled with moral ends and willing, it still maintains its freedom; and into this freedom also the religious consciousness, and the historical development of the same are involuntarily drawn. Both the religious consciousness and the free self-consciousness thus come into contact, to interpenetration, without which the first could be neither individually living nor capable of a historical growth. But so as this livingness and growth, after their first contact, become the subject of religious reflection, they are again torn from the self-consciousness, they step before the consciousness as the deed of another, and now also, necessarily, the interposition which had placed them in the self-consciousness as its own movement, becomes a machinery whose bands are guided in another world.

No one after having mastered this lesson need ever be at a loss to understand his religious nature and emotions. No one need marvel hereafter about the “me and the not me” of the German philosophy. None need be mystified about how the reflection of one’s self by the power of the imagination can become an infinite God before whom one falls down in profound and humble adoration, exclaiming, “I am a worm and no man.”

But who, after reading such an effusion from the pen of a learned German Philosopher, and making all due allowance for damage by translation, can marvel at the eagerness with which men in our country abandon a simple faith in a simple gospel that they may possess themselves of the revised, improved, philosophical religion of the Germans? To the foregoing quotation we have nearly a parallel, so far as we can comprehend, in a definition of Religion given by Mr. Wasson of Mass., at a Free Religious Association, lately held in Boston, by what may be regarded as the American branch of the German school. The definition is this, Religion “is the absolute affirmation of spirit made in and by the soul of man. Spirit, pure, universal, free, embracing all necessity and holding all in the everlasting solution of divine freedom This

is forever postulated in the soul of man. That absolute affirmation is religion reflected in the spontaneous worship of humanity." Here again is the thorough deification of man. Indeed these several quotations make not *one* deity of this imaginary kind, but as many as there are minds to reflect them. And this is the system of religion that will admit of nothing as a revelation that has not been tested by human reason! What effect can it produce on the mind and heart of a man to pray in secret or in public to the God of these philosophers, compared with the influence of praying to God—a *living* God who hears and answers prayer? Who that believes there is none but the imaginary God of Hegel, Bauer, &c., can regard prayer as anything else than a farce, and providences, revelations and miracles, as as anything but words without meaning?

The men who put forth this theory may be moral men, and may find the restraints of their philosophy all sufficient for themselves. On this subject we will here raise no question. But can this be said of all men? Can it be said of a large proportion of those who will most eagerly drink in their philosophy—devour it greedily, because of the very fact that it affords them a relief from the restraints from vice and incentives to virtue which orthodox religion affords? That this system really does this cannot be reasonably doubted. The opinions of the religious world in general have been, that the Bible is a revelation from a living God, a distinct, personal identity, who has proclaimed all the principles and precepts contained in it, and will hold man to a strict account for their observance—that God is the only lawful *object* of worship in the universe—that every man is a distinct being, and has a distinct and individual responsibility which he must render to God, whom he must not only obey but worship and love—not as a myth, a vapor, a phantom, a shadow of himself, but a GOD.

Is there no difference between the influence of a moral code proceeding from one of these sources or from the other?

Orthodox Christianity, (as it is termed) teaches that the human family are depraved and must be regenerated before they can love God and virtue, and hate vice and sin, or be loved of God. This philosophy denies that man has any inherent de-

pravity or any acquired moral turpitude—but proclaims him good enough for a God, possessing all the attributes with which he invests the object of his worship, possessing within himself an inherent divinity, and proclaims him a proper object of worship. Its own language is, “Man is God and must worship himself.” Vices, by this system, become a part of the necessary means for man’s development. Of course then they should be placed on a common level with virtues. What then can be the real distinction between vice and virtue, depravity and holiness? THERE CAN BE NONE—at best there can be none but such an one as varies to correspond to every man’s opinion—a chameleon-like distinction, that changes color as often as it changes hands. By this theory there is no standard for virtue, no test for vice. Of course the attainment in virtue which will satisfy the demands of this philosophy requires no regeneration.

By this philosophy the religion must depend on two circumstances the *unbelief* and the *imagination*. Unbelief in this philosophy and a confidence in the existence of a veritable object of worship, wholly independent of the subject, must of course greatly facilitate the *projection* of the image which these philosophers call God. Whereas if one is a firm believer in the philosophy he cannot without a most powerful imagination project an image distinct enough to exert any considerable moral influence on the mind or produce any devotional effect.

Of course there is no need of a vicarious atonement, and Christ is no Saviour in any higher sense than any other great good man would be, who had lived a tolerably blameless life, been a very earnest and sacrificing laborer for the good of mankind (gods though they be) and was finally murdered by those he sought to bless. That Christ was divine all these philosophers will admit by turns, because *all* men are divine. That he was a Saviour they readily confess, if occasion requires, because every great well meaning man is a Saviour, if he teaches and practises virtue, bears burdens for mankind, and lights up the pathway he goes, with words and deeds of kindness. But beyond this, by this philosophy, he was not and could not be a Saviour. If it be right for any man to worship any *other* man, then this Philosophy allows that Jesus may be worshipped—not

because he was superhuman, faultless nor sinless (if sin really exists among gods), but, if Almighty Self is the only legitimate object of worship, of course it would be very inconsistent to worship any other being.

But how is the plain testimony of the scriptures to be disposed of which so clearly proves Christ to have been superhuman? Can any method be devised by which the holy brow of Jesus of Nazareth can be shorn of its God-like dignity, and be reduced to the status of a mere man? To this inglorious work, whose accomplishment would cast the pall of death over all the good and holy of all ages, and blot out the brightest prospects and most cherished hopes of the pious, and tear away the pillars on which the moral world leans its aching head—does this philosophy address itself. If successful, the moral restraints of the old Christian system are removed, the necessity for regeneration obviated, and for one moment, at least, the unbelieving world will raise a shout of joy and triumph,—preparatory to a plunge into an eternal night of paganism or infidelity, with no Christ to redeem.

David Frederic Strauss, a countryman of Hegel and his faithful disciple, among many others, but eminent among his peers, has undertaken to break these fetters which have restrained the freedom of men by a superstitious veneration for Jesus. He begins with the expectations of the Jews that a Messiah should appear during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius Cæsar—introduces John the Baptist, and Jesus, whom he calls Jeschua. Thence he proceeds with a history of his Jeschua, which is by far more unlike the Bible record of the Son of God, than Jeschua is like his Bible name. He introduces divers *facts* which the scripture account has *omitted* to mention, and flatly contradicts the Evangelists. Well, why should he not? Is not all truth projected from within, according to this philosophy? And is not all revelation to be tested by reason, and rejected or admitted as reason decides? The intuitive reason of Strauss assures him that Jeschua was bred and born and lived and learned and planned and succeeded and failed and died like other men.

After his death his disciples pondered his character and

death, and there were terrible disappointments, for a while, and then they consoled themselves with the thought that he had gone to glory instead of being dead—They became so enthusiastic on this subject that at length *some of the women, imagined* that they had seen him since his death and burial, and told the men so—all finally became so excited that they imagined they saw him two or three times when together, &c., &c.

Before this miracle of the resurrection of Christ, it seems nothing at all had been accomplished in the line of miracles. But after having imagined they had so often seen him alive, of course they could easily imagine that they had seen him do a thousand wondrous things when alive. So they turned his parables and other teachings into miracles, and then they became recorded as such. Then again the fruitful imaginations of the believers, set them to work to produce a counterpart for the miracles of the Old Testament and ascribe them to Christ. In this manner, and in the course of time, a very respectable list of miracles was made out. For, of course, in the estimation of those unphilosophical men, a Christ must have wrought miracles; and yet this Jeschua never wrought one. In a manner very similar were his doctrines and discourses made out, so that the record we have of Jesus of Nazareth is a jumble of unauthentic stories.

All this might sound very well for a professed Atheist, who is bound to raise every cavil and conjecture imaginable upon the sacred records, but how does it sound for a man who professes to be himself a Christian, and is stating his own candid convictions of Christianity? Verily, if this is Christianity in Germany, what is German infidelity?

Another work of similar character has been written by Weisse. The brief review we have given of the Saviour's life as presented by Strauss, might answer for this work also; only the two sources of *proof* to which these authors resort—*reason* and *imagination*, seem to differ a little in the two men. Now let us bear in mind that by this German Philosophy, an *object* is formed by the *imaginative projection* of the *subject*. Of course then, the *objective facts* of these two great philosophers will differ just as much as the *subjects* (or the men) themselves differ.

Weisse therefore admits that wonderful prodigies were witnessed in connection with the Saviour's teaching, for he was, as



modern spiritualists would say, "a powerful healing medium"—or, as Professor Stowe has it, "He was in fact a full charged galvanic battery, ready at any touch to be discharged." By the exercise of this power he obtained his celebrity as a miracle worker. Once too he succeeded in restoring a damsel who had swooned, which, of course, soon gave rise to the report that he had raised the dead. But like Strauss, he understands that the main facts relating to the great miracles Christ performed, and even his other acts, were gathered up from unreliable sources, a considerable time after the death of Jesus. And, with all the gravity of a judge, he goes on with a lengthy account of the manner in which this was accomplished. How much better he understands these matters than those who professed to have been eye and ear witnesses of them, all must decide for themselves by the free use of their own *reason* and *imagination*. For as these Philosophers claim the right to try all the facts of the sacred record perhaps we may exercise the same liberty with theirs. In doing so we have not only found out that they have differed widely in their relation of pretended facts, but we have also tried the whole mass of them by our *infallible human reason* and found them all wanting.

Another of these spurious gospels has been written by Prof. Daniel Schenkel. It contains more contradictions and corrections of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, than we have time or inclination to examine in detail. In fact *his* infallible reason, aided by his vivid and powerful imagination, has set forth the New Testament biographies as an almost perfect tissue of misrepresentations. He is able, by some means, to correct them in regard to the most trivial as well as the most important matters. He also makes some statements which exhibit either a thorough unacquaintance with the Old Testament prophecies, or else a thorough willingness to contradict them, and yet, after all this stupidity or recklessness, he regards the New Testament biographies of Jesus, not as wilful prevaricators, but as being actuated by "THE UNCONSCIOUS HOMAGE OF A RELIGIOUSLY INSPIRED IMAGINATION!" These are the words of this learned Professor, and they show in what estimate he holds *religious inspiration*—and how he thinks it will stand the test of the infallible reason. Or possibly he may him-

self be religiously inspired as well (for is he not a Christian?) and allows himself the same latitude, when so inspired, as he accords to these honest evangelists. This singular stroke of the Professor's pen also shows, clearly enough, how far from the truth one may be led by a religiously inspired imagination.

Numerous other German authors, of almost equal celebrity with those already mentioned, have written lives of Jesus, and other books bearing directly on Christianity, with a view to render the Christian religion a consistent rational system—fit to be believed in by a Philosopher. It almost seems as though a perfect mania had seized upon those Teutonic intellects, so rapidly have such works increased within the last thirty years; and at very few things have we ever marvelled more than the cool effrontery with which they contradict the Scriptures when they stand in the way of their own theory. We have not read them all. We have gained the most of our knowledge of them by the reviews written, both by their friends and opponents. But we hazard nothing in adding, that in what we have said of those mentioned, we have given a fair sample of all.

But this epidemic has spread into France also; and one Ernest Renan has wielded his pen in the same inglorious effort, to elevate Christianity by bringing into contempt the only source from which we derive our knowledge of it, viz., the Scriptures.

This illustrious savan has lately written a volume which purports to be a Life of Jesus, and another entitled, *The Lives of the Apostles*. In his introduction to the life of the Saviour he kindly gives us a key to his method for clearing much of the sacred text of its corruptions. He says, "Matthew clearly deserves unlimited confidence, as regards the discourses of the Saviour. He gives the *Logia*, actual notes from a clear and living memory of the teaching of Jesus. A splendor at once soft and terrible, a divine power, if I may use the term, italicises these words, detaches them from the context and renders them clearly recognizable to the critic. He who attempts the task of forming a regular composition out of the gospel history, possesses, in this respect, an excellent touch-stone. The real words of Jesus will not be concealed. As soon as we touch

them in this chaos of traditions of unequal value, we feel them vibrate ; they come spontaneously, and take their own place in the narrative, where they stand out in unparalleled relief. Yet later even, in the introduction itself, the author says, "Must we therefore renounce all the coloring of narratives and confine ourselves to the general enunciation of facts? This would be to suppress history. Indeed I do believe that if we except certain short mnemonic axioms, none of the discourses reported by Matthew are literal. I willingly admit that this admirable relation of the Passion contains a multitude of approximations." By these sweeping sentences we learn

1. That M. Renan claims ability by his own erudition and sagacity, to correct the sacred record, by selecting what Christ said wherever he may find it—an ability which, in the body of his work he uses with a *perfect freedom*, not on Christ's *sayings* only, but also on his acts and circumstances.

2. That though Matthew was partially correct in his account of the Saviour's discourses, yet those sayings must, after all, be selected from a mass of interpolations—a perfect chaos of traditions.

By applying these almost superhuman powers of criticism to that which other profound scholars have for eighteen hundred years regarded as the word of God, M. Renan sifts the wheat from the chaff. We have seen threshing and winnowing done before, but seldom to get so little grain from so much chaff.

We are not sure that we speak correctly. We do not know but we should say that Renan has written the life of Jesus entire, to disabuse the minds of the Christian world who have been thoroughly misled by the records of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

In many respects he is like the German authors—he speaks right on, as by authority, approving or commending *here*, and correcting or condemning *there*, with the same apparent unconcern as though he had been an eye-witness often ; and adducing proofs, in other instances, which are no evidences at all.

In the first paragraph of the body of the work we are gravely informed that, during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, there "lived a superior person, who, by his bold initiative, and by the

love which he inspired, *created the object*, and fixed the starting-point of the future faith of humanity." In the second paragraph we are taught to believe that, being religious, consists in seeing "in nature something beyond *reality*," and for ourselves "something beyond death." The second chapter opens with a direct contradiction of the Evangelists, declaring that Jesus was born in Nazareth and not in Bethlehem—charging upon the Evangelists or somebody else, that they have made an awkward detour that their legend might fix his birth at Bethlehem, and altered the primitive text so as to make it correspond to this perversion. The motive for this, he informs us, was "the Messianic character attributed to Jesus." He *proves* that Jesus was born in Nazareth by adducing several texts from these same condemned authorities, which show that he dwelt at Nazareth, *but say not a word of his birthplace*—also by mentioning that some of the Evangelists do not mention the flight into Egypt.

So then, at this late age, we are to learn that the story of the flight into Egypt, and the fear of Joseph and Mary to come back to Judea, lest they should fall into the hands of Archelaus, were gratuitously thrown in to make out a narrative to prove that Christ was the Messiah, the whole having been very awkwardly done. Then he gives us to understand that the name of Jesus, which was common enough, was afterwards searched, to find in it some mysteries. Then in the third chapter follow some general facts in regard to the early education and circumstances which the Evangelists have omitted entirely. He defines very nearly the amount of Jesus' education, and of his general reading. "He knew nothing of the Greek language"—"or of Greek science." "Happily for him he knew nothing of grotesque scholasticism." "It is doubtful whether he understood the Hebrew writings in their original tongue." "Hillel was the real teacher of Jesus." He had no knowledge of the general condition of the world." "He had no precise idea of the Roman power; the name of Cæsar alone had reached him." "The court of kings seemed to him a place where people wear fine clothes." "He knew nothing beyond Judaism."\* Indeed it seems astonishing

\* pp. 75, 76, 77.

how little this man knew, who created such a profound sensation, baffled the skill of the doctors, and even *created an object of faith for humanity.*

“The charming impossibilities with which his parables swarm, when he puts kings and mighty men upon the scene, prove that he had no conception of aristocratic society, save that of a young villager who sees the world through the prism of his own simplicity. Still less was he acquainted with the new idea, created by Greek science, which is the basis of all philosophy, and which modern science has fully confirmed, the exclusion of the capricious gods to whom the early faith of the ancient ages attributed the government of the universe.” He believed in the devil, whom he looked upon as a sort of genius of evil, and imagined that nervous diseases were the work of demons, who took possession of the patient and tormented him.” “He never attached much importance to the political events of his time, and he was probably ill-informed concerning them. The dynasty of the Herods lived in a world so different from his that undoubtedly he knew it only by name.” “Jesus not only believed in them [miracles] but had not the least idea of natural order governed by laws. His knowledge on this point was by no means superior to that of his contemporaries.”†

Little allusion is made to the miracles of Christ in this work, and no attempt is made to disprove them. There is no need of any such attempt, for every miracle and all evidence based upon miracles, are discarded in the outset. Two or three pages of the introduction are devoted to the ignoring of all such proof, *a priori*. Everything supernatural falls under this head. “No miracle was ever performed before an assembly of men capable of establishing the miraculous character of an act.” (p. 43). “It is not, therefore, in the name of this or that philosophy, but in the name of constant experience, that we banish miracle from history.” M. Renan and his associates have no right to banish miracles from history. There was never an age of the world in which miracle did not constitute a part of religious history—Pagan, Mohammedan, Jewish or Christian. The ques-

† Life of Christ. pp. 78, 79, 80, 230.

tion to be decided is—are those miracles genuine or spurious? Christianity claims that miracles were wrought to prove Christ divine, and it is a bold assumption which the “experience” of no class of men is sufficient to justify, by which the evidence of miracles is denied *a priori* and conclusions ignored which those miracles if genuine would establish.

These German and French authors have unfolded no new records, sprung a lever upon no secret cabinet, discovered no old histories, for centuries concealed from public view, but with a strange recklessness of consistency and defiance of criticism to which they lay themselves liable at every step, they contradict and pervert the sacred biographers. Their style is no more attractive than that of a hundred authors who have written volumes in defence of Christianity and its founder. But their very boldness and hardihood recommend them to the favor of many who have neither capacity to refute them, nor inclination to read the numerous refutations written and published by others. But how can men of candor, and of any just pretensions to research, possibly satisfy themselves with the manner in which this subject of miracles is set aside? Take Renan’s account of the raising of Lazarus which runs thus—Jesus, after having filled this species of pilgrimage to the localities of his first prophetic activity, returned to his cherished abode at Bethany, where occurred a singular event, which seems to have had decisive consequences upon the end of his life. Wearied out by the ill-reception with which the kingdom had met in the capital, the friends of Jesus desired a great miracle which should have a powerful effect upon Hiersolemyte incredulity. The resurrection of a man well known at Jerusalem, would be more convincing than anything else. We must recollect here that the essential condition of true criticism is to comprehend the diversity of periods, and to lay aside those instinctive repugnances which are the fruits of a purely national education. We must also recollect that in this impure and oppressive city of Jerusalem, Jesus was no longer himself. His conscience by the fault of men and not by his own, had lost something of its primitive clearness. Desperate, pushed to extremities, he no

longer retained possession of himself. His mission imposed itself upon him and he obeyed the torrent. As always happens in great and divine careers, he suffered the miracles which public opinion demanded of him, rather than performed them. . . . It seems that Lazarus was sick, and that it was indeed in consequence of a message from his alarmed sisters, that Jesus left Perea. Perhaps also the ardent desire to close the mouths of those who furiously denied the divine mission of their friend, may have carried these enthusiastic persons beyond all bounds. Perhaps Lazarus, still pale from his sickness, caused himself to be swathed in grave-clothes as one dead, and shut up in his family tomb. . . . Mary and Martha came out to meet Jesus, and without permitting him to enter Bethany, conducted him to the sepulchre. The emotion which Jesus experienced at the tomb of his friend, whom he thought dead, may have been mistaken by the witnesses for that groaning, that trembling which accompany miracles. . . . The stone having been removed, Lazarus came forth with his grave-clothes and his head bound around with a napkin. This apparition must naturally have been regarded by all as a resurrection. *Faith knows no law but the interest of what it believes to be truth.*

Well, if faith knows no other law than this, in the estimation of Renan, then faith must be unprincipled indeed—at least the faith he advocates. Rather it shows that he knows not how to discriminate between faith and a zeal as strong and blind as the fabled Polyphemus.

Thus the miracles of Christ are mangled and denied. Thus are the Saviour and his friends charged, as in other instances in this work, with having practised a sheer deception on the people, and with having produced a Popish miracle—a mere sham of a miracle. Yet this same author, nearer the close of this work, justifies the character of Christ and the apostles as fully as he here justifies this deception—and calls the co-laborers of Christ demigods, and calls on all men to fall down and worship them, and breaks forth into a panegyric of the Redeemer, in the midst of which he says he will never be surpassed, and exclaims, “Between thee and God there will no longer be any

distinction!" Yet in other instances he says, "Jesus never for a moment enounces the sacrilegious idea that he is God." "Never thought of passing for an incarnation of God."

In what we have quoted above, as well as in many other instances,\* Renan and others, while they deny all miracles tacitly confess that there was an indispensable necessity that miracles should be wrought to convince the multitude of the divine mission of Jesus.

But the resurrection of Christ fares still worse in the hands of Philosophy than the resurrection of Lazarus. Renan informs us that we are indebted for this idea to the fruitful imagination of Mary Magdalene. When Mary came to the tomb the stone had been removed and the vault opened. What, in spite of the watch? And the body was no longer there. By whom removed and whither? Mary informs Peter and John, who ran to the sepulchre and saw something white—the grave-clothes probably, and ran home again. Mary remained and imagined she saw her Saviour and spake with him—throws herself down at his feet to kiss them, but "the light vision gives way, and little by little the shadow disappears." The story of these three *imposed* on the others. Other women saw the clothes and imagined them to be an angel, and that he had spoken to them—or perhaps they saw nothing at all. This was soon magnified to two angels, and many other reports were rapidly circulated—stories contradictory and enlarging and incoherent. Two of the disciples going to Emmaus met with a stranger who breaks bread with them as Jesus used to, and so they imagine it is Jesus—*after he has gone*.

Then follows—but no matter—all the facts of the meetings with Jesus were dreams, visions or imaginations—and the author interlards them with the most fervid rhetoric. Take out this rhetoric and you reduce the disciples to a poor company of lunatics—demented—thoroughly demented—hopelessly crazy, for none but crazy men and crazy women could ever have gone through the process through which the special pleading of this vivacious Frenchman puts these poor disciples.

Peter dreamed that he saw Jesus alive, and that he told him

\* See pp. 92, 93.



to feed his sheep—dreamed that he saw him again, and that he had told him if he saw fit for John to remain till he should come again, it was nothing to him. At one time some five hundred disciples, having climbed to the top of a mountain, saw a mirage and believed it was Jesus, and fell on their faces and worshipped, &c., &c., and went down impressed with the idea that Christ had commanded them to convert the world.

“With difficulty have we thus far dreamed,” says this author, “in order to propose a trifling question, *but one which admits of no easy solution.* Whilst Jesus rose in this real manner, that is to say, in the hearts of those who loved him, in what place did the worms consume the lifeless corpse, which on the Saturday evening had been deposited in the sepulchre?” And at this confessedly difficult question he labors—charges the Christians with having invented the story of the watch and the seal, and concludes that some of the disciples stole the body and carried it off to Galilee; or that the gardener stole it, or somebody else. After all, the author concludes it is best to “draw a veil over these mysteries.” Trifling as this question is he does not advance one step towards the answer of it. The ascension is, if possible, a tamer invention than the resurrection. But we cannot pursue these senseless details farther. We have seen and we trust presented enough of the German philosophy to satisfy all candid examiners of its character. This investigation was commenced with a high opinion of the intellectual powers of the philosophers, and a comfortable estimate of their sincerity. We shall part company with them with this estimate perceptibly diminished. The German authors are dreamers—visionary theorists, with intellects too obtuse for close criticism or careful investigation. Renan is a flippant writer who affects to dream in imitation of the Germans. But a Frenchman can never be a German. Renan has undertaken too much, and dreamed too far, and meddled with particulars in which he has shown the weakness of his cause by making total failures. The entire brood of these philosophers have made some magnificent blunders, two of which we will mention. They have deified human consciousness and reason, and proclaimed it infallible, and then they have set themselves to the

Life of the Apostles. pp. 75, 79.

task of disparaging the consciousness of all the Jewish, Moham-  
medan, Pagan and Christian world, and building up a system  
founded on their own reason, consciousness and imagination,  
which the reason and consciousness of nine out of every ten of  
the human family, will pronounce a hallucination. They have  
even shown the untenableness of their common theory by widely  
differing from each other.

The other blunder, which however stands out too prominent-  
ly to need more than a brief notice, is that they undertake to  
laud and almost deify Jesus of Nazareth and his disciples, and  
to praise the Christian religion as though they were Christians  
by turns, and also to dilute all the main principles, and mar or  
explain away all the main features of Christianity, and reduce  
the Son of God, by subtle sophistry, to a mere piece of humani-  
ty, and make both himself and his disciples a set of keen, sharp-  
sighted dupes, and good-hearted, honest, knavish enthusiasts.

What M. Renan's religious belief is (and nearly the same may  
be said of the other philosophers) it is difficult to make out, if  
indeed he has any. His general writings show that he regards  
himself as a Christian or wishes to be so reckoned. But in what  
this Christianity consists we are left in doubt. He says (page 87)  
"Had Israel possessed the doctrine termed spiritualistic, which  
separates man into two parts, body and soul, "and he thinks it  
perfectly natural that while the body rots the soul survives," this  
storm of rage and energetic protest would have had no cause  
for existence. But this doctrine, sprung from Greek philosophy,  
was not in the traditions of the Jewish mind. The ancient Hebrew  
writings contain no trace of future rewards or punishments." Again (page 89) "Others, the Pharisees especially, had recourse  
to the dogma of the resurrection. We find among the ancient  
people of Israel only very uncertain traces of this fundamental  
dogma. The Sadducee who did not believe in it was in reality  
faithful to the old Jewish doctrine: the Pharisee the partizan of  
the resurrection was the innovator." On page 253 he denom-  
inates the doctrine of the immortality of the soul a "deistical  
dogma." On page 103 he says: "If God is indeed a determin-  
ate being without us, the person that believes he has private re-  
lations with God is a visionary, and as the physical and physio-

logical sciences have shown us that *every supernatural vision is an illusion*, the deist who is at all consistent finds himself beyond the possibility of comprehending the great beliefs of the past." But adieu to Renan, Strauss, Hegel, Schenkle, Weisse, Bauer, Schelling and their fellow *Christians*. If the ancient disciples had done no better for Christianity than these philosophers have done, the last, lingering shadow of it would have departed centuries ago.

It is to be expected that whenever God thunders from Mount Sinai, or rains fire and brimstone, and hurls mighty hail stones on Egypt and Sodom, there will be men of great science and extensive research, who will say—"Ah! this is only an unusual commotion of the elements. We pity all those weak-minded mortals who know no better than to attribute these phenomena to the power of God. Make us gods to go before us for we know not and we care not what has become of these Moseses." We may always expect that when God sends vipers, lice and blood, as plagues and tortures to those who oppose his work, there will be wise men who will work many wonders with their enchantments. We may expect that in all ages, so long as Satan lives and the taint of depravity remains uneradicated from the human heart, there will be men—great men and small, sages and imbeciles, and all grades between, who will prove their depravity by talking in alternated tones of contempt and commiseration, of the folly of a firm, well-grounded Christian faith—who alternately laugh and philosophize about the ravens of Chereth, the sea voyage of Jonah, the ass of Balaam, the sun-dial of Ahaz, the angel of death in the threshing floor of Arunah, and the wonder-working of Christ and the apostles. We expect that the character and person of Christ will be ridiculed, that there will be great men who will prefer to believe that the soldiers who said "the disciples came and stole him away while we slept," rather than those disciples who testified that he appeared alive after his resurrection, to themselves, on various occasions, and under various circumstances, and also to 500 of their contemporaries at once—men who will coolly talk of the fruitful imagination, or the stupidity or blind enthusiasm of those who laid down their lives for the truths they proclaimed—men who will talk with

the most perfect *nonchalance* of the exaggerations of the apostles—of their having wrought themselves up to believe that Christ actually performed those things which it was prophesied that a Messiah should perform, and then publishing these conjectures as facts of which they were eye witnesses. We expect that from generation to generation there will be those who after having seen proofs of the Redeemer's miraculous power, and of the descent of the dove upon his holy head, and the audible voice of God proclaiming "This is my beloved Son," will break the awful silence that succeeds by feebly and tremulously saying—"It thunders." We expect there will be professedly wise, philanthropic men, who, when God has answered a universal demand for an Incarnate deity—a demand which every Christian heart must utter and every heathen heart and voice must echo—will say of that Incarnate God—"He is but a man"—will say of the voice of revelation with which God hath spoken from heaven—"It is a less certain sound than the deep toned voice of human reason"—will dilute the word of God with sophistry, till it has no healing balm for the incurable ills of humanity—who will pronounce every miraculous display of God's power a result of some natural law or a deception. But must such men be found among those who profess to believe in the Christian religion? And will men apologetically say such things as these, and incorporate them as admissions into their pretended defences of Christianity? Then may Christianity well pray for protection against its friends, though it might have power to vanquish all its enemies.

And what now shall be done? Shall the Christian church at large adopt the German theory? Shall they consent that all joy unspeakable and full of glory with which they have rejoiced while believing on Christ, though now they see him not, is a delusion? Shall they consent that their internal evidences of a living Saviour are a delusion? Shall they consent that being born again by the word of God that liveth and abideth forever—of incorruptible seed—not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God—is a delusion? Shall they consent that the support they have enjoyed, and do enjoy, amid trials and affliction—as they feel their hearts assuaged in answer to

prayer by the soothing touch of the hand of mercy—is all a delusion? Are they to consent that those bright visions of a better land which Stephen enjoyed, as he stood upon its margin, and the full view he had of God and Christ—that the visions of angels which the pious shepherds enjoyed in Judea—that the shining seraphs often seen in the most perfect ecstasy by the departing saint—that the ecstatic visions of the holy land, enjoyed by Paul and Peter and John, which so dazzled and ravished them that they longed to depart and be with Christ, were mere hallucinations? That all *such* Christians and all such apostles are simply good, pious, unphilosophical enthusiasts? And shall they see their cherished doctrine, so peremptorily insisted on in the word of God—that the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin and that there is no other name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved—all swept away because a few German philosophers of the nineteenth century contradict these doctrines without a fact to sustain their bare assumptions? And shall those who have for twenty, forty, sixty years, lived their lives in the flesh by the faith of the Son of God, and known all the sweets and joys of a spiritual religion which gave them communion with God through Jesus Christ—shall those who have felt the utter helplessness of their bondage to sin and have yearned for deliverance from its power, and found no relief, no hope but in Christ—all yield the point at last, and see that holy religion sunk into hopeless oblivion, and the place where it stood sown with salt from the hand of a cold, stupid, cheerless philosophy? Shall Christians be so cheated by infidel philosophers as to adopt and cherish skepticism under the name and profession of *religion revised and improved*—and admit that the sacred records on which they have leaned, are mere legends to be sorted and sifted by men who never felt their power—and that Jesus of Nazareth was a mere man and God a creature of the imagination? O, no, no! These marks are too transparent to conceal the infidel features that lurk beneath them. These delusions will have their day, but the foundation of God standeth sure.

These efforts of the adversary to overthrow the church of Christ are uncomfortable but will not prove fatal to its interests.

Like a miasma of whose presence one is all unaware till his whole system is affected by the malaria inhaled, so does this subtle skepticism permeate the religious atmosphere of our own country, and infect it with its poison unperceived for a season.

But even the system itself has its uses.

1. It demonstrates that there is no middle ground except in *transitu* between Evangelical piety and skepticism—

2. It demonstrates the absolute impossibility of denying successfully that there was a Jesus of Nazareth who established the Christian religion, and that in all the researches of lynx-eyed skepticism no facts, FACTS, can be found, and no *reasonable* conjectures formed, which damage the testimony of the evangelists.

3. That the *infallable reason* of those men who try the word of God by their own *inspiration* is like those who testified against Christ at his arrest—though all testify, yet their testimony does not agree.

4. That no human ingenuity is able to cope with the evidence which Christ's miracles furnish that he was divine, since these men do not, and *dare* not confess the *possibility* of miracles under *any* circumstances so long as they *deny* that *Christ wrought miracles*. This is scarcely less than a confession that if miraculous power could prove the divinity of any being, Christ by his miracles proved himself divine.

5. It shows how low a standard of morals, and what monstrous conceptions of God, can satisfy the demands of philosophy, when in the same chapter a philosopher can talk of Christ and the apostles as practising deception on the multitude to maintain a power over them, and yet bear testimony to the apostles as the best of men and "demigods," and say of Christ—"He will never be surpassed," and "between thee and God there will no longer be any distinction."

## ART. VII.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

LECTURES ON THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. Delivered in the Mercer Street Church, New York, January 21 to February 21, 1867. On the "Ely foundation" of the Union Theological Seminary. By Albert Barnes, author of "Notes on the New Testament," etc. New York: Harper & Bros. 1868. 12mo pp. 451.

The Bampton foundation in England has become well known through the valuable Courses of Lectures which it has secured and caused to be sent into the world. Mansel and Rawlinson have given us volumes whose appearance marked an epoch in religious literature, and indicated the importance and value of the gift which continues to preach so effectually long after the donor himself goes up to the great Source of truth. The gift of Graham some years since in New York for a similar object was hailed with high satisfaction, and now Mr. Ely of the same city puts down \$10,000 as a basis for a Christian Lectureship, and Mr. Barnes is very properly selected to deliver the first course. No man could well be found whose words promise more weight than do those of Mr. Barnes, and on no branch of the great general topic whose discussion is contemplated, would he find a field of inquiry to which his studies and his habits of mind are more admirably adapted. The field has been often traversed by many able and original thinkers, so that there is little to be said that is really new. But the need of restating in fresh forms the evidences upon which the Christian revelation makes its appeal to our judgment and faith is constant, strong and pressing. If they are old foes that are met they wear new faces; and if they only repeat old arguments they aim to utter them in a novel and taking dialect.

Mr. Barnes's volume is one of solid worth. He is a calm, clear reasoner; his style is plain and simple, but his thought is weighty; seldom brilliant, he is eminently convincing; rarely irradiating a topic by a flash of genius, he does not often leave it till his analysis has reached its core and his ample statement has fairly spread it before us; seldom carrying his point by means of taking epigrams or a rhetorical charge, he plans his campaign with a wary eye and a cool brain, captures a fortification by siege and steady advances, and conquers by the use of reserved forces and assaults in detail. Candid, thoughtful, serious, never diverted by any side issue, keeping his end always in sight, putting a dignified courtesy into his words and an oaken strength into his arguments, patient as though sure of his ground and persistent as though he meant that nothing should hinder him from reaching his goal, he has supplied a large amount of material which perplexed minds may use in building up within themselves an intelligent and well fortified faith, and from which the preacher may draw often and freely in giving force to the appeals with which he would win the understandings and hearts of his hearers.

THE  
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

---

No. LXII.—APRIL, 1868.

---

ARTICLE I.—THE BLESSEDNESS OF GIVING, AS COMPARED WITH THAT OF RECEIVING.

There is a good surely in receiving, if it be with gratitude and meekness ; but there is a greater good in giving, if done wisely and heartily. There is a choice between good things ; as also between evil things. If a lesser good is preferred to a greater, that good becomes relatively an evil, and the choice of it—a sin. Or if an alternative of evils is presented, the lesser becomes a good comparatively, and the choice of it—a virtue. We say evils—and not sins ! An alternative of *sins* is inconceivable. Where but two possible courses or choices are before one, *both* of them cannot be sinful.

Receiving, then, is a good, if it be in the right spirit, and is not preferred to the greater good of giving. We gain what we give properly ; we lose what we withhold selfishly. It is not he who lays up for self, but he who lays out for Christ and the poor, that becomes truly rich ! The worldly man says—it is more blessed to get than to give ; but the good man says, it is more blessed to give than to gain. With the one, gain is godliness ; with the other, godliness is great gain ! But Christ settled this question when he said—it is more blessed to give than to receive.

We shall not undertake to prove this truth. We assume that the



words of Christ are themselves proof from which there is no appeal. We shall aim only to interpret and illustrate these words of the Lord. Let me then refer—

1. To *consciousness* and *experience*. Does not giving awaken pleasanter reflections than can come of mere receiving? Does it not excite more exalted feelings and foretastes than ever connect themselves with bare possession? Who has ever made a noble sacrifice, and not been the happier and the better for it? Who ever regretted almsgiving, if done wisely and usefully? The mere recipient of favors can never have the sweet reflections that give joy to those who love and give, and who love to give.

We need not name here the trials that come often of large receiving and large possession; the anxieties and perplexities, treacherous friendships and trembling forebodings; but these never enter into the experiences of the benevolent and self-sacrificing.

We could refer to another experience at life's close, when honest thoughts come, and just reflections throng. Which will seem the greater good then, at the sunset of earthly things, a life of receiving and accumulation, or of noble disinterested giving? Oh, the thought at that hour that we had done what we could for Christ, and those for whom he died, how much happier, sweeter, holier, than ever comes of the recollection of what we had received or possessed on earth!

2. The principle of giving is affirmed also in *nature*, not less than in *experience*. We ask, is it more natural for us to be givers than receivers? We use the word in a good sense. Benevolence accords with true nature, right nature, upright nature,—as God created it, and not as man has perverted it. God made man upright, in his own image, to be a benefactor to others, not less than a beneficiary from his own hand. God is love. Giving is in accordance with his own infinite nature. And his offspring were made to be like him in this. Receiving is simply the necessity of nature; giving the grand law of nature. We were made to be a providence to others. Our welfare consists in doing as we were made to do. Selfishness is an unnatural thing. It is a perversion of nature. We were made for usefulness and disinterestedness. The selfish man is a miserable man. He is

not himself; he is beside himself. Avarice and covetousness are crooked things, ugly growths, hostile to nature, and antagonistic to all good. They are contrary to God, contrary to man; they are against nature, and hence unnatural.

The principle of communicating prevails everywhere. Nature is full of illustrations. The sun, the moon, the stars, do not shine for themselves, but for other worlds. The winds do not blow for themselves, nor the clouds wing the skies for themselves, but for earth, for nature, for man. Everywhere one thing respects another, gives to another, blesses another. Nothing exists for its own sake. Nature is one vast contributor to man and to animal. God's law and love are written out legibly and beautifully upon all things. The dew, the brook, the mist, the sunbeams are all sermons to us, if we had eyes to see, ears to hear, and hearts to appreciate. They tell us how to live, how to act, and how to bear ourselves toward others. How feelingly is life's great lesson impressed on all the handiworks of God! Not for myself but for others, is inscribed upon everything, the meanest as well as the sublimest. The moss on the rock—the cheapest thing,—the wave of the sea—the mightiest,—each breath of air and blossom of the field—the sweetest and purest,—the beam of the morning, the blush of the evening—the most beautiful,—are continually contributing themselves, giving themselves to other natures. This is God's plan and way in all the universe. He has put us to school in the presence of these great facts and emblems, where every object is a teacher or a type, to impress upon us this great lesson of love. For if all above us, and around us, and beneath us, have this truth wrought into their very nature and texture, should we expect to find an exception in man—God's noblest work—next to the angel? We should not expect it, we do not find it. Man is not thus degraded in his rank in creation; but was made to be, like his Creator, a benefactor and a providence to his kind. Everything in nature and in providence points to this one duty of giving. In all the activities of creation, seen in these grand processes of imparting and communicating, we have a symbol of God's goodness and purpose concerning man. This law of benevolence, stamp-

ed upon creation, is also printed on the tablets of the human heart. So that we never act ourselves, we can never be ourselves, till we respond to this law,—illustrated everywhere, and made necessary by the very nature God has given us! But we refer,—

3. To the principle of safe and true *expediency*. We use this word in a good sense. We are allowed to act according to methods of wise expediency, but never in view of carnal and selfish policy.

There are compensations as well as penalties in the government of God; so we are permitted to have respect to the recompense of reward. We have, indeed, a right to take the course that is best for us, and no right to do otherwise.

It is giving—right giving—heart giving—that makes our receiving safe, our prosperity real, our possessions our own, our gains actual, and our riches treasures. Is honesty the best policy? So also is benevolence, which is honesty toward God, and is essential to a just stewardship. If all things are God's, if we are his, and our property is his, and we are set in the world and in the church to carry out the great principle of love to man, in the relation of secondary providence, do we not rob God, and wrong others and our own souls by a life of selfishness?

The giving has always need to correspond in its measure to the receiving. If it does not, there will be danger and disaster. Of this there are illustrations everywhere. The pores of the body must give out as well as take in, or we die. Exhalation is necessary in order that inhalation may be safe. The lake must send forth waters as well as take in streams, or it will flood the land. There must be outflow, as well as influx, or destruction. The fields must needs give forth herbs and grass and trees, or the rain and richness that come on them would poison. The ocean gives as well as receives, and as much, else it would drain, or drown the earth. The heavens, so bright and beautiful, could not be so if they did not give. They are made so by giving. They scatter abroad their light and mist, and thus sow the earth with beauty and abundance. We need not add il-

illustrations. Who will doubt that a heart to give blesses both the giver and the gift? An old poet says, in rather homely lines, but expressing a beautiful sentiment—

“ God’s love hath wealth in us upheaped,  
 Only in giving is that wealth reaped,  
 The body withers, and the mind,  
 If pent up in a selfish rind ;  
 Give thoughts, give deeds, give words, give self,  
 Give time, give prayer, give thyself !  
 Give, *give*,—be always giving ;  
 He who gives not, is not living,  
 The more we give, the more we live.”

A thing is never truly our own till consecrated. It does not become a property till held in an open hand. We possess actually *only* what we have a heart to bestow. That only is ours which we hold as God’s, and in an open hand, to be given up when he calls. So a good Earl of England had put upon his stone and that of his wife, these words :—

“ What we spent, we had ;  
 What we gave, we have ;  
 What we kept, we lost.”

Without a heart to give, our receiving becomes a snare, and our possessions a curse. The acquisition of a fortune endangers the soul unless the safety valves of benevolence are kept open. The only antidote to the dangers of prosperity is the warmth of heavenly charity, and the activity of doing good. Outward gains, unconsecrated, become inward losses, and there are no such losses as inward losses. An old writer has said, “ he is rich in grace whose graces are not damaged by riches.” But the graces will be damaged by riches, unless these are used as the Lord’s, to bless mankind.

To illustrate this truth to the minds of the young, we venture to revive an old allegory, that bears upon this subject. The language we have lost for the most part, which we but imperfectly supply.

See that little fountain yonder, away yonder,—in the mountain ; sparkling like a diamond in the sun, and writing its path-

way to the sea with a pen of silver. But hark! the hoarse pool hails it: "Whither going, master streamlet? Whither bound?" "I am going to the sea, to bear this cup of cold water God has given me." "Ah! foolish wanderer, you will want it all for yourself before summer is ended." "Well, if I may die so soon, I'll work while I can, I'll run while I am." (Good resolution, little rill.)

So on it went, leaping and blessing on its course, giving drink to the flower, sweetness to the air, freshness to the fields, and joy to the countenances of men! (No stream ever gets to the sea that does not run. And no soul ever gets to the ocean of blessedness that does not do the same.)

But soon the summer heat came as predicted; but it fell first on the face of the old pool. And the pool grew sickly and heavy and green! The breeze that blew over it caught the contagion. The beasts put their cautious lips to it and turned away. Its breath became a pestilence to the land. The very frogs spit out their venom upon it, till Heaven, in mercy to man and earth, smote it with a hotter breath, and it dried up. Its caution to the rill was the dirge as well as symptom of its own decease.

But what became of the rill the while? Did it not die too? Oh, no! God saw to that. It was his thing,—for it served him. The trees crowded to its brink, and threw their shelter of shade over it. The flowers overhung it tenderly and lovingly, and breathed their best incense upon it. The birds sang around it their best tunes. So on it went singing and blessing in its course, till its own gentle song swelled to an anthem, and its first soft voice of treble deepened into the mighty bass of the sea. And the sun smiled on the sea, and the sea sent up its ocean incense to the sun. And the winds came into the ministry, and bore the mist and clouds away to the mountain top, and tipped their brimming treasure there, as a baptism upon its brow. So the little stream that ran its race of usefulness, never ran dry; but, joining hands with a thousand smaller ones, broadened and deepened and rolled on its wave to the mighty ocean.

Now this is God's way in all his works and worlds; to give to him that giveth, and more abundantly. For if he so blessed

the rill, that little liquid missionary, born of the mountain, that gave its cup of water to man and beast, bird and flower, will he not bless you, will he not bless me,—if as we have freely received, like everything else in the universe, we also freely give? But view this subject,

4. In the light of *moral principle*. Benevolence is an outgrowth of principle. It constitutes the ground work of the gospel. It takes its place among the virtues,—and has promises accordingly. There is a blessing in it, and a reward for it. So much cannot be said of mere receiving. Whatever may be claimed for it on the ground of convenience and personal benefit, it cannot take rank among the virtues. Benevolence has an advantage just here. It takes its place with that which God approves, and has promised to reward. Anything that costs us sacrifice—gives us character. That which roots up selfishness—plants disinterestedness. Whatever crucifies the passions—creates moral principle. That which crosses the vile affections—crushes them. Hence the advantage of giving over mere receiving. We assume in this paper that the giving is real, is genuine, and not for vain show, or from heartless impulse. It is profitable to do as we were created to do, and as we are commanded to do, and as will promote the highest good. It puts us upon a mount of influence and enjoyment, and will give us a crown of blessedness. We have not a faculty nor a feeling that is not strengthened by benevolence and damaged by selfishness. Reason has an easier flight, the imagination a loftier wing, in the atmosphere of love. The emotions and affections move in a purer, higher, heavenlier orbit, while under this divine attraction.

Benevolence promotes the spirit of prayer. Rev. Jotham Sewall, known as the patriarch of Maine, always mighty in prayer, was once called upon at a meeting of the American Board, to lead the congregation in prayer. He rose, left his seat, went to the Treasurer's desk, took out his wallet, and laid down a bank bill, saying, in an undertone, "Now I can pray!" He took his position, and wrestled with God as few on earth have ever done! The truth is, he could not pray till he had given! No man can, if there are claims on his justice or his

charity that are uncanceled. Be ye fed, be ye clothed, be ye saved, is not a prayer. But feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and saving the lost, if not a prayer, are essential to prayer, the condition, the accompaniment, and expression of prayer. There is the worship rendered by *works*, as well as by words. Words must be crowned by deeds. We must answer our own prayers, or God will not. This we do by acting answerably to them. We work out our salvation; so must we our prayers. Good deeds open the channel of prayer, and tend to keep the stream full. To change the phrase, sacrifice gives wings to prayer. Every idol we give up gives buoyancy to faith, and inspiration to prayer. Give alms of such things as ye possess, and all things shall be clean unto you; the faith clean, the heart clean, the character and principles pure, and the immortality bright and blessed!

True conversion reaches the possessions, as well as the affections. When we experienced religion, the fact extended to our property. Our goods and estates came into the church with us, else we climbed up some other way. Where our treasures are, there *we* are, or our hearts, and our hearts *are* ourselves, morally. If these are outside the church, so are we. To unchurch our property, therefore, excommunicates ourselves. Our hearts and possessions go together. If we serve God with either, we serve him with both. Our property and our piety cannot be separated. So the judgment will show.

5. Giving has the highest of all *sanctions* and *examples*, which cannot be said of mere receiving. God gives, but does not receive. Christ gave, but does not receive, except it be our hearts and offerings; and then, the receiving is all on our side. *We* are the gainers by what we give up; Christ is not enriched by what we renounce, or bestow. All is his now, and we, are his. We do not *give* to the Lord, we "render" unto the Lord.

But God has put this service into the form of an *ordinance*. Benevolence has every element and feature of a fixed ordinance of Heaven. It has a foundation in the fitness of things. All ordinances have! It is an outward expression of an inward sentiment. All ordinances are! It has a practical use in its benefits to the giver, and to mankind. All ordinances have!

And it brings glory to God, as well as good to mortals. Says Paul, "the administration of this service (of giving) not only supplieth the wants of the saints, but abounds by many thanksgivings unto God." This service was an ordinance under the Old Testament. A part of the yearly income of the Jew went directly to the Lord. And in the New Testament it has the same high place. Definite rules are given to regulate it. It is to be *systematic*. Each one is to lay aside at a certain time. It is to be *voluntary* and not constrained, "willing of themselves." The gifts are to be brought in, and not gathered in. As to the *amount*, it is to be as God hath prospered each one. So the poor as well as the rich are to make offerings unto the Lord. And, finally, it is to be with *simplicity*, not as an eye service, not with covetousness, nor grudging, nor shirking. This ordinance is a part of Christianity. It gives visibility and the proper test to the Christian religion. It cannot be spared from the constellation of Christian ordinances and graces. If it had need to be an ordinance under the old dispensation, where the responsibility of the church was limited to a single nation, how much more under the new dispensation, where the church is set as the light of the world, and is sent forth to evangelize the world. But this ordinance of giving, alas, how neglected, how ignored! But it cannot be spared. The greatest of these is charity. We may better part with baptism than benevolence. That is a sign, this a grace. Better spare the *communion* than the grace that makes us welcome there. That commemorates, this admits to the marriage supper. Better let go the shadow than the substance, the mere symbols than the living spirit. We do not undervalue the Christian ordinances. We only ask that this *lost one*, this orphan institution, have its own high place among them. We often administer at the Lord's table, where the members all apparently partake. Then follows frequently a *supplemental* ordinance, for which this other prepares us. It has for its end not commemoration, but communication. It is celebrated not by receiving, but by imparting; a surer test, indeed, of discipleship. But, alas! how few apparently partake! He that sat over against the treasury, and saw the two mites of the widow, and the rich men's gifts, notices now the noddings of the head, the stiff bolt



form, or averted, perhaps contemptuous, eye. We sometimes think if this latter ordinance were celebrated by taking something out of the treasury, rather than by putting something into it, there would be quite another appearance. Perhaps all would partake. But is it not a greater privilege to put something into the treasury of the Lord than to take something out of it? or in the words of Christ, is it not more blessed to give than to receive?

By what one great act was this world redeemed? It was by *giving*, in the form of sacrifice. And never will peace and life come to the earth till this principle is accepted and honored. The church will never become the light of the world, and the instrument of God in its conversion, till this first lesson of Christianity is accepted. God so loved that he gave! Christ so loved that he gave! What? Whom? *Himself!* And for what? For this world! And we do not follow him, nor imitate him, nor commemorate him, till we accept this condition of discipleship in *the form of sacrifice!* So may we fill up our measure of the sufferings of Christ. If that is an ordinance which brings Christ to the *memory* merely, is not that also which helps to bring Christ *himself* to the world and the world to him?

If, then, we take testimony of *ourselves*, our consciousness and feelings; if we interrogate *nature* and her teachings; if we bring the matter to the test of true *expediency*; or to that of sacred *principle*, or of inspired *authority*, or of the divine *example* and *sanction*, we find the question settled just as the great Teacher and Saviour of men has settled it,—that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

May the churches soon arise to this high privilege and calling. Then will righteousness rest upon the earth as a crown; and Christ the Redeemer of men will wear his many crowns, for then he shall have the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession.

## ART. II.—THE HEBREW LAWGIVER.\*

## REVIEW OF HIS WORK.

In the present article we are to consider Moses as a statesman,—as the founder of the Hebrew commonwealth, with an unique code, in which he reduces to practice the principles of government acquired in the court of Egypt.

In the inauguration of the new state, he exhibits a breadth of view and a constructive ability, equalled only by his decision, courage, promptness and humanity, in the executive department, far exceeding any other example of statesmanship. This may appear in part when we consider the MATERIALS out of which he constructed the state.

Here we naturally revert to the condition of the people at the time he took them in charge,—destitute of culture, and degraded by more than two centuries of Egyptian bondage. As a nation, they were a confused, unorganized mass. Yet, strangely too, they had some form of government of their own, by which they controlled their own affairs, as a distinct but subordinate people. In this we find a prophecy of their future institutions.

## TRIBE ORGANIZATION.

The families of Israel while in Egypt had separate forms of government, the father being supreme; yet they were so related as to be homogeneous. These formed clans or larger families, and were governed by *heads of houses*, who were each called "*head of the house of their fathers*," addressed and spoken of as "*Elders of Israel*." Under their immediate direction the people were arranged for the exode, five abreast. At that time there were fifty-eight such clan families, exclusive of the family of Levi. Each of these had a chief, higher in grade than the "*heads*" just alluded to, and to which twelve "*princes of tribes*" were added, one from a tribe, forming a representative body of seventy, the type of their future senate. Their government, at that time, was similar to that of the descendants of Ishmael, the Edomites

\*Authorities,—Exodus, Chronicles, Horne, Wines and others.

and Arabians, and also to that of the ancient German and Scottish tribes, and the Aborigines of America. Each family, tribe and clan constituted a quasi state.

Each tribe had its origin with the family. Smaller tribes, composed of families formed into clans, as occasion required, organized into tribe families, instituting a special but temporary government, separate and independent, having their own chiefs, like smaller clans or families, yet never relinquishing their hold on or interest in those primary organizations. But aside from these tribe families, there was the tribe itself, an organization running parallel with the family. They were twelve in number, each a state, having a specific and local government, inherent rights, independent, yet related. Each was ruled by its own prince to whom chiefs of lesser bodies were subordinate. Tribe princes were representative and administrative, engaged for their respective tribes, and now conducting them forward to liberty.

#### FORMATION OF A JUDICIARY.

Before arriving at their destination they are called upon to join in selecting a board of counsellors and assistants chosen "from all the people," good men, fearing God, able and wise. This is the first popular election on record, the officers being chosen by vote of representative heads and sanctioned by the masses in general assembly. Their responsibilities were specific and various, from "rulers of tens, fifties, hundreds," to "rulers of thousands." They were graded justices or minor judges, to whom questions were submitted. Such as the lower grade was unable to decide were referred to the next higher, and so on through each successive grade. If, finally, any cases remained unsettled they were left to the decision of Moses.

#### NUMBER OF JUDGES.

Ruling over thousands there were six hundred; over hundreds, six thousand; over fifties, twelve thousand; over tens, sixty thousand; seventy-eight thousand and six hundred in all. They were subsequently called "*heads over the people,*" and were to the masses and to Moses as our Heads of Departments are to us and the president of the United States. On petition or com-

plaint by any one, they were to attend to the case presented, listen "at all seasons" having no respect to persons, thus rendering the settlement of all questions, practicable, speedy, cheap and just. Like the princes, they were representative men, clothed with delegated powers, engaged for the people as well as for their greater chief. By virtue of their office they seem to have been entitled, subsequently, to legislative positions.

#### IN FRONT OF SINAI.

The place selected, as a legislative hall, was solemnly impressive and appropriate to the occasion. Here was the commencement of the THEOCRATIC and MOSAIC legislation, in its higher and more significant sense. At a distance of two hundred miles from Egypt, and at the end of the forty-fifth day, the people pitched camp on the Sinaitic plains, a locality familiar to Moses from a residence in that vicinity the forty years preceding. On the ninetieth day from Egypt he submitted to the people a proposition from God to make Jehovah their king and supreme Ruler, promising to make them a "kingdom of priests" in return. Doubtless it was through the "elders of Israel" and the judges that the proposition was extended to the people. The forth-coming convention bears the marks of a *delegated* body, chosen by and on behalf of the people to consider the proposition. Concurrent with this was the presentation of the covenant or ten commandments, preceded by a brief preamble, as a declaration of rights on the part of God. These comprised the first section of the constitution, each being a separate article. Others were added at subsequent times, as recorded from the 20th of Exodus to the 23d; also in the chapters following to the 11th of Numbers, are amendments, resolves and special acts, called, taken together, *the commandments and statutes of the Lord.*" All of these were acted upon, first by delegated bodies, then by the masses. The first were called (Numbers 1: 16) "the renowned of the congregation, princes of the tribes of their fathers, heads of thousands in Israel."

Their deliberations were brief, resulting in the unanimous acceptance of the proposition. This acceptance was unanimously sanctioned by the masses in a more general convention where

they declared,—“ *All that the Lord hath spoken will we do.*” By popular vote, unanimously and without precedent, God became their king and sovereign, and the commandments and statutes of the Lord their written constitution.

Each of the ten articles of this instrument was made the basis of subsequent legislation, alike applicable to church and state. Each was a kernel or root, capable of expansion and innumerable applications, much as the separate articles of the constitution of the United States. The more profoundly either are studied, the more apparent is their susceptibility of application to all emergencies, indicating latent principles yet to become universally developed and applied.

#### THEOCRACY.

Here is its inauguration, a government from God, enacted and administered by Moses during his lifetime, then by Joshua and his successors for more than four centuries. In some respects it reminds one of the consular government of Rome, though differing from that and all others, yet warring upon none.

Its object was three-fold; first, to insure the worship of the one only true God, as supreme, perfect and worthy; second, to proscribe idolatry, then universally prevalent; third, to secure in return the highest welfare of the people. An additional object may have been, the illustration of moral principles in human governments.

Resistance to any theocratic requirement or to any one entrusted with the administration of government, was rebellion against God, against the state and church, a violation of a solemn covenant. In accepting God as king, they pledged themselves to strict obedience to him, and, of necessity, to whatever he ordained. By popular vote they had made idolatry a crime, treason, punishable with death. Hence, the severity of the legislation against the worship of idols.

#### UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

We have it in *Theocracy* as here established. The government then forming, was, from the nature of the case, theocratic and of a two-fold nature, religious and secular. It was quite

unlike all other existing governments in being furnished with a written constitution, proposed to and considered by the people, acted upon and accepted by popular vote.

#### RELIGION A STATE INSTITUTION.

This was deducible from theocracy. It was required of all ; to it, all were pledged. They were forbidden to copy or mix with the heathen, the worship of whose gods was treason. The presidency and worship of the one God were to be acknowledged and promoted ; and when, subsequently, they rejected their theocratic government, they repudiated God as king, and in his dethronement were chargeable with the highest possible crime.

#### UNITY OF THE PEOPLE.

This comes from the consolidation of the tribes. By that, though twelve separate bodies, they were cemented into one. The precise time of consolidation, whether previous to their Sinaitic encampment or subsequent, may not be as apparent as the fact itself, but, by reorganization or otherwise, the compact was formed, and the twelve tribes, united in one, held councils on public affairs ; the united body having the same oneness of interest, a similar individuality characterizing the larger as the less. In both instances, the general welfare was the object ; for this they entered into union, the parts were blended into a whole ; yet, like our states, each retained certain prerogatives and local considerations, not essential to the perfection of the union. But this perfection of organization was only that of an earthly compound, for the compact was frequently broken. The tribes, as states, having interests of their own not surrendered to the union, took exceptions to the majority rule and occasionally revolted. The loyal tribes resorted to coercive measures to reduce the disloyal to submission. A revolt against the general government, by person or tribe, was an offence against each loyal person and tribe. Examples are found in the 11th and 20th chapters of Judges, and also in the cases of Absalom and Rehoboam. Tribes struggled for supremacy, especially Ephraim and Judah. Each was ambitious to lead, hence the conflicts and trials of relative strength, recorded in several of the Biblical historical books. Yet these were exceptions, and occurred a

long time subsequent to the organization of the general government. The government was a *peace* establishment, though liable to perversions. Expeditions were forbidden, foreign conquests were unlawful, cavalry was prohibited, horses were proscribed to guard against temptation. Standing armies were neither lawful nor essential, though by *impromptu* organization invasions might be repelled, and rebellions suppressed. But in this, the government was humane, often, if not always, proposing terms of submission before letting loose the thunder-bolts of war.

*Unity of the people*, as a rule, is not only evident from the fusion of the tribes, but from the unity of the object of their worship, from the requirement of unity in their worship, from the unity of church and state, in short, from their accepted *Theocracy*. It is evident also from the manner in which they are addressed, always implying one people; in the prohibitions and requirements and also in the guarantees of government, in return for individual concessions to the state. There was no central power to overawe beyond what the people delegated, and being the source of power, they could withdraw it if abused, ever holding magistrates responsible.

The part which the masses took in the formation of the government, as seen in their frequent conventions, by delegates or *en masse*, the interest had in carrying forward the government in the appointments and elections, also their public sanctions, the consultation of one and the same oracle by magistrate and people through one invariable medium, and also the general neutrality of the ruling and ruled, are all in proof that their confederation was a one people's government. And this was strengthened by the fact that their officers were not salaried, at once preventing distinctions arising from popular favor; and, being plain men, laboring for the general welfare, patrons of morality, promoters of religion, serving church and state, having neither badge nor diadem, excepting the high priest, the masses regarded them fraternally.

#### AGRICULTURE.

The Hebrews were a nation of peasants, agriculture was the basis of the state, the ownership of land the source of power. The same principle universally holds good at the present time, the possessors of the greater amount of landed property being

allowed corresponding influence and power in the government. Excess leads to monopoly and oppression, to class distinctions, but the legislation of Moses provided against this in a general distribution of land. Large estates and baronies were proscribed. Excepting the Levites, every Hebrew male child was put in possession of a tract of land. A farm for every one was the policy. All were equal in this, none could become absolute. The cultivator of the soil was its owner. All were interested in the soil they cultivated. All were stimulated to activity, to improvement, to the increase and support of families, to the development of manhood, to the means of happiness and to an equal interest in the state, its magistrates, laws and institutions. To the same extent was forced, unpaid labor prevented; poverty, unthrift and dependence guarded against, and independence secured. In the same proportion were the people not only interested in the state and its government, but were able to meet current expenses, pay taxes, and otherwise contribute to the public welfare.

#### PERMANENT PROVISION.

To preserve equality and secure ownership of land on a permanent basis, provision was made, that, where lands had been mortgaged, as sometimes they were, and temporarily passed into other hands, they should return to the original owners. If allowed to remain permanently possessed by the mortgagee the equilibrium of society would be disturbed; estates would enlarge, power accumulate in the hands of a few, aristocracy and wealth on the one hand, servility and poverty on the other, would inevitably follow; labor become unpopular, the land unproductive, and suffering or want be confronted by affluence and oppression. To prevent this, lands were made hereditary, and as an additional safeguard, there was an established limitation to debts and other obligations.

#### THE SEVENTH YEAR.

The foregoing provision received an illustration on every seventh year. Even the land shared in its cultivation that year being forbidden, the year previous producing enough for two



years, so that with the discharge of poor debtors and the release of a certain portion of apprenticed servants, the land itself should have rest and share in the festivity. Debts weighing heavily for one or more of the six preceding years were canceled, died of limitation. The poor man, disappointed in business, or otherwise unfortunate, and unable to discharge his obligations, was fully released and encouraged to begin anew. But the greater festival, the equalizer and leveller,—the great smoothing plane, was

#### THE JUBILEE.

Its legal occurrence was every fiftieth year. Its great significance arose from the fact that on that year, not only were all debts discharged, as on the seventh, but all slaves were liberated, and all mortgaged lands, as previously noticed, reverted to the possession of former owners or their heirs. Thus, monopoly of ownership and power, destitution and degradation were foreclosed. Laborers, for years in the employ of others, became the owners of the lands they cultivated, possessors of homesteads, hitherto controlled by and worked for the benefit of a quasi nobility.

By such means, agriculture became a pleasant and profitable pursuit, and the principal employment of the people. It enlisted the first, the highest and best men of the Old Testament history. Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Elisha, Amos and others of note, all "loved husbandry." No other department of labor received so strong legal stimulants, none was so attractive to the wise, the considerate and the good, and none was so conducive to the general welfare. In this we make no exception, not even to commerce, thought by some, worthier of legislation,—an opinion, unsupported by considerations of profit, morality or patriotism, simplicity of manners or domestic happiness. Thus, and by other legal means, social relations were provided for, life rendered sacred, industry encouraged as well as demanded, idleness made a crime, and labor and love of country pronounced sterling virtues.

#### FESTIVALS.

They were held three times in every year, calling together

large numbers from all sections, like the subsequent games of Greece and Rome. These served to renew friendships, and when in after years they went into disuse, alienations and revolts became more common.

#### ELIGIBILITY.

This comes from equality, constitutionally established. Yet, while promotion was possible to all, few only could expect it. The restrictions were exceptions. But with this existing possibility there was a class on which the choice for magistrates more frequently fell. The Levites, the smallest of the tribes, incapable of holding landed property save house-lot and garden, and scattered through all the other tribes, were specially devoted to the study of the law. These constituted a class of candidates for church and state. From it the majority of officers were selected, and also because of their superior qualifications, the scholars, teachers, politicians, judges, and priests of the nation engaged in its service. They were proscribed in regard to property, having no claim upon the other tribes save one-tenth of the increase of the herds and flocks, and of this they were obliged to contribute one-tenth to those of their number selected as priests for the altar service. Neither the wool, products of the dairy, nor land, paid the Levites any tribute.

#### SUFFRAGE.

This was universal, with exceptions corresponding with those of eligibility. Suffrage is predicated on equality and eligibility, and follows of necessity. That such was the fact is evident from the manner of choosing the judges. The masses were required to exercise the franchise and did, both then and afterward, in accepting God as king and the decalogue as the standard of conduct. The same was true in accepting Moses as leader, and after him, Joshua, and also men to spy out the country and divide it into lots. The franchise elevated Jephthah, ratified the selection of Saul and David as kings of Israel after their anointing by the prophet. The same truth appears in the ratification of "*the commandments and statutes of the Lord*" on the mountains of Israel every seven years.

## REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.

That such was the character of the Hebrew state, may appear from the foregoing, and especially from all those passages that refer to the franchise, for this is associated with representation. The calling together of "*the elders of Israel*," "*their heads, officers, judges, rulers, chiefs, princes, famous men in the community, those wont to be called the convention*," and the use of similar terms, are inexplicable only as representation is admitted.

The object of choosing men to certain positions is that they may act for others, and here is representation; we see it in Hebrew history, in Moses, Joshua, and in the use of the foregoing terms designating representative bodies. The whole establishment was, from the nature of the case, of this character. The state itself, prefigured a principle to be developed by others in the future. The sacrificial system was prophetic, typifying and foreshadowing, and thus, like the more secular, was representative. Persons constituting a "*convention*" or "*assembly*," are addressed as a representative class, as acting for others, doing their business, and to them are amenable. It is the same with "*the princes of tribes*," a somewhat higher grade.

## REPUBLIC.

The constitution gave the state this character. The consolidation of the tribes, their unity, equality, eligibility, suffrage and representation, all contributed to it. The reconstructed nation, with its united head of church and state, its fusion of twelve states into one, whose magistrates were creatures of law by the votes and sanctions of the people, was a republic, the first upon record, democratic and theocratic, approved of God and man.

## CHANGE CONTEMPLATED.

In this, and providing for it, we see the foresight and wisdom of the great Lawgiver. As the people might tire of the republic and desire a monarchy, the overthrow of the former was more than possible. Hence, the provision made for that emergency, so that the king elect might be a constitutional ruler. However selected at first, or by whom anointed, the people must act upon the se-

lection, ratify or reject, accepting of no foreigner, no polygamist, miser, warrior, or any other than a patriot, a defender and patron of religion, lenient, wise, and from among some one of the tribes of Israel, infusing into the monarchy as much of popular liberty and elements of prosperity and happiness as possible.

#### GENERAL GOVERNMENT.

This has been implied or stated throughout the foregoing. It not only had existence, principles vital and active, but it had form, locality, proportions, departments. It seems to have had three grand divisions; the first, the oracle of God, usually either the cloud or high priest, constituting one of a two-fold nature, the divine and human; the second, the administrative, including the various grades of magistrates, the judiciary and all executive functionaries,—a division quite comprehensive and susceptible of subdivisions; the third, the advisory, acting the part of cabinet or council, consisting of a body of senators, of which we shall speak hereafter.

#### LEGISLATURE.

This appears to have been composed of two branches, the lower and higher, the former more popular and allied to the people. It is called "*the assembly, the congregation, the convention, heads of houses, heads of families,*" and relative terms. This is the house of commons, the larger and next to the people. The higher is more select, honorable, venerated, composed of "*elders, princes of tribes, captains of tribes,*" more experienced, less popular, more remote from the people, answering to our Senate or the British house of lords. The "*assembly*" is composed of an indefinite number, the Senate,—the "*Sanhedrim,*" was limited to seventy. The latter was a great national council, legislative and advisory, containing the best talent, the ripest experience and wisdom of the nation; it was a sage body, permanent and supreme in its functions, often called to check the rashness of the lower branch, to hold the balance of power and guide the ship of state. It seems to have subserved a two-fold purpose and was inaugurated with corresponding solemnity. It wielded heavy blows against rebellion, overawed to prevent sedi-

tion, dividing the responsibility with the chief magistrate. It was a great law court. It settled, in conjunction with the chief magistrate, referred questions, there being none higher for appeals, unless we except the oracle; and at the same time submitted legislative matter to the house to act upon, though the latter body was the more natural origin of ordinary questions for legislation, and was usually the first to act on matters submitted by their chief, through deputies, heralds or other channels. In neither case was the representative office hereditary, nor did it command a salary.

#### OBJECT OF LEGISLATION.

It was to secure the public welfare, to meet and provide for the demands of the people, for the oft recurring emergencies, to render inviolate the interests and constitution of the Hebrew people.

#### POWERS OF THE LEGISLATURE.

Concurring with the oracle always present, these powers were amply sufficient to enact, modify or repeal laws, amend the constitution, establish national policy, declare war, make peace, form alliances, foreign relations and treaties, officer the army, control the judiciary, and perform other functions, subject to the action of the people. Hence, the great variety and number of legal enactments, civil and religious. The first related to religion, which was followed by one regulating servitude—not establishing it. Succeeding that, was one to elevate females, and another setting forth the sacredness of life and the relations of parents and children. Others having reference to marriage and divorce, sanitary regulations, vintage and husbandry, appointment of courts, the years of release, fines and penalties for every species of crime, and other matters too numerous to mention, came within the powers of the legislature.

#### WHEN AND HOW CONVENED.

Formerly, at intervals, as circumstances demanded; afterwards, at stated times, but always at the call or by sanction of the chief magistrate or the authority of legal statute. In case of vacan-

cy, the officer next in position, tribe prince, commander of the army, high priest or minister of state was competent to assemble the legislature and perform the functions of the vacant office till filled. Trumpeters and heralds were usually employed in serving notice upon the people and calling their representatives together. The chief, or acting magistrate, communicated to the assembled body a statement of the condition of the country and the nature of the legislation required.

#### LAWS PROMULGATED.

Special officers were appointed for this service, or it was performed by the representatives either in person or by forwarding to their constituents the enactments of the legislature for the popular sanction.

#### HOW EXPOUNDED.

This seems to have been generally done by the legislators, though at first it appears to have fallen to the lot of Moses himself. At a later day it was performed by the Levites, but more fully by the priests, and particularly by the high priest, who, as chief of holy persons, took the lead.

#### JUDICIARY.

The initiatory measures in this department were entered upon, as previously shown, before reaching Sinai. The judiciary, as there perfected, embraced graded courts, from metropolitan to national or supreme,—from justices to high grade judges. These were competent to the settlement of all questions, excepting the more intricate, which, as previously noticed were carried on appeal to the chief magistrate, or beyond him to the oracle. Secular and religious crimes against society, man or God, were here adjudged and corresponding punishment denounced, ranging from fines to the death penalty.

Court officers were elected by the people, though their nomination was frequently, if not always made, by the ruling magistrate or legislature. They were usually selected from the tribe of Levi, that, as before stated, being the judicial and priestly tribe. The high priest is frequently represented as the Chief

Justice or Supreme Judge and sometimes as chief magistrate, provision having been made for the filling of vacancies, so that all departments might co-operate and the people ever have before their eyes a tangible, presiding ruler.

The judiciary harmonized and co-operated with the legislature, and frequently, if not always, the latter was partially composed of members of the former. The qualifications of the members of the judiciary were considerations of great moment; legal attainments alone were not sufficient, but they must possess the moral and religious, and must be men of sound minds and large experience. To the supreme court the tribes were responsible, and before it, their cases were at once presented, as the lower courts had no jurisdiction over them. Individuals more generally found adjustment of theirs before the latter. The manner of commencing action in court was established by law and duly observed. Witnesses were required to give oath to a written formula concerning the case in hand; no advocates were allowed for plaintiff or defendant, each party could plead its own case and avail itself of advice in the premises. No mention need be here made of the variety, extent and nature of the laws of the Hebrew state and their adjustment to the ever changing phases of society, subjecting the judiciary to unceasing watchfulness and activity, nor of the manner or place of enforcing penalties, the facts being apparent to all.

#### INFERIOR COURTS.

While the nation had its supreme court, with jurisdiction over all the tribes, each tribe had a judiciary of corresponding nature for the adjustment of minor questions, as previously indicated. Its officers were of a grade and qualifications to meet the demands of tribe and inferior interests. Each tribe had its legislature, but it was subordinate to the national. In these respects, as in some others, the separate tribes, with their own institutions, resemble our states.

#### MUNICIPAL COURTS.

That there were such, with corresponding officers is too evident to require remark, for the passages are numerous that

speak of such. These frequently give even the names of the judges of various city courts. These men had jurisdiction over cities like our metropolitan judges. These courts and officers were to the cities what the supreme courts were to the tribes and to the nation. Their duties required a faithful administration of the laws of their respective cities. They were to see that justice was done, the rights of all respected, morals and religion enforced, giving counsel to men or parties when and where the existing laws did not apply. Such judges and courts were established in all the cities by statute or by the requirement of the chief magistrate. Each city had, in addition, a legislature of its own, corresponding with, but inferior to that of the tribe.

#### OTHER OFFICERS.

They are known by several titles, designating important positions, additional to those previously named. In connection with these are the SCRIBES, usually, if not invariably, selected from the Levites. Their office was quite different from that of the judge or legislator. They were admitted to the sittings of other bodies by virtue of their office. Formerly they were called SHOTERIM, and are everywhere recognized as a distinct and important body from the time of Moses to Christ. Though nominated by the magistrate or otherwise designated to the office, they were chosen by vote of the people. They were required to understand the laws and history of the nation, to possess varied and extensive learning, to be ready and active men. They were subsequently called "*doctors of the law*," as they made the laws their study. Their office primarily corresponded with our idea of clerk or secretary. For similar purposes they were entitled to seats in all deliberative assemblies, and from several indications we may suppose that they participated therein. They kept the records of the nation, the debates, resolves and laws, and, subsequently, the doings and muster roll of the armies extemporized for exigencies. Sometimes they acted in the capacity of other officers of the government, and as teachers and expounders of the laws and constitution of the nation. They were the more able and scholarly of the Levites, unless we except the high priest.



They constituted a numerous class, the most prominent of which are known as *genealogists*. Their duty was to keep and preserve records of marriages, births and deaths, the histories of families and tribes however scattered, so that relationships could be traced and the several component parts and proportions of the tribes and nation be at once ascertained. Their duty required them to take the census of the nation, tribe and family, to assess taxes, equalize burdens, ascertain and report the number of the able-bodied capable of bearing arms and all the resources of the nation, presenting its strength at one view. They were scrupulous in this respect,—so precise that the origin of certain families or persons can be traced with exactness through their line of descent, from their records, (terminating with the Mosaic,) for more than three thousand years; that of Christ was traced back four thousand. Their exactness is remarkable, especially, when we remember how the families and tribes were subsequently dispersed. The preparing and preserving of such tables under such circumstances, for so many centuries, is more than marvellous,—almost miraculous. The rank of genealogist was next to the tribe prince, and he was chosen by vote of the people from the scribes.

#### PRESERVATION OF MEMORIALS.

In all ages public monuments have served this purpose. In the earlier history of the Hebrew people, previous to their nationality, the occurrence of some particular event was memorialized by some rude structure, usually of stone, as Jacob's altar at Bethel, the one subsequently reared as witness of the covenant between him and Laban, the heap of stones in the centre of the Jordan as witness and memorial of the miracle there wrought. For the same purposes similar memorials were erected at subsequent times, but nothing has been more effectual than the written word upon parchment which has preserved the laws and institutions of the Hebrews, as enjoined by their great lawgiver. The preservation of memorials was made a matter of law and conscience. To enhance their sacredness they were required to be proclaimed from the written page in general convention, and for the renewed sanction of what the records preserved in

memory, every seven years. Here the scribes, genealogists and ecclesiastics were brought into service.

#### PRIESTHOOD.

No other institution of Moses had such tenacity; all others but the moral code have perished or become greatly impaired. This is still vital, both as respects Jew and Gentile, Judaism and Christianity; the former retains the form, the latter possesses the spirit.

The priests were the ecclesiastics of the nation, consecrated by the high priest as the teachers of religion. Like the majority of other functionaries, they were from the Levites, and, like them were dispersed throughout all the other tribes, subserving important ends in all the departments of government, secular as well as religious, promoting loyalty, preserving peace and perfecting civilization. They were dependent upon the Levites for a livelihood which was always precarious, as the payment of established tithes was voluntary, never forced, even when long due and finally denied. At best, one tenth of the incomes of the Levites, and theirs usually was only one tenth of the increase of the sheep and cattle of the other tribes, was all to which they were entitled. Had their dues been paid as the law contemplated many evils would have been avoided. Deprived of the right to possess land, with the slight exceptions previously noticed, precluded from other channels and resources, their influence and power were derived from other causes such as their talents, position, learning, law and religion which for generations they employed in the public service. The limitations of their office prevented the promotion of selfish ends; however dissatisfied they might become, especially in view of general neglect, their situation, dispersed through all the tribes, precluded any combination among themselves against the existing order of things. Their poverty and subsequently the degradation of many, both priests and Levites, are readily accounted for, for often tithes were so withheld as to produce these results. Micah's Levite priest is an example. He was a vagrant, in search of business when Micah employed him. But with all their disabilities, their loyalty and submission were equal

to other classes more highly favored in pecuniary matters. They were as much bound by the laws which they taught as others, though there were two exemptions in their favor as compensation for disability to hold lands, as before noticed.

Like the Levites, but more especially, they were set apart for the general welfare; the altar and tabernacle were under their control, they had an oversight of the judiciary, an eye on the administration generally, sometimes were engaged as genealogists or judges, being capable of varied service and ready and effective in adaptation. And here we may remark that the Levites had not only to tithe their one tenth for the support of the priesthood, but every third year to divide their tithes from the people that year with widows, orphans and strangers in need in their respective localities; and from the one tenth income of the Levites' tithe to the priests the sacrifices for the tabernacle service were supplied, leaving but little, and that uncertain, for family or personal support.

#### HIGH PRIESTHOOD.

The incumbent was chosen from the priesthood. He was the chief in ecclesiastical matters, frequently filled high places in the civil department, was the chief justice of the judiciary and sometimes appeared as chief magistrate of the nation.

His introduction into office was accompanied by great display and solemnity, the chief magistrate and senate taking part in the ceremonies. His appointment by magistrate or senate required the sanction of the masses. The office was hereditary in the family of Aaron. Of the sanctity of the position, the grandeur of attire, the majesty and precision of movement, the sublimity of utterance, the near approaches to the terrible presence of the overshadowing cherubim and seraphim, speaking by Urim and Thummin, revealing, from the holy of holies, like the cloud and fire, the will of God, and thereby symbolizing his presence, majesty and glory, no particular mention need here be made. Through this medium we not only ascend to the oracle of God but reach the source of knowledge and power. They were a favored, "peculiar people," "a royal priesthood," exalted infinitely above the surrounding nations. But how much more



exalted are we, for our lawgiver is Christ, our mediator and great high priest, the medium of access to the Father and the mercy seat, the channel of divine communication between heaven and earth, through which a world instead of a nation is to be redeemed and saved.

---

### ART. III.—THE AGE OF LOUIS XIV. IN CHURCH HISTORY.

On the seventh of March, 1661, cardinal Mazarin, shrinking with horror at the conviction that it was impossible for him to enter the kingdom of heaven, solaced with cards, bade a final adieu to his vast treasures, his "beloved pictures" and his power.

At his death, Louis XIV., then twenty-two years of age, assumed direction of the affairs of the realm and inaugurated the most brilliant age of French history. "To whom, Sire, shall we now apply for directions?" asked the secretary of state, when the crafty Italian minister was no more. "To me," was the decisive, unhesitating reply. Absolute monarchy was begun and Louis stood as its perfect representative before Europe. "I am the State," was the declaration of a monarch who spared nothing to fulfil his central thought: "One Faith, one King, one Law."

At the head of his armies were Turenne, Conde, Luxembourg and Vendome; Colbert was his financier. Under such leaders the fortunes of France, almost ruined by the wretched administration of the cardinals, were placed in the foremost rank among the nations. Freed from the menaces of Spain, the plots of Fronde and League ended, the land at length rested from the civil wars which for nearly a century had brought fearful disaster to financial and political life. Her boundaries were extended by the addition of the rich provinces of Lorraine, Flanders, Franche-Comte and Strasbourg.

The period from the death of Mazarin to that of the king in 1715, is fittingly called the Age of Louis XIV. Under his patronage arts and sciences flourished as in no previous reign. The genius of Vauban, of Riquet, Perrault and Mansard appeared in the construction of fortifications, canals and palaces; the great names of Poussin and Le Sueur head the list of celebrated painters; in literature we meet Corneille, Racine, Moliere and La Fontaine, Bossuet and Pascal.

An age opening with wonderful brilliancy in art, in letters and in war, it was apparently the dawning of a long illustrious career of glory for France; but the sun of its glory no sooner approached its meridian splendor than it hastened to set in gloom. The seeds of destruction were planted by the very hand that scattered largesses to poet and painter; deep and cruel wounds were inflicted upon France by the heart governed by mistresses of the court. The prodigal expenditures in wars and upon palaces bore with grievous weight upon the people. Monarchy was triumphant, parliament and the people were nothing. The most hideous aspects of absolutism were placed before the realm, and long before the peevish, "stogy" old monarch died, that reaction began which resulted in the revolution of 1789.

We shall look with interest for the religious developments of such a reign,—we shall expect to find the happiest results of unbiased catholicism, for never was there closer union between church and state; the Bible was withdrawn and the mass-book everywhere appeared instead; papal influences permeated and controlled the realm; the heart of the sovereign was open to the poison of a Jesuit confessor; the most brilliant minds, with few exceptions, were either engaged in the defence of the Romish church or by their talents gave it glory in the eyes of the world. In the firmament of the church shone Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Massillon, Bridaine and Fenelon. But uncontrolled Catholicism brought in the reign of reason; the crosier, raised aloft in pride and insolence, became the object of contempt.

At the beginning of this age we see Italy, Austria and Spain no longer leading the nations in art and in war. The efforts of the Pontiff and of that favorite son of the church, Philip II., to establish the Catholic faith by the poniard of the assassin,

by the inquisition and by arms, had failed in every land save Spain. There intellectual vigor and the spirit of inquiry, were hopelessly crushed. The monk and bigot sat grimly smiling over the corpse of freedom and called the universal stillness peace, but it was the startling quiet of death. No heretic disturbed the devotee of the "most holy faith," but the nation, once the terror of Europe, the chosen, secular arm of the papacy, sank into pitiable insignificance and, during the greater part of the reign of Louis XIV., was ruled by the half-idiotic grandson of Philip II., under the title of Charles II.

Henry of Navarre, chief of the Huguenots, ascended the throne in 1594. From motives of expediency he abjured the faith of his childhood and the object of his noblest struggles, thus losing the glorious opportunity of giving to France the reformed religion and of breaking up forever the religious and political centralization of the realm. He satisfied his conscience by the fact that his course enabled him to promulgate the edict of Nantes, and thus he hoped to serve his faithful followers better by his apostacy than by his truth. So the reign whose opening was radiant with no common promise, accomplished little for the civil and religious liberties of France. His "perpetual and irrevocable law," as the edict in favor of religious toleration was styled, was unceremoniously and cruelly revoked by his grandson, in whose reign the banished Jesuits returned, maddened by long years of depression, to wreak a more fearful vengeance and a more complete extermination upon those whom that Protestant charter had protected, than the abjuring Bearnese could have imagined.

After the death of Henry IV., alliance with Spain was sought with as much eagerness as he had repelled it. Protestantism was imperilled and its chiefs gathered once more for its defence. Another civil war was inaugurated, resulting in the loss of the province of Bearn, the patrimony of Henry of Navarre; its lands were confiscated and its privileges annulled. In answer to the remonstrances of the province, claiming the favors granted by Henry III. and Henry IV., the king, Louis XIII., replied that "the one feared, the other loved them, but he neither feared nor loved them."

By the fall of Rochelle, the citadel and headquarters of Protestantism, in 1629, the last bulwark of the reformers was destroyed. In the favorite church of St. Marguerite, in that wretched city, Richelieu held high mass in honor of this strange victory, which, though it quickened his hopes of a glorious and unified France, hastened the preparation for absolute monarchy, for complete crystallization and forced uniformity in church and state, under the despotic will of Louis XIV.

Mazarin, the successor of Richelieu, though not considered a friend of the Protestant faith, confirmed the privileges of the edict of Nantes and became a shield against further persecutions. At the death of that ecclesiastic, Louis, in the flush of youth and power, sought some appropriate way to signalize his piety. There must be but one faith, and he resolved to be the special evangel of that faith to France; he would make proselytes and every day should witness new converts.

The terrible work was inaugurated. Flight from the country was forbidden by the severest edicts; children were kidnapped to be brought up under Catholic teaching; dying Huguenots were tormented by magistrates and priests who imposed their presence to receive recantations. Often the crucifix was placed at the lips from which the last breath was issuing and the expiring subject was pronounced a convert. But kingly zeal devised new measures for producing conversions more rapidly. The gown and the cassock employed only spiritual devices; reasoning was a slow and somewhat uncertain process, and was therefore declared unnecessary. Military agency was invoked that conversions might be effected in a moment at the point of the bayonet.

The Huguenots offered no resistance. "The peaceful flock," as Mazarin was pleased to term them, met in sorrow to pray that the king's heart might yet be softened toward them. But blow followed blow with increasing force. Their churches were levelled; they were required to bury their dead after night-fall; the singing of psalms was forbidden; pastors were banished; children were prohibited from gathering in schools.

We have not the heart to dwell upon or to rehearse at any length the story of the insults, indignities and horrors of this

period of persecution. Its martyrologies fill many volumes, and yet that dreadful tale of suffering and woe remains untold. The massacre of St. Bartholomew may, for terror, stand alone, but the most revolting chapter in French persecution is furnished by that of the dragonnades of Louis XIV. Impiously, in the name of the Prince of Peace, the royal persecutor and his court offered up these hecatombs of helpless, impoverished, hunted victims.

“In that servile court, obedience to the presiding demigod was not merely a law but a passion. To win his smile by making proselytes became the daily labor of all the sycophants who thronged it. At each levee, dukes, peers, bishops and generals laid before him their list of new converts. No post reached Versailles without intelligence of some Protestant church having been demolished, or of the dispersion of some Protestant assembly. If, with such grateful tidings, there also came the news of riots, outrages and conflagrations, of which the heretics had been the victims, the sovereign, jealous as he was of his power, regarded with seeming indifference and with at least supposed favor, such violations of the laws of which he was the guardian.” \*

Patience and resignation at length gave way. Reaction began in 1683. A confederacy was formed, and sixteen delegates from Languedoc, Cevennes, Vivarais and Dauphine, determined in council at Toulouse, to assert their faith despite all consequences and no longer to be registered as converts to Catholicism,—to die rather than abjure. It was ordered by the council that on a certain Sabbath all the churches should be opened and divine worship conducted. Not only were churches re-opened, but many congregations, glad even to gather on the ruins of their temples which Catholic zeal had demolished, sang their wonted hymns, made dear by the rigor which had forbidden their use, and bowed in fervent prayer. Away from the precincts of church and church ruin, many of those who had abjured upon compulsion gathered in forest and beside noisy streams to utter their sorrowful and repentant petitions.

\*Stephen's Lectures on France.



No sooner was Louis informed of this defiance than troops were dispatched with orders to slaughter without mercy. "There is no amnesty," said the king. Louvois, the prime minister, declared: "You are to cause such desolation in that country (the Vivarais) that its example may restrain all other Huguenots." All who refused to abjure were at the mercy of a brutal soldiery. Private persecution and public murder, accompanied with untold horrors, were the portion of the faithful in city and country.

Equivocal expressions sometimes deceived the magistrate and procured release. It was eagerly reported to the credulous king that twenty-four thousand conversions had taken place in Languedoc alone. Flattered by such large and promising accessions to the "Mother Church," Louis believed that the time had come when every heretic might be drawn back to the loving embrace of the apostolic church by a revocation of the edict of Nantes, which had been in force nearly a century. This edict, he remarked, was never meant to be perpetual, but was a temporizing act of his grandfather; that, by the recent conversions, the greater part of the Huguenots had returned to the true religion and therefore there was no need of that edict. That apology went forth to the world, and, however ineffectual abroad, it served as an opiate to the king's conscience.

The hour of triumph for the Jesuit had fully come. The "most Christian monarch" was pronounced a convert. That conversion had been rapidly going on during "the dragonnades." "Every twinge of pain, every fit of colic, every prick of conscience was succeeded by new resolutions to extirpate heresy. Penance must be done for his incontinence, but not by himself. It was the virtuous Huguenots that must suffer vicariously for him; and, by punishing them, he flattered himself that he was expiating his own sins."\* This work of conversion was carried on by his last mistress, Madame de Maintenon, directed and controlled by the severest Jesuitical bigotry.

As a testimony to the completeness of Jesuit influence, as a remonstrance of a quickened conscience, as an expression of

\*Smiles's Huguenots

unwillingness to meet the record of his life, cherishing to the last that same irresponsibility which had marked his whole reign, "he died declaring to the cardinals Rohan and Bissy, and to his confessor, the Jesuit Le Tellier, that, being himself altogether ignorant of ecclesiastical questions, he had acted under their guidance and as their agent in all that he had done against either the Jansenists or the Protestant heretics, and on those, his spiritual advisers, he devolved the responsibility to the Supreme Judge."\*

The edict of Nantes was revoked, Oct. 22, 1685. All privileges granted by Henry IV. and Louis XIII. were suppressed; the exercise of the Protestant faith in public and in private was strictly forbidden; all Huguenot pastors were compelled to leave France within fifteen days; the penalty of the galleys or imprisonment for life was imposed upon all attempting to flee the kingdom; the property of all refugees who should fail to return to France within four months was declared confiscated. Such were the principal provisions of the act that sounded the death-knell of the Huguenots.

Scarcely was the edict signed than salvos of cannon shook the capital. Te Deums were sung in Paris and in Rome. It was the inspiring theme of praise and panegyric in dissolute court and crowded cathedral. Bossuet declared Louis to be a second Constantine, the strengthener of the faith, the exterminator of heretics, the saviour of the Catholic faith. Massillon rejoiced in tones of highest exultation: "The profane temples are destroyed, the pulpits of seduction are cast down, the prophets of falsehood are torn from their flocks."

In five days the great Protestant church at Charenton, near Paris, capable of holding fourteen thousand persons, was levelled to the ground. It was the work of only a few weeks to throw down more than eight hundred Protestant churches. The horrors of the dragonnades were carried on with new vigor and, if possible, with greater cruelty. Often not more than twenty-four hours intervened between the torture and the abjuration, and

\*Lectures on France, Stephen.

between the abjuration and the communion, to which the executioners were the conductors and the witnesses.

From all quarters the king received, with extreme delight, detailed accounts of these persecutions. The Huguenots had been in his early years painted to him as monsters or fiends,—foes of God and of kings, and as such he treated them in his maturer years. When congratulations were poured upon him from all sides, and a desecrated pulpit mingled his praises with those of the Most High, he really supposed himself not only the wisest of monarchs but the most pious of saints.

In the devoted provinces cruelty and horror were at their height. It was no glorious war for dominion, no expenditure to relieve an already impoverished and suffering country, but war upon his own subjects, causing deeper woe and more terrible wretchedness. The cries of the persecuted ascended to Heaven together with the insane rejoicings of king and court.

The peaceful, industrious communities of Huguenot subjects Louis would extirpate as his bitterest enemies. But nothing could have been better devised for giving strength to the foes beyond his borders. Fifty thousand families fled, carrying with them the bone and sinew, the industry and art of the kingdom, to Germany, Holland, England and Switzerland. Manufactures which had been known only in France were known there no more for years, until brought back from the lands which had given them protection. One of the suburbs of London was completely peopled with artisans in glass and in steel. The great influx of strangers made Berlin a city. A thousand houses were built for the refugees in Amsterdam. The States-General obtained from them skilful officers to discipline the very troops that, under William, Prince of Orange, were to make the declining years of Louis full of disaster and defeat.

From the year 1685 the fortunes of Louis were changed. That year is the dividing line between glory and dishonor in the field, profusion and emptiness at the court. Thenceforth the genius of his generals was directed chiefly to preserve France from foreign encroachments and to destroy Protestantism. No

leaders appear on the field in the latter part of his reign, like Conde, Turenne and Vauban; no financier like Colbert supplies the royal treasury; while in letters a dreary desolation reigns, with scarcely a name to relieve the oppressive dullness.

So we bid adieu to the "Grand Monarque," defeated in war, having outlived all the great men of his age, leaving France at his death burdened with debt, hated by the nation whose idol he had once been. His revocation of the edict of Nantes struck a more fatal blow to Catholicism than the massacre of St. Bartholomew, for that reaction ensued which brought about not the destruction of a part of the Romish system, as the Albigenses and Huguenots desired, but the wholesale devastations of Rousseau and Voltaire.

Thirty years of reverses, pitiful extremities of fortune, in his last days, caused the "Grand Monarque" to remember the 22nd of October, 1685, and in bitterness of soul, he cried in the words of Augustus: "Varrus, give me back my legions."

The prince who, amid the splendors of Marly, with the cries of a famine-stricken multitude rising all about him, sat down to examine various samples of grain to see how he might further impose upon the people, who maintained forty galleys filled with gaunt, hopeless, fainting victims of his persecutions, died in poverty and loneliness, deserted by all whom he had benefited. The overjoyed populace celebrated his death with demonstrations of wildest mirth. The road from the Boulevard to St. Denis was lined with festive booths around which the people danced for joy that the tyrant was no more.

Absolute monarchy was ended. The body of its representative, buried without pomp, unattended by a mourner of rank, awaited the indignities of the hour of the French revolution; only seventy-five years later. Parliament, outraged by the destruction of its rights, treated the last will and testament of the king as so much waste paper. Thenceforth kingly authority gradually died away, while year by year the popular assembly made perceptible advances in power and influence.

The destruction of Port-Royal, the academy where the learning and piety of the Jansenists centered, and the revocation of the edict of Nantes produced a war of pens against France from

abroad which at length led to the literary revolution of the eighteenth century by teaching the doctrines of popular rights and personal independence. With the year 1685 the influences of religious reform upon intellectual and civil liberty ceased, but the excesses of absolutism in church and state invited the attacks of a new philosophy before which crosier and crown were mingled with common dust.

Fenelon, asserting the rights of man in his *Telemaque*, was exiled from France; but his principles, once thrown into the ready mind of a priest-ridden and despoiled people, could not perish, but were clothed with new power and light by Voltaire, Montesquieu and a host of lesser minds. The blows levelled at the throne fell upon the altar of a universally detested church. Louis by his dragonnades, had taught his nation the fearful experiment of hypocrisy and fickleness in religion. Men chose Catholicism under his successor through expediency and as a way to preferment. Men of education sought the confessional as a matter of fashion while skepticism pervaded the intellect and poisoned the heart.

The empiricism of Locke and Hobbes, soon after its birth, became universally prevalent in England and early found its way across the channel. It destroyed for the time the idealism of Descartes and Malebranche, developed its fullest tendencies in materialism and sensualism, and, boldly throwing off all disguises, broke up all the foundations of moral and religious life. The intermediate links, in the development of this philosophy toward its grossest results, were supplied by Condillac and Helvetius. Doubt and infidelity were sown by the exiled Bayle in his principles of criticism, while Holland furnished a Spinoza, and Germany a Wolff to contribute, though from different standpoints in philosophy, to the triumph of materialism and atheism in France. In 1713, Diderot and D'Alembert published the philosophical *Encyclopædia* which speedily became the pride of France, since, by reasoning away law from the State, freedom from morality and God from nature, it gave fullest expression to the hopes of the revolutionists in politics, letters and religion. After them were the reckless materialist La Mettrie, Paine, Robespierre, Fourier and the French Revolution.

The outward life of Protestantism was crushed beneath the weight of royal and Jesuitical power, but the efforts of Louis toward the establishment of his favorite church made it more vulnerable to the attacks of its enemies. Political and religious liberty expired together. The church, reduced to the servile position of servant to the state, shared its dreary desolation. The priesthood, taught to look alone to Louis for wealth and power, were largely alienated from dependence upon the Pope and allegiance to his authority, until the French church, though still retaining the principal dogmas of Rome, assumed a firm and almost hostile attitude toward the papal throne. The clergy became the favorite instruments in the hands of Louis for governing the people, and at the same time, agents in his projects against the encroachments of the popes.

To the clergy alone, though he despised them in their growing weakness of intellect and grossness of morals, Louis left the outward marks of independence, while all other powerful corporate bodies had either been destroyed or humbled. They were allowed their annual assemblies, in which they taxed themselves; they were possessed of a considerable portion of the landed property of the kingdom and thrust themselves in many ways into the public administration. The church presents a pitiful picture in the latter part of this age. A tool of the court, fawning at the feet of royalty, applauding the most revolting vices and stimulating the most fanatical zeal, it alienated the heart of the people from all religion. In the struggle for place and power its ministers had lost the traces of that faith which cannot dwell in temples reared to a reckless ambition. Elegant as the Romish system of this period in France appears, glittering with outward magnificence and grand in its service, its foundations were full of rotteness and decay, for they rested upon an earthly throne.

PHASES OF DOCTRINE. EFFORTS TOWARD REFORM IN THE  
CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The Confession of Faith of the Protestant church in France, framed in 1559, was based on that of Geneva. Baptism and the Lord's Supper were the only sacraments recognized. Christ

crucified was the one great centre of their faith, and around it they gathered the cardinal doctrines of justification by faith and the all-sufficient mediatorship of Christ. In marked distinction from the gilded, hollow service that prevailed around them, their worship was simple, consisting of prayer and praise followed by exhortation. In their service the sermon was a principal feature, and ministers were chosen chiefly on account of their ability as preachers.

In church government they resembled the Scotch Church. Each congregation was governed by its *consistoire* or kirk-session, and was represented by both lay and clerical deputies in the provincial synod and the *colloque* or provincial assembly. All the congregations were again represented by delegates in the *Synode Nationale*, or the General Assembly.\*

Many eloquent and celebrated preachers belonged to the Reformed church of this period. There was the celebrated Claude, the antagonist of Bossuet and champion of Protestantism at Paris; Abbadie, who received the doctor's degree at the age of seventeen, and whose grandest performance, the "Treatise on the Christian Religion," won the highest encomiums from such minds as Voltaire and Madame de Sevigne, the one a deist, the other a hater of the Huguenots; Faucheur, distinguished in his pastorate at Montpellier and at Charenton for a vivid and masterly eloquence; Guillebert, co-pastor with the celebrated Du Bosc at Caen; Jacques Saurin, who, in his exile, proved by his pulpit power that France had lost a greater than Massillon, and by his scholarship, a reformer of the culture of a Melancthon; Peter Allix and De l' Angle, each renowned as pastor of the great church at Charenton, honored at home and abroad with the highest marks of esteem. Beside these, of considerable note and recognized power, were Drelincourt, Daille, Bagnage, Amyraut, Bertheau and Capell.

At the beginning of this age there were three parties in the Catholic church: Jesuits, Jansenists, and Gallicans. The two latter, alarmed at the encroachments of Rome and desiring greater purity in the church, endeavored to secure reforms.

\*Smiles.

The principles of the order of Jesuits required strict and unreserved obedience to its General, even when his commands violated the dictates of conscience and reason. The society was under the absolute control of its chief and became "like a staff in the hands of an old man." An organization the most complete, absolute obedience to one controlling will, full appreciation in its nature and importance of the work required, entire absence of scruples as to the means for accomplishing that work, the possession of privileges granted by the Pope such as no other body of men ever possessed, made this order the most formidable and dreadful opponent of reform. Within the church for which it labored endless intrigues for place and power brought disaster. Wherever it gained the ascendancy, kings, empires and people were overwhelmed with hopeless ruin. It was never an agent of edification but rather of destruction wherever it appeared.

At length its dangerous and wily plots, its heartless ambition in church and state, raised against the order the opposition of clergy and statesmen. The university of Paris declared it to be useless. The Jansenists, chiefly through the wit and eloquence of Pascal, exposed its absurdities and destroyed its prestige with the masses. Its hour of destruction that seemed so near in 1662, was indefinitely postponed by royal interference. It still lives, after astonishing reverses of fortune, now oppressed, now favored; a suspected power within the papacy, but vitally connected with the history of Catholicism, it will endure till the whole system of imposture and darkness shall fall before a pure and heaven-sanctioned faith.

In the party of the Jansenists, Roman Catholicism made the nearest approach to Protestantism. They strove to relieve the consciences of men from the arbitrary will of their confessors; to circulate a higher degree of religious knowledge; to free theology from its fetters and to promote the reading of the Scriptures among the people. "We have no master but God," said the followers of Jansenius, "from whom we receive, through grace, all that we possess." They advocated, as an antidote to the hypocrisy and formal worship of the Jesuits, a spiritual homage from a sincere heart; the renewal of the heart by grace; the completest liberty in the surrender of the will to God. The



Jesuits excited the king against the order and procured its condemnation at his hands, on the ground that it opposed the infallibility of the Pope. Port-Royal, the retreat of Pascal and of Arnauld, the academy and monastery of the Jansenists were destroyed, and in 1709 the order was wholly suppressed. Pious Catholics make solemn pilgrimages to those shapeless ruins in a dark and marshy valley near Versailles, for sacred memories of Pascal, Rollin, Arnauld and 'Mother Angelique' invest them with no common radiance and beauty for the heart of faith in every land.

With Pascal the hope of reform in the Catholic church passed away. His successors were slow to perceive the advantages he had gained, and caught but too feebly his spirit. This mighty genius was bowed down beneath the deadening influences of the system he strove to reform; though ever seeking spiritual repose it eluded his grasp, for the liberty with which Christ maketh free never fully gladdened his heart. It is nevertheless a source of deepest pleasure to the enlightened Protestant to sit at his feet, and learn from the author of the *Pensees* the grandeur of the gospel and the depth of divine condescension, to gather from the 'Provincial Letters' arguments that fell with such telling force upon Catholicism and Jesuitism alike. He belongs not to that age alone, for new beauty and power will ever flow out from his labors to gladden the heart of the ages.

Another effort to regenerate Catholicism was made by what is termed the Gallican party, which defended the ancient privileges of the French church and opposed the usurpations of the Pope. It strove to diminish the power of the Pope over the church in general and to free it from the influence of the Ultramontanes. They yielded submission to the king and became the hopeless servants of monarchy with the loss of all real independence. They expressed, as did the Jansenists, full approval of the massacre of the Huguenots. Once subjected to royal influence they found themselves forced to acquiesce in royal caprice and excess.

"In virtue of the Concordat of August, 1516, between Francis I. and Leo X., the king of France had become the patron of all episcopal sees, of all royal abbeys and of many par-

ochial benefices. By the skilful use of that patronage Louis was enabled to attach to his service and person every considerable family in his kingdom. Sometimes he bestowed the cure of souls upon laymen. Sometimes he charged the revenues of particular churches with pensions for the support of his favorites. The abbeys became the appanages of noble lords or ladies. The mitres were almost invariably bestowed on men of high birth but of mean fortunes. The temporalities of the Church were thus employed for the corruption of the world. The single mitigation of the evil was, that the sacerdotal aristocracy was composed of men whose hereditary rank secured for them a liberal education, elegant manners, and at least decorous lives. If in the reign of Louis XIV., the mitre in the Gallican church adorned the brows of no candidates for canonization, it was very rarely disgraced by the scandalous habits or open immoralities of those who wore it.”\*

Another movement toward reform in the Catholic church was inaugurated by the Quietists, who may fittingly be called Catholic Quakers. They were not a recognized sect, nor did they acquire influence enough to be called a party, but they represented a spiritual and mystical tendency in the church. Madame Guyon, who by a lively imagination, not always checked by sound judgment, presented much valuable truth mingled with some gross absurdities, was at the head of this movement which strove to bring back to a religion of form the vigor of spiritual life.

Quietism demanded pure and disinterested love of God; an internal worship and silent communion with him; a complete inaction and repose to the entire destruction of one's personality. Self-renunciation meant the annihilation of all the faculties of the intellect and the entire passivity of the soul.

The influence of these teachings won over many of the court. Madame de Maintenon favored Madame Guyon at the outset and even admitted her to St. Cyr. The jealousy of Louis toward anything which drew off attention from himself compelled Maintenon to withdraw her friendship. Alarmed by this change

\*Stephens's Lectures on History of France.

at court, Bossuet, who had largely imbibed the teachings of Madame Guyon and given her a certificate of orthodoxy, suddenly became her most determined adversary.

Fenelon, who was not a court bishop, remained in her defence. He published a work called "Maxims of the Saints," in which he draws attention to the difference between true and false mysticism and strenuously advocates a true mysticism as the great need of the church. Then began the renowned controversy on Quietism with Bossuet. Instigated by the latter, whose extant letters show that he once fostered the worst phases of the belief he sought to destroy, the king sent the book of "Maxims" to the Pope and obtained its condemnation. Fenelon read his own condemnation from his episcopal pulpit at Cambrai and made a full recantation. The disgrace into which Madame Guyon had fallen with those in high places, together with her imprisonment, caused her to be abandoned by those who had befriended her, yet the system she taught was matured, and "a new revelation was circulated among men in place of that which embodies the whole mind of God for our salvation. That system has been thus described: 'God makes himself known to the soul by divine touches, by tastes, by gentle illapses, and ineffable sweetnesses. Men's affections being thus moved, the soul sinks into a delicious repose which rises above all delights, all ecstasies, all notions, all divine speculations—a state in which she knows neither what she feels nor what she is.' A description this of one who is the dupe of his own feelings, rather than an intelligent believer in God and his Christ."\*

The doctrines of mysticism became powerful weapons in the hands of the church against heresy. They inspired the persecutor with a firm belief in his own absolute infallibility and in the inviolability of his opinions. They condemned the heretic not only as guilty of error in judgment but of obdurate depravity of will. Many of the perpetrators of the atrocities in persecution doubtless believed they were doing God service, and following his special, personal inspiration, rather than the suggestions of fanaticism. Mysticism leads inevitably to persecution

\*Tweedie.

and intolerance, inasmuch as it substitutes the fancies of an erratic mind for the truth of God. Fervors and ecstasies are made to stand in place of divine revelation; genius is the only inspiration; Jesus, Voltaire, Moses, Spinoza are inspired alike, according to the creed of the new mysticism of the nineteenth century, and are alike moved by the divinity that resides within them. Paganism is placed on an equality with the religion of Jesus, and the faith that sustains the soul in its hour of direst calamity gives way to a religion which every man is able and meant to form for himself out of his own heart. Under the pretence of teaching higher truth, or an advanced theology which has proudly burst the swaddling bands of long ages of error, proffering a freer and more liberal belief, the mysticism of to-day endeavors to sap the foundations of faith and beguile unstable souls. The spirit of those who slew the prophets, of those who built monuments to their fierce spirit of persecution with the bones of their victims in France, in Spain, and in Italy, still lurks within the system which, smooth and shining as the scales of the serpent, creeps, in the guise of reason and liberality, into the hearts of those who scorn the safe though rugged paths of spiritual safety and assured triumph.

“The Mystic and Quietist literature of France was pre-eminently devout both in its tone and in its design. But it propagated those views to which may be ascribed the massacre of the Albigenses and of the Huguenots. It contributed more powerfully than any other teaching to annihilate, in the minds of men, that modest self-distrust by which the uplifted arm may be arrested before it falls in vengeance on those who dissent from our opinions. It fostered what we have before called the pride of belief—the pride of him who, believing that his own soul is a mirror reflecting the eternal verities of the divine intellect, considers it impious to doubt his own infallibility. . . . The royal exterminators of the heretics were elevated by their destruction to an absolute and despotic power over every class and variety of their subjects. Those literary teachers, whose mysticism scattered the two prolific seeds of those persecutions, were therefore, in effect, the most fatal of all enemies to the growth of constitutional liberty in France.

It is of the deepest moment to mankind that, in the age and country of Louis XIV., literature was faithless to her highest calling; that her great authors abandoned the free investigation of truth religious and of truth political; that the men of the seventeenth century abdicated that high office to the men of the succeeding age; and that Racine, Moliere, Bossuet and Arnauld abandoned the highest of all realms of merely human inquiry to the fatal ambition of Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu and Beaumarchais. Seizing on that deserted province, those great writers assailed the ancient bulwarks of our faith in that divine power in whom we have our being, and in those human powers to which God himself has commanded us to be subject. They found those fortresses of France unprotected by any recent defences, and dilapidated by long neglect; and. . . the literature of the age of Louis XV. won a disastrous triumph, which might have been averted if the literature of the age of his predecessor had exchanged the debasing service of an idolized man for that service which we rejoice to accept as our perfect freedom.”\*

---

### COWLES'S EXPOSITION OF DANIEL,†

Many are of the opinion that the interpretation of prophecy is a peculiarly difficult task. This no doubt is in part true, yet we apprehend that it is no more difficult than the exposition of the parables of our Lord; and when as much talent is bestowed upon the one as has been upon the other, the main difficulties will have passed away, in as large a degree as they have from the parables. We hail with gratitude any effort which is adapted to bring to notice the main points of difficulty which exist in the writings of that most obscure book of the Old Testament,—

\*Stephens's Lectures.

†Notes on Ezekiel and Daniel. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

the prophecy of Daniel. In addition to the exposition of the text, the author has appended two dissertations, one to show wherein Mr. Miller was wrong in his celebrated attempt to prove the end of the world in 1843, the other is aimed at the system of interpretation which makes a day stand for a year in several passages in this book, and also in Revelation. But in laboring to show that a day does not stand for a year in several of the visions of Daniel, he places himself in antagonism to the mass of Biblical critics, both Jewish and Christian, and involves himself in inextricable difficulties. This shall be considered when we advance to the consideration of those passages to which this mode of exegesis is applied.

The points in this book which claim our especial consideration, may be classed under the following heads. 1. The vision of the great image. 2. The vision of the four beasts. 3. The vision of the three domestic animals.

1. The vision of the great image is recorded in chapter second. The image, as seen by the king was composed of four kinds of metals with an intermixture of clay in the fourth. As interpreted by Daniel, these metals symbolize four distinct kingdoms; thus expressed in the language of the prophet;—"Thou O king, art the head of gold." "And after thee, shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee. And another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: for as much as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise." History furnishes us with four great universal kingdoms: viz. Babylon, Persia, Greece and Rome. Biblical expositors with wonderful unanimity, have followed the course marked by the historian.

Mr. Cowles chooses a different path so far as the fourth is concerned; which he thinks is the kingdom of Alexander's successors. Against this view; many things must be most obvious.

1. The successors of Alexander continued the domination of the Greeks over the East; and brass, not iron, is the symbol of the Greek as truly as silver was Persian, or gold the Chaldean.

2. No one of the successors of that great captain had a kingdom which is worthy to be considered in the same category with Ba-

bylon, Persia and Greece. 3. No one of these kingdoms fills up the outline drawn by the prophet for the fourth kingdom. He says "as iron breaketh in pieces all these,"—the other metals, gold, silver and brass,—"shall it,"—the fourth kingdom,— "break in pieces and bruise." In the matter of strength this kingdom exceeds the other three. 4. His legs were of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. This fitly symbolizes Rome, which was all iron down to the days of Christ, but became weak after that period, and was mixed with a barbarian element which eventually subverted it; but it does not characterize either of the kingdoms into which the empire of Alexander was divided. 5. Daniel speaks of the fourth kingdom, as being one, whereas, the generals of Alexander, after many bloody wars, divided the empire into four kingdoms. 6. Daniel says, the stone that was cut out of the mountain struck the image upon his feet; but the kingdoms which succeeded Alexander's, were destroyed before Christ made his appearance. "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom. As Christ's kingdom was to be established in the days of "these kings," it is absurd to suppose that the Greek kings were intended, as the last remains of these kingdoms were years before subdued by the Romans.

On the other hand, the Adventists take the opposite extreme, supposing that the kingdom symbolized by the stone, refers to one not yet established. This cannot be, for the following reasons: 1. The stone smote the image upon his feet. If iron be Rome, whatever is symbolized by smiting the feet, must take place while Rome is yet in existence. 2. In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom. By using the term "these kings," the attention is especially called to kings, before mentioned, but only four are alluded to, which by common consent are understood to be the kings of Babylon, Persia, Greece and Rome. 3. Some have attempted to show that the term—"these kings"—has reference to the kingdoms symbolized by the toes of the image. Nothing is gained by this supposition. (1) Daniel says nothing of the kind. (2) The kingdoms which sprang into existence during the decline and fall of the Roman empire, were weak, feeble, and short-lived,

not one of them is now in existence. (3) No less than thirty distinct kingdoms sprang into existence while Rome was falling, and these were succeeded by twice as many more in a few centuries. Nothing but the most absurd fanaticism could prompt any one to suppose that any part of this properly is yet unfulfilled, except that part which refers to filling the earth with the kingdom of God.

Mr. Cowles has the following concerning the kingdom symbolized by the stone, which we introduce, as it serves the double purpose of illustrating his style and of forcibly starting an important doctrine.

“In regard to this fifth kingdom, specially described in verse 44, observe that in the opinion of all intelligent commentators, our divine Lord and his forerunner, John the Baptist, take their current and oft used phrases, kingdom of God, and kingdom of heaven, from this passage. Daniel says the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom! Hence it might be called either ‘The kingdom of God’ or ‘The kingdom of heaven.’ In fact both these designations are used frequently. John began his preaching, saying, ‘Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.’ (Matt. 3 : 2.) Jesus began with the same text. (See Matt. 4 : 17). According to Mark, (chap. 1—15) Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God saying, ‘The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand.’ Luke has it, The kingdom of God, (chap. 4 : 43, and 8 : 1) ; ‘I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also.’ Showing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God!—I quote only a part of these numerous cases, yet enough to show (1) that Daniel’s fifth kingdom is precisely the gospel kingdom of the New Testament, our divine Lord himself being the highest authority for this identity, and (2) that its time was then ‘fulfilled;’ it was ‘at hand’ and was set up during that generation. (The proof of this last point will be more fully adduced in my notes on Dan. 7.) This identification of the fifth kingdom is a point of the greatest importance. Especially should it be noticed that both Jesus Christ and his inspired apostles, by taking up these words of Daniel and applying them to the reign of Christ became themselves so far forth the interpreters of Daniel’s prophecy, certifying to us, that, in their view, the Spirit, who spake by Daniel, meant by this fifth kingdom that of the gospel age whose king was Jesus the Messiah.”



II. The attention is next invited to the vision of the four wild beasts : Dan. 7. These same great kingdoms which in the second chapter are symbolized by four kinds of metals in the great image, are in this chapter symbolized by four wild beasts : viz. a winged lion, a bear, a four-bearded, four-winged leopard, and a nondescript beast of terrible appearance. A labored attempt is made to show that the fourth beast here described, symbolizes the kingdoms of Alexander's successors, instead of Rome as has been believed by the mass of Biblical students. His signal failure goes not a little way in confirming the received opinion. A few points will be sufficient to show the error of Mr. Cowles. 1. A beast signifies one kingdom, not two or more. The lion symbolizes Babylon ; the bear, Persia, and the leopard, Greece. Shall we now violate this law of Scripture exegesis and say this fourth beast symbolizes two or more kingdoms, Syria and Egypt? If such license as this be allowed, no adequate conception can be formed as to the variety of absurdities into which expositors may fall. Besides Daniel has given his own interpretation to these symbolical beasts : verse 17 " These great beasts which are *four*, are *four kings* which shall arise out of the earth." Also verse 23. " The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms and it shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it to pieces." This ought to be sufficient to show that *one* king or kingdom,—the prophet uses these terms interchangeably—and not *four* is meant. 2. Neither Syria nor Egypt was great enough to fulfil the symbol employed. More attention is paid to this beast than to the three others which precede it. Each of the others are dismissed with a single verse, while nearly a whole chapter is given to this. Mr. Cowles thinks the " terrible" of the beast lay chiefly in the " little horn," but this is not wholly true. The seventh verse describes the fourth beast, before the appearance of the notable horn, as being " dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly, ' and it had great iron teeth ;' it devoured and break in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it. Such language as this could not have been applied to either of the feeble kingdoms which arose on the breaking up of Alexan-

der's. Neither Syria nor Egypt could be called "dreadful and terrible and *strong exceedingly*," when contrasted with Babylon, Persia and the empire of Alexander. No nation of antiquity could bear the weight of this description but Rome. Nor yet does the suggestion of Mr. Cowles, that this greatness and terribleness have reference to the Jewish people, relieve his exegesis of its embarrassment. Babylon completely subjugated the Jews, destroyed their city, demolished their temple, and reduced them to servitude for seventy years;—with the exception of a few halcyon days under the sway of the earlier emperors. Persia kept the Jews under the abjectest servitude; and Rome held them under her iron heel until they were utterly destroyed from being a nation; whereas, Syria allowed them ever to remain in their own land, never so much as threw down their temple, and only for three years suspended their daily worship in the temple. Mr. Cowles objects to the introduction of Rome into this series of kingdoms, on account of its European origin and character, the rest being Asiatic. He overlooks three important points. (1) Greece, which he introduces, is European in origin and character. (2) Daniel says nothing as to where these kingdoms should originate. (3) But as to character he says, "This shall be diverse from all kingdoms." 3. The assertion of the prophet that this kingdom "should devour the whole earth," ought forever to drive us out of Syria or Egypt for the fulfilment of this part of the vision. 4. Mr. Cowles succeeds no better when he considers the "ten horns that were in his head, and the other which came up, before whom three fell." "The ten horns are ten kings." He restricts the term "kings" to its literal meaning, and proceeds to identify them in the calendar of Egyptian and Syrian kings. But Syria alone had twenty-five kings. Why then take five from each and pretend that this is the fulfilment of Scripture? The judgment fell upon the little horn, which thought to change times and laws,—Antiochus Epiphanes,—according to Mr. Cowles. But no less than seventeen Syrian kings reigned after him. This is all the more disastrous to the exegesis under consideration, from the fact that Daniel observes, that this beast was slain and his body given to the burning flame,

while the lives of the *rest* were prolonged for a season and time, The history of Antiochus affords not the least show of evidence that he ever succeeded in plucking up three kingdoms, or even kings. He seems rather to have failed in all his enterprises, to have strengthened the kingdoms he attacked, and damaged seriously only his own.

The comments of Mr. Cowles upon the judgment scene, (Dan. 7: 9—14), are well timed and worthy of due consideration. The reader will pardon the length of the quotation in view of the importance of the subject and the masterly manner in which it is handled.

“The vital question on this passage is; Does it refer to the final and general judgment; or to the providential judgments in time, for the destruction of the fourth beast and his horns? I adopt the latter view and defend it on the following grounds. (1) The general final judgment is not in place here; would have no connection with the subject in hand; is not indicated by any thing said in the context, or by the nature of the subject. On the contrary, an allusion to God’s providential judgments upon guilty nations is in place here, precisely so, being the very thing that such blasphemous hostility to his kingdom and people calls for and should lead us to expect. (2) In the government of God over men, individuals will be judged at the end of this world, and punished or rewarded in the next; but nations can be punished only in time—only in this world, for the sufficient reason that they exist only as nations here. They are not known as nations after this life. The awards made at the final judgment are upon individuals only; the retributions of eternity are on individuals alone. Hence if this judgment falls on the fourth beast and his horns, it must be in this world, it cannot be at and after the end of it. (3) The declared result and out-come of this judgment is that this fourth beast is destroyed, and his body given to the burning flame.” (v. 11.)

Conclusive to the same point is v. 26. The judgment shall sit (i. e., on the little horn-king, then representing the fourth beast), “and they shall take away his dominion to consume and destroy it” utterly,—what could be more decisive? A nationality swept away. . . . But if this were the judgment scene of the last day, the results and out-come ought to be like that of

Matt. 25 : 31—46,—the assigning of the righteous and of the wicked each to their eternal destinies—"these into everlasting punishment," "those into life eternal." (4) But further, the distinctive characteristics of the final judgment are not here.—These are; (a) That it takes place at the end of the world: (b) It is preceded by the general resurrection: (c) It embraces all the human race from the beginning to the end of time and even the fallen angels: (d) Men are judged in it as individuals and not as nations. They are not known as nations there. There every one of us shall give an account of himself unto God.—(e) In the final judgment, Jesus Christ is to be the judge. In this, the judge is the Ancient of days, the Eternal Father. (See v. 13). (f) Its results are not transient, as these appear to be, but eternal, even the eternal award of destiny to the righteous and the wicked. It may be added;—that in this scene the Son of man comes to the Father and receives a kingdom, even the one which had been before in the possession of the beast and his horns, whereas in the judgment of the great day, the Son delivers up the kingdom to God, even the Father, and becomes subject "unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." (1 Cor. 15 : 24—28.)

III. We come now to examine the part of the book relating to the eight chapters which contain the vision of three domestic animals. In this, a ram having two horns symbolizes the Medo-Persian kingdom, a rough he-goat having a notable horn characterizes the Greco-Macedonian kingdom under Alexander the Great, the breaking up of this kingdom and the establishment of four others in its stead, are fitly represented in symbol by the breaking off of this large horn and the out-growing of four in its place. Thus far there is a general agreement among commentators. At this point there is a divergence. "A little horn" is said to come out of one of these four, and it is concerning this that men differ; one class refers this to Antiochus Epiphanes, among whom are our author, Albert Barnes and others; another class refers it to Rome; and yet a third—a small minority—find in it a symbol of Mohammed and his kingdom.

We will now consider these points in order. As Mr. Thur-

man has dealt with the claims of Antiochus in a very masterly manner we cannot do better than to make a few extracts from them.\*

1. "The 'little horn' came 'out of one of' the 'four notable' horns (Dan. 8: 9); hence, was a fifth horn or kingdom. But Antiochus constituted no new kingdom; for he continued to be one of the four,—that is, the Syrian kingdom.

2. This was at first a 'little horn which waxed exceeding great' (Dan. 8: 9); but Antiochus 'did not enlarge' his kingdom.

3. The little horn was to arise in 'the latter time' of the kingdom of one of the four horns (Dan. 8: 23); but Antiochus was not in the latter time of these kingdoms; for he was 'the eighth in the Syrian line of kings' which numbered twenty-five.

4. The little horn was to arise, 'when the transgressors are come to the full' (Dan. 8: 23); and the space of time as allowed, 'to finish transgression' (Dan. 9: 24), did not end until about 228 years after the death of Antiochus.

5. It is said of this horn 'his power shall be mighty,' (Dan. 8: 24.) Antiochus, being 'tributary to the Romans,' has no mighty power.

6. Though his power was mighty, it 'was not by his own power;' (Dan. 8: 24.) But what power Antiochus had, was his own; for he had no aid from other nations.

7, 'And he shall destroy wonderfully'—(Dan, 8: 24.) It is said that Antiochus destroyed 'about eighty thousand Jews;' but the Romans, in a single siege, destroyed 1,100,000.

8. And he 'shall prosper and practice' (Dan. 8: 24); but such was the reverse of prosperity with Antiochus: 'He was astonished and moved, whereupon he laid him down upon his bed, and fell sick for grief because it had not befallen him as he looked for.' (1 Macc. 6: 8.)

9. He 'shall destroy the mighty and holy people' (Dan. 8: 24); which people were not destroyed under 230 years after the death of Antiochus.

10. 'And by peace shall destroy many.' (Dan. 8: 25.) Antiochus destroyed none 'by peace.'

11. 'He shall also stand up against the Prince of princes' (Dan. 8: 25); but Antiochus died 158 years before the Prince of princes was born.

12. By this horn, 'the place of the sanctuary was cast down.' (Dan. 8: 11.) Antiochus left it standing. . . . .

\*Bible Chronology Established, pp. 173, 174.

13. The kingdom of Persia, which extended from India even unto Ethiopia over one hundred and seven and twenty provinces (Esth. 1 : 1), is only called 'great' (Dan. 8 : 4); and Grecia, the 'third kingdom which bare rule over all the earth' (Dan. 2 : 39), is called VERY GREAT (Dan. 8 : 8); but this little horn waxed EXCEEDING GREAT. (Dan. 8 : 9.) Can Antiochus, who was 'tributary to the Romans all his days,' be considered greater than the kingdoms of Persia and Greece? So far from having 'waxed exceeding great towards the south, and towards the east, and toward the pleasant land' (Dan. 8 : 9), the very reverse was the truth. He became so very weak that he feared he should not be able to bear the charges any longer! 'Wherefore being greatly perplexed in his mind he determined to go into Persia, there to take the tribute of the countries, and to gather money' (1 Macc. 3 : 30); but he was not able because they of the city 'rose up against him in battle; so he fled and departed thence with great heaviness, and returned to Babylon' and there died, saying, 'Behold I perish through great grief in a strange land.' And why? Only because of the extreme weakness to which his kingdom was reduced, in that he was no longer able to carry out his ambitious designs against the Jews. Because of this, his weakness, he 'fell sick for grief,' saying, 'I thought with myself into what tribulation am I come, and how great a flood of misery is it wherein now I am.' (1 Macc. 6 : 1—16.)"

It must require some boldness, not to say desperation to assume that Antiochus is the power intended by the symbol of the little horn, when so many things can be said against it. But the embarrassments increase when we come to consider the length of time during which the sanctuary was to be trodden down. (Dan. 8 : 13—14. "Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spoke, 'How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?' But he said unto me. Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.")

"Those who apply the little horn to Antiochus count these literal days; others consider them as marking so many years. The most important point to be settled is, what is transacted during these days? Do these days mark the length of the whole vision as Mr. Thurman contends, or the time of the affliction

occasioned by Antiochus, or simply the time the sanctuary is trodden under foot? The grammatical construction excludes the two former positions and limits us to the latter. "How long shall the vision concerning (1) the daily sacrifice, (2) the transgression of desolation, and (3) to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" It is not, How long is the vision concerning (1) the ram with two horns, (2) the rough he goat, (3) the four horns which sprung up after the first was broken off, and (4) the little one which waxed exceeding great; but concerning the desolation of the sanctuary until it should be cleansed. How long did Antiochus desecrate the sanctuary? Josephus has the following; "This desolation happened to the temple in the 145th year, on the 25th day of the month Appelleus, and on the 153d Olympiad: but it was dedicated anew, on the same day, the 25th of the month Appelleus, in the 148th year, and on the 154th Olympiad."\* According to this authority, the sanctuary was desecrated just three years to a day, or 1096 days. We are willing to give a degree of liberty in interpreting prophecy, but who shall say that Daniel had in view this desecration of the temple which lasted less than half the time he specified; when penning the above text? This is still further embarrassed when it is taken into the account that Mr. Cowles applies the other numbers given by Daniel in the seventh chapter and twenty-fifth verse, and those found in the twelfth chapter, to the same event. Thus we have, as dates referring to the same event, according to Mr. Cowles, "A time, times, and a half,—" "three years and a half,—" "two thousand three hundred days;" "a thousand two hundred and ninety days," and a "thousand three hundred and five and thirty days." By way of reconciling these seeming discrepancies, he urges that, while the prophet has in mind the desecration of the temple as the leading thought, he nevertheless includes with this event, other circumstances before and after this, which prolong the time. But what is fatal to this mode of reconciling the discrepancies, is the fact, that the longest period mentioned—the 2300 is by its grammatical construction closely confined to the

\*Antiquities Book XII. Chapter 7.

deseccration of the sanctuary; while both Josephus and 1 Macc. 1:59; 4:52, state that the temple was deseccrated just three years. It is true, that Josephus says, in his history of the Jewish wars, that Antiochus caused the daily worship to cease three years and six months. As an offset to this, it is stated in a foot note at the beginning of this work, that it was his first work, which was written before he had become well acquainted with the book of Maccabees, upon which he relied for his dates. The Antiquities being written several years later, is the more accurate work. We feel compelled, therefore, to reject the exposition of Mr. Cowles and Mr. Barnes so far as pertains to the power symbolized by the "little horn." But if Antiochus be not the power intended, we must at the same time, look for some nation to fulfill this symbol, inasmuch as no one king appears, who stands any chance as a competitor with Antiochus whom we have abandoned. But if we look for a nation, the 2300 days will extend themselves to 2300 years. Inasmuch as they have never been fulfilled literally, we look for their fulfillment on the day-year system. That "horn," used as a symbol, means a kingdom, and not a church, nor religion, nor even a man, is evident from the following considerations; (1) The terms, "king" and "kingdom," are used interchangeably in this prophecy. (Dan. 2: 37—39.) "Thou, O king, art a king of kings." "Thou art the head of gold." "And after thee shall arise another kingdom," "and another third kingdom." But in verse 44, it is said, "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." Nebuchadnezzar is called a kingdom, in so far as at that time he is at the head of Babylon. (2) The eleven horns of the fourth beast, of the seventh chapter, are called kings; the four horns which succeeded the one that was broken off, as related in the eighth chapter, are said by Daniel to be "four kingdoms that shall stand up out of that nation,"—the nation symbolized by the broken horn. (3) We are now prepared to inquire whether Rome is the power symbolized by the little horn. Many of the points specified are completely fulfilled by this power, as also by Antiochus; but as was the case with that prince, Rome fails in a few points, yet not in so many as Antiochus. The most



prominent of these are the following. (1) "And out of one of them came forth a little horn : " (Dan. 8 : 9.) Rome did not arise out of the Grecian empire, it was never under the sway of Alexander or any of his successors. (2) "A king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences shall stand up." This seems in no way characteristic of the Romans. (3) "He shall be broken without hands." Rome was destroyed by the violence of her enemies. Whatever else is said, seems appropriate to Rome, and yet some parts are more appropriate to the Mohammedans, which we now notice.

3. Mohammed arose out of the Syrian kingdom; his forces were very small at the beginning, consisting only of a few personal friends; he waxed exceeding great toward the south,—conquering the whole peninsula of Arabia, making of itself a kingdom four times as large as the French empire; he then extended his conquests towards the east,—planting his standard upon the walls of China, and at the mouth of the river Ganges; after taking Damascus his generals turned their faces towards Palestine and subdued that country. If Persia was "great," and Greece "very great," the Mohammedan power was "exceeding great." From the columns of Hercules to the walls of China, extending more than one quarter the distance around the globe, and embracing nearly three quarters of the civilized world, he held in subjection more lands than Alexander overrun.

This power was to rise "in the latter time of their kingdom when the transgressors are come to the full." As to time, Rome has the advantage over Arabia; as to the state of morals, there is but little to choose: if we consider the Jews, the description is very accurate—the "transgressors had come to the full,—"they had slain the Son of God—had persecuted and slain his disciples. On the other hand if we consider the state of religion in the beginning of the seventh century, even then, had the transgressors come to the full. "Whoever carefully examines the history of the East from the death of Alexander the Great to the rise of Mohammed, will be convinced that the transgressors had come to the full; one bright spot only appears, during all these long dark ages, that one marked out by the light of the gospel; but even this became almost obscured by the substitution

of the worship of the Virgin Mary, the twelve apostles, and a host of saints, for the Saviour, and the endless jargon of the priests for the pure faith of the primitive Christians."

"A king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up." This most accurately describes both the king and the nation to which he belongs. "He early led a roving life, following the caravans of the desert; he delighted in the weird tales of his comrades, eagerly grasped the histories of the various places which he visited, studied the religions of the various peoples with whom he came in contact; and at length, having come in possession of a fortune by a lucky marriage, retired from active life, spent much of his time in a cave near his residence; at length, as the result of his researches and profound investigations, he gave to the world the Koran, a book abounding in dark sentences, which holds the faith of more millions of human beings than any book save the Bible."

"And his power shall be mighty but not by his own power." This is more strictly true of Mohammed than of any other conqueror who came in contact with the Jewish people. He was a poor caravan boy, destitute of power or patronage, was raised to affluence by his marriage, and extended his conquests, as did his successors, by conciliating the nations conquered, and incorporating them into his own faith and kingdom; "through his policy he caused craft to prosper in his hands."

"And he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall practice and prosper." Had some distinguished novelist, with the breadth and fertility of imagination of Sir Walter Scott, been called upon to write a romance of the seventh century, he could not have produced a more wonderful composition than is afforded in the simple narration of the facts attending the rise of the Mohammedan power. While yet his forces were busying themselves with subduing the peninsular of Arabia to the sway of Mohammed, his ambassadors were visiting the most distant kingdoms and demanding, in the name of the "Prophet of God," submission and tribute; these courts were in doubt whether the Arab were a madman or a fanatic, but while they were yet discussing the matter his fierce warriors were scaling the walls of their capitals or laying waste their pleasant fields.

“He shall destroy the mighty and the holy people.” If this refers to the Jews it was very accurately fulfilled by the Romans; if to Christians, we have but to look to those countries where Christianity flourished most in the early centuries, to behold its fulfillment by the Mohammedans.

“And he shall stand up against the Prince of princes.” The Romans crucified the Prince of princes and persecuted his followers. Mohammed claimed to be greater than Jesus Christ, supplanted the religion of the cross by that of the crescent, and gave the world the Koran for the Bible.

“By him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of the sanctuary was cast down.” Rome overthrew the city of Jerusalem—burned the temple, and put an end to the daily sacrifice. But it will be observed that the word “sacrifice” is not in the original. If we substitute “worship” in its stead, and note still further that it does not say that this power threw down the sanctuary, but the place of the sanctuary, the preponderance of the evidence will be for Mohammed and against Rome. This view is still further corroborated when we observe that by this power “the truth was cast down to the ground.” The overthrow of Jerusalem by the Romans was for the establishment of the truth, and must be considered as a prosperous event rather than otherwise, while the conquest of the East by the Saracens effectually dislodged truth from the whole country.

As the sanctuary, or the place of it, was to be trodden down for 2300 days, which we are disposed to consider so many years, there can be but little difficulty in finding the time when it is to be cleansed, or at least, in showing that the day is quite distant. If we take Rome as the power symbolized by the “little horn,” the sanctuary cannot be cleansed before A. D. 2370, as the Romans overthrew the city in the year 70. But if we take the Mohammedan power as the one intended, the time of “cleansing the sanctuary” will be deferred to A. D. 2935.

Some suppose that by cleansing the sanctuary is meant the end of the world, but nothing of the kind is hinted at. What was polluted will be cleansed. Both Romans and Mohammedans have trampled down Jerusalem. Jesus said it should be trampled down until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.

When these times are fulfilled it is not unreasonable to suppose the city will be rebuilt and the scattered nation restored.

---

#### ART. V.—REGENERATION.

Whoever discusses such a subject as Regeneration with any thoroughness, will, of necessity, exhibit all the main features both of his theology and his mental philosophy, as well as set forth more or less the principles of interpretation which he applies to the Scriptures. Such a discussion must include a view of human character as it lies under the cloud of sin, an exhibition of its degree of moral power and responsibility, the relation of divine help to its deliverance, the method and means by which its redemption is to be secured, and its state after the new creative work has been wrought in its behalf. In a word, it involves a philosophy of moral life, such as will classify and harmonize the main facts of consciousness and all the distinctive utterances of inspiration that bear on the subject. It is a theme for a volume rather than a topic for a brief article. All that will be attempted now is to present a mere outline of the principles by the aid of which this result would be sought, and indicate a few of their applications.

The term Regeneration occurs only twice in the New Testament,—it is not found at all in the Old. The first instance of its occurrence appears in Matt. 19 : 28 ; where Christ promises large future distinctions to those who have followed him in the regeneration. It is proper to observe, however, that many eminent critics regard the pointing in this passage, which is found in our common versions, as improper and unauthorized. As at present punctuated, the passage makes the *following* to be in the regeneration ; with the modified pointing, it makes the promise to find its fulfilment in the regeneration. The other instance of its use occurs in Tit. 3 : 5 ; where Paul speaks of our being saved by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the

Holy Ghost—a use of the word evidently figurative and typical in a high degree.

But while this precise word is thus sparingly used, the idea conveyed by it frequently appears in equivalent expressions. Such are “born again;” “born of God;” “born of the Spirit;” “born from above;” “begotten again;” “begotten of God;” “created anew;” “renewed in the spirit of your mind;” &c., &c.

Indeed, though the Scriptures give new prominence to this idea, and make the idea itself more radical than before, it appears in the religious literature of almost every people. The human heart yearns every where for a new and higher life, and so it pictures to itself some new and nobler existence, to reach which is regarded as the accomplishment of the great end and the attainment of the supreme good of existence. True, the ideals have often been very low, and the modes of reaching and realizing them have been often very strange and foolish; but the conception of a redeemed nature has still haunted men and inspired their noblest and worthiest efforts.

As the term is used in theology, Regeneration signifies, in its results, a new spiritual life either begun or completed—in the germ or matured. Omitting the prefix, and we have the word *generate*, which is expressive of a familiar physical act and process which perpetuate and extend the domain of life; and is taken, as nearly all our words denoting spiritual things are taken, to signify an act and process by means of which the spiritual life mounts to a higher plane and reveals higher forces and phenomena.

It seems proper to remark here, that violence is done both to Scripture and to reason by an attempt to find complete correspondence between all the facts of the physical and the spiritual process. Those zealous interpreters of Scripture who will at all hazards have something in the spiritual process answering perfectly to all the consecutive phenomena of the physical—who insist on discovering the impregnation, the quickening with vital force, the gradual development of the spiritual fœtus, the painful birth into self-consciousness, &c., &c., are not expounding Scripture, but setting forth their own foolish fancies. It would be just about as wise to insist that, when the

Psalmist says "God is a rock," he must have meant the granite which upholds the other species and which has three elements, viz., quartz, felspar, and mica, and that these respectively correspond to the three persons in the Trinity. There are two Greek words, *gennao* and *ginomai*, with their derivatives and variations, employed in the New Testament to express the idea of Regeneration. In their original use the first word, *gennao*, more frequently signified, as applied to the physical process, the act of generating, while the second, *ginomai*, was more generally used to denote the birth; but gradually this distinction grew less and less observable in use. In examining most of the passages where either of these words is used to denote a spiritual idea or otherwise, we cannot discover that either the writers or the translators of the New Testament meant anything different when they use one word from what they would express when they employed the other. Thus in Heb. 11: 23,— "By faith Moses, when he was born, was hid," &c.; it is not *ginomai* but *gennao* that is used; and yet it cannot mean when he was generated, but when he was born. So in 1 Pet. 2: 2,— "As born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word," &c.; it is *gennao* again; but it must mean *born*, of course, though *ginomai* is not chosen. This, without farther illustration, indicates that the New Testament writers use the words interchangeably. Take as an example of translation, 1 John 5: 1,— "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God; and every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him." Here we have *born*, *begat* and *begotten*; but the original word is the same in all the three cases, and that word is *gennao*. It is the same word also that is used in the conversation between Christ and Nicodemus, and yet our version invariably reads *born* again. Besides the Greek word for Regeneration has for its chief element, not *gennao* but *genesis*,—a derivative of *ginomai*, originally expressive more fully of birth than of generation. All this shows the almost entire synonymousness of the words *begotten* and *born* as used in Scripture, when they are applied to the spiritual nature, and the folly of attempting to engraft a theory of complete correspondence upon the letter of the New Testament.

The only principle which seems to have been adhered to by the New Testament writers in their choice of words when dealing with this subject, is that of making the language conform to the particular aspect of this spiritual work which was the object of attention. Thus when the regenerated are spoken of in connection with the *cause, means, or instrument* of the work, the word *gennao*, begotten, is used, as denoting the foreign agency. So Paul speaks of having *begotten* (*gennao*) Onesimus in his bonds. "Every one that loveth," says John, "is *begotten*, (*genniao*,) though the translators render it *born*. "*Begotten again*," (*gennao*,) says Peter, "by incorruptible seed, by the word of God;" though the translators have rendered it, born again by the word of God—not a very natural rendering certainly, but one showing how innocent they were of any opinion that *ginomai* and *gennao* meant different things. Both terms imply one and the same thing, and that thing is the renewal of the man in righteousness and the development of spiritual life and power.

But how radical a work is effected in the human soul in Regeneration? and by what means and methods is the result produced?

The testimony of Scripture in setting forth the necessity of this work clearly indicates its moral importance. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature; old things have passed away, behold all things are become new." These passages would seem to imply that Regeneration is essential to the possession of God's favor and of all true moral life. And this leads to another question, viz., what are the defects in human character which Regeneration comes to supply? In what consists the disease which the new birth is to overpower or expel? Is it constitutional, hereditary, or acquired? Is it in our organism, our legacy, or our culture? Does the responsibility of it attach to God, to our ancestry, to our contemporaries, or to ourselves? We must know what our deficiencies are before we can comprehend what that provision is which can meet them. Any theory of Regeneration, therefore, will be greatly modified by our theory of sin and depravity. Pronounce human nature uncorrupted, and Regeneration can be only an impulse to quick-

en its ascending march ; declare it totally depraved, and Regeneration must imply as radical a work as would be necessary to make a spiritual body, meet for heaven, out of the flesh and bones which moulder in the dust of time. Any exposition of Regeneration must want definiteness except as it is based on a plain, tangible theory of man's moral state before the Spirit broods over the soul to warm it into life. In this essay we must almost wholly dispense with proof and illustration, and simply lay down the theses which constitute the framework of the theory.

1. Human beings are under no necessity of sinning in such a sense as to incur guilt. They may be unable, through ignorance, to avoid violating law ; but guilty violations must rest on a conscious and voluntary rejection of duty. No moral being is necessitated to do wrong,—the imposed necessity would imply that the moral element was lost or had never been possessed. To cherish and exercise a dutiful spirit is every man's prerogative, and whoever should do it continually would be accepted of God.

2. Such a being—i.e. a dutiful, obedient being—would absolutely require for his moral improvement and spiritual life and growth, nothing but knowledge, and what stands often in the place of it, viz., faith in the truth which cannot yet be wholly comprehended. We do not say that nothing else could benefit such a being ; for holy impulses from without himself might quicken his pace, enable him to overcome evil influences and temptations without using up so much time or energy ; but if the heart were set on duty, if the purpose bent itself always in the direction of obedience, the reception of sufficient light to enable the traveller to see the path would guarantee its prosecution. Spiritual life—by which is meant the experiences resulting from the soul's real fellowship with God—would be a constant fact in such a being ; the kingdom of God would be within him.

3. In no proper sense would such a being need Regeneration. Never dead in trespasses and sins, there could be no new birth. Being always in Christ, there could be no rendering all things new as the result of an entrance into the relation. The general sentiment of Christendom attributes to the angels just such a moral life and state as this, and whether there be or be not dis-



cernible any *human* beings of this character, does not affect the principle.

4. Those statements of Christ, therefore, which insist on the radical and universal importance of Regeneration, must be understood as corresponding to the actual *facts* in human character and experience, rather than as the exhibition of an abstract principle. As a fact, men sin; they consequently suffer whatever injury results to their character and standing, and whatever disarrangement disturbs the harmony of their moral powers; and so they are to find restoration only by means of Regeneration. Of however many persons it may be affirmed that they have gone out of the way and ceased to do good, of so many may it also be said except they be born again they cannot see the kingdom of God. But whoever lives a true, spiritual, obedient life can say, when others tell of the price by means of which they attain the freedom of spiritual children, "But I was free born."

This point, then, is reached; viz., that, notwithstanding all the disabilities of every sort suffered in consequence of Adam's sin, or in consequence of the sin of our entire ancestry, each human being has the power of obedience in his own individual nature and capacities. Adam's probation did not deprive us of ours. His failure did not cheat us of the trial, nor absolutely doom us to failure. He sustained no such representative relation as that his act became ours; his fall did not doom us to helplessness; his guilt did not put us under condemnation. The son does not bear the iniquity of the father—the sire can make no scape-goat of his child, nor divide with him the responsibility of his own criminal act. Each man acts for himself. His birthright is freedom; his heritage a Canaan of spiritual abundance. Duty is no mocker when it speaks to him solemnly from within and without; and God's fellowship is no tantalizing Hesperides which recedes from him the faster he approaches its shore of beauty. His divinely appointed tasks may be wrought out; his joyous soul-rest as pictured by his imagination and sought by his craving desires may become a glorious daily fact. God deals deceptively with no man;—the inner prophecy of our faith and hope may meet a fulfilment.

By all this it is not meant that we suffer no unwelcome and serious results in consequence of membership in a corrupt race. Along with our moral inheritance that makes communion with the skies our privilege there comes a current of evil influence which has been swelled and strengthened by the tributaries from a hundred generations. Not only does God speak to us the eternal and glorious verities of heaven, but the voices of an ever-increasing company of lying teachers blend about us in a mighty tone, as if to drown the lofty utterance. The tables of the Decalogue are all scrawled over with maxims of expediency that half hide the original inscription. While God has kept the moral scales in the hand of conscience, the pampered passions, that pull down on the one side for victory, have waxed more fat and heavy. All about us still rise the altars before which meditation would take us to worship; but custom, growing more and more tenacious and powerful, clamors loudly for homage. One generation heats up its passions by indulgence, till they scorch and blight the whole soul and burn off the garment of flesh prematurely; and then that terrible heat causes evil tendencies to vegetate all too soon in the souls of the offspring. These are our disadvantages, felt by many, sincerely mourned over by a few. The hereditary and other relations to the past thus put added weights upon us, make our ordeal the more severe, the gauntlet to be run the more trying. But these bonds, thus uniting the race, are mercifully framed and attached. Not only can faith believe in their wholesomeness, but reason can measurably apprehend their value. While they may be made the occasions and instruments of evil, they are indispensable conditions of many forms of good. But of this we cannot stop to speak.

But no man need despair of himself. He may conquer yet; and the victory may have added glory because it is the fruit of a well fought battle. His foes are not more than his helpers. He is never conquered till he capitulates. And just so far as his unfavorable circumstances call for the ampler provision,—when the external foe is so mighty that the old methods and means of repulsion fail to afford him a fair field,—he will find new aids offering themselves. When the human power gives way and

flows out in life-drops in the Gethsemane of trial, the strengthening angel is at hand. When Moses and the Decalogue cannot meet the necessities of an earnest soul, then appears Jesus to preach and live the Sermon on the Mount and give the promise of deliverance. Is this called special grace—a later provision? We reply, it was a special want that called for it and which can never call in vain; and it is only a fuller development,—not a change,—of God's plan and principles of moral government. The gospel is now man's heritage not less than his conscience; Calvary as well as Sinai is a part of the earth; the promises scattered over the New Testament are his, not less than the flowers that smile in his face from beneath, or the stars that kindle over him in the firmament. In taking the inventory of his spiritual helps, a man may now as appropriately forget or omit the mother who bore him to the feet of the divine Presence in her prayer, or hushed him to blessed dreams with a sweet-voiced psalm, as forget or omit Him who comes to be the ever present strength and hope of the submissive and aspiring soul. It is not alone the guilty and sensual that Christ would help. He will not love the soul which always fought sin, less than he loved one which at last consents to spurn its fellowship. But to pass.

What is the state of those who have sinned,—and, of course, of those needing Regeneration?

1. They do not cease to be moral and responsible. They are still free. Because they have sinned once they are not obliged to continue the process. They have power to repent and reform; if not they can incur no further guilt in going on. If they are absolutely dependent on God's sovereign influence for repentance and reform, then God alone is responsible for their future character.

2. They do not lose any constitutional element of human nature. No original power is stolen away, bartered, or destroyed. Any classification of the mental powers that was adequate before, would be still as applicable as ever. The same mental philosophy that previously explained the phenomena of existence will do it still. No part of the mental mechanism has dropped out; not a single wheel or spring is gone; the organic manhood is still entire.

3. No new power has been added ;—no extra foreign force introduced. Phrenologically speaking, there is no new faculty in the mind ; no new protuberance on the skull will appear to show the location of the extra power. The sin has been wrought by the same mind that, up to the present time, has avoided it. It is not that a foreign foe has crept in by stealth and subsidized our powers ; we ourselves have done the deed that condemns us.

4. But on the other hand, there is a disregard of the authority of conscience and moral obligation, forever felt to be supreme in the soul. No man can help regarding the voice of his conscience as the assertion of the highest law, nor avoid the loss of self-respect when he disregards its claim. Up to the present time it may be supposed that this moral power has been yielded to ; now the rightful ruler has been at least temporarily dethroned.

5. But, while the conscience has been denied the privilege of governing us, and its authority has been set aside, our action has been determined on some other, and of course, on some lower grounds. We never act intelligently without motives ;—in other words we never act in one direction rather than another without some ground or reason for so doing—if it be not a degradation of that word to employ it in such a connection. And in discarding the higher and better motive we have adopted and acted on the lower. The conscience protests against the wrong course. What is it then that points out that course, calls for its adoption and endorses it? It must be either blind impulse, improperly cherished desire, or planning self-interest ; for, setting obligation aside, these are the motive forces that remain. Neither of these is a proper guide or safe counsellor. They were not meant to be rulers but servants. They have their high uses in the human economy, but they are good in their own sphere, not otherwise. Every man who sins, therefore, has, for the time, done two wrong and dangerous things, besides performing the outward act ;—he has wrested the sceptre from that part of his nature which God has made regal, and then he has given it, for the time at least, to another portion whose only office is to serve and obey. We do not forget that the mind is a unit ;

we use this form of speech for the sake of a clearer designation of the wrong deed.

6. This act of sin has destroyed the internal harmony of the doer. Monarch and vassal have changed places; and from both the throne and the footstool will come forth the elements of a fierce struggle. A real king is kingly in his humiliation. A conscience is made to rule,—to serve can never be its normal function. It must protest against the usurpation for which it suffers,—it cannot help struggling to regain its seat. It will never cease save as it is paralyzed, wholly perverted or destroyed; and neither of these things is very likely to take place. The passion, the selfish tendency, was never made to rule, but to be a subordinate. In its false position it will use the newly gotten power strangely and mischievously. It will prescribe any laws but wise and good ones, and it will resist to the last the determined efforts of the conscience to regain its seat. Life loses thus its internal harmony. Opposing and mighty forces are at war, and the soul is like a troubled sea when it cannot rest.

7. There results from this act of sin a diminution of moral power. The conscience is practically weakened by being once overborne; the passion has acquired strength and become more clamorous in consequence of triumph and indulgence. The soul has taken a wrong bias, and so, besides the former work of keeping it erect, there is required an added energy sufficient to overcome its leaning. And every act of sin carries this deteriorating process further and further forward.

8. Conscious guilt is incurred as another result of the sin. Before God and his law—once the desired standing-place—the soul feels uneasy and blushes with hanging head. Innocence has departed and given up its place to self-reproach. And this last has not only sometimes a tendency toward repentance, but often a tendency in the opposite direction. The first impulse of a self-condemned man is perhaps always to retrace the step; but if that be not yielded to—and as a fact it is only seldom that it is so yielded to—it is followed by a prevailing tendency to hide or excuse the crime. So the pair in Eden

sought the shelter of the trees, and when they could be hidden no longer, they came forward in an attempt at self-vindication; and no one who reads history or studies himself can fail to perceive that they have begotten children in their own likeness. And when that sense of guilt becomes intense, it often, perhaps usually, operates to blot out the hope of redemption, and so paralyzes all effort in that direction.

This is the fallen state of man. What now does he need to remedy his condition, and bring to him the spiritual life which he was made and fitted to enjoy? The answer to that question will be a definition of Regeneration; for all agree in believing that this is the work effected by Regeneration.

In view of what has been said, the answer is simple. His sin does not result from excess or deficiency of powers, but from the misuse of them,—disarrangement, abuse and perversion. His passions are good things; so are his instincts and appetites; so is his regard for himself. These are all needful forces, but they have no principle of self-regulation. They are not a law unto themselves. Over and above them God has set intellect and conscience, the one to discern the facts, the other to apply and enforce the law. Appetite and desire are excited by any and every object corresponding to them; their awaking is no sin; it is not a matter of choice whether they shall wake, but one of necessity. But it is then the office of the ruling powers to decide when, how and how far they may find gratification. The desire for food is the condition of life; its indulgence without restraint makes the sin of gluttony and drunkenness. The love of true power and distinction is the perpetual impulse to the ascent of a man or an angel; indulged without limit and unrestrained by moral law, its offspring is the demon of selfish ambition. The impulse to ward off danger is our source of safety; follow its promptings blindly and its matured fruit fills the heart with revenge. And it is in this perverted form of action that sin always consists. What is wanted, therefore, is a restoration of the powers of the man to their normal relations and functions, and a moral help to preserve their balance and promote their culture. That makes the man's nature whole and glorious; and when his guilt is pardoned and God bends over him in tender-

ness and sympathy and fellowship, a new spiritual life is kindled whose expansion shall be the object, and whose added vigor the glory, of an eternal future.

But to specify :

1. Regeneration practically re-establishes the authority of the conscience,—enlightening and invigorating it for a still more royal service, quickening it with an energy that makes its voice like the echoed speech of God.

2. It subdues and subordinates the passions and the tendencies toward self, so that they are servants more or less docile at the feet of a higher lawgiver, and learn to act under the direction of duty.

3. It stills the inward tumult and gives unity to the soul's action. Peace has succeeded to the storm; and the spirit is a quiet arsenal of harmonious forces.

4. By a well known law, moral power to resist evil tendency or achieve an external result, is greatly augmented and put on the path of constant progression.

5. There comes also an assurance that the incurred guilt is forgiven us; so that the soul rises from the stooping of its fear, full of hope and courage and humble self-reliance as it stands before men and God.

6. The goodness and mercy and love, which have been concerned in effecting this regenerating work, open its eyes newly to its obligations, awaken its deep joy and gratitude, excite a sympathy for God's glory and man's welfare that bind it to duty with the strongest moral cords; while the glowing future bears the spirit onward to where it shall drop off all the badges of its wretched years and life, and awake satisfied in God's likeness.

The agencies in Regeneration may be easily inferred. They are :

1. God; in his manifestations, special and general, in nature, providence and the Bible.

2. The word of truth; the foolishness of preaching, teaching us what we are, showing us how we are fallen, revealing our perils, offering us deliverance.

3. The Spirit of grace, giving that word reality, making it quick and powerful, bringing it home to our remembrance and hearts.

Ourselves; conscious of sin, suffering from quiet, craving peace, and at last yielding ourselves to these higher influences which have been adapted to our wants and are mighty for our quickening.

It is objected that this view makes too little of conversion! We do not see the ground of the objection. Does it make less than the facts or the scriptures make of it? Is it a light thing? Is it nothing or little to restore a turbulent family, or a belligerent state to quiet and harmony? Is it a slight thing to bring out of a block of marble the Greek slave or the Belvidere Apollo? from some varied pigments to develop the Transfiguration of Raphael? or group the words of a lexicon into Patrick Henry's speech, or Shakespeare's Hamlet, or Milton's Paradise Lost? But there are more significant elements in the chaotic and sinful soul capable of more surprising combinations and grander results, when God puts forth his hand to create the spirit anew and bring out its resources and shine upon it with his glory.

---

#### ART. VI.—ESTHER.

Sacred History and also profane, are valuable as records of past events, and especially so as they show that God reigns over the nations of the earth and providentially superintends the affairs of men. "He putteth down one and setteth up another." "He causeth the wrath of man to praise Him." "The counsel of the froward is carried headlong." "The blind are led by a way they knew not." "The wise are taken in their own craftiness." "The way of the wicked is turned upside down. Those that dig a pit for the good to fall into, fall into it themselves; and those that plot for the ruin of the good, find that disaster, confusion, dismay and destruction come upon themselves. He who notices the falling sparrow, careth for the righteous, and will have them "in everlasting remembrance."



The first universal monarchy was the Assyrian. It was denoted by the golden head of the metallic image in Dan. Ch. 2, and the beast like a lion with eagle's wings in Ch. 7. This empire was idolatrous and wicked. It repeatedly made war upon God's people, the Jews in Palestine, finally prevailed over them,—took Jerusalem,—destroyed the temple and carried the people into captivity to Babylon. After the empire had existed 1695 years it fell by its own corruptions B. C. 538. The account of its fall is recorded in Dan. Ch. 5. Belshazzar the king was slain, the Persians and Medes under Cyrus were the victors, and the Medo-Persian empire commenced.

This empire was designated by the breast and arms of silver in the image, Dan. Ch. 2; and the beast like a bear in Ch. 7. The captivity being ended, the history of the Jews, as contained in the books Nehemiah, Ezra and Esther, is connected with the affairs of the Medo-Persian empire. Often the reigning princes showed God's people great favors, and for a time the empire had much prosperity and power, but it became voluptuous, oppressive and corrupt. After existing 207 years it fell, being subdued by the Grecians under Alexander the conqueror, B. C. 331. Esther was the queen of the Persian prince, called in Scripture Ahasuerus.

#### WHO WAS AHASUERUS ?

Histories of the Persians give a somewhat full account of the reigning monarchs, but no one is mentioned bearing this name. It becomes then a question of some interest as to which of the kings the sacred writer in the book of Esther applies the name Ahasuerus. In Ezra Ch. 4, a ruler is mentioned named Ahasuerus. But this was not the Ahasuerus of Esther. Both Rollin and Dr. Clarke say this was a prince named Cambyses.

Those who have investigated, have not come to a uniform conclusion. Usher, the author of the chronology of the Bible, was of opinion that Ahasuerus was Darius. He reigned 36 years and was the prince, who, as recorded in Ezra ch. 6, enforced the decree for rebuilding the temple in Jerusalem. Rollin notices this view of Usher, and being aware that others thought differently, declares he will not engage in controversies of this kind, but he

follows Usher in chronology much, and more than intimates that he agrees with him on this subject.

Dr. Kitto says it was Xerxes, son of Darius, who succeeded him to the throne. He was a powerful ruler but violent and oppressive. He reigned 13 years. He collected the largest army ever known. This army with its attendants numbered five millions. He led it against the Lacedemonians. The campaign was attended with disaster, and Xerxes after various misfortunes abandoned himself to ease and luxury and was murdered while asleep by Artabanus, captain of his guards. Dr. Kitto defends his opinion with some reason, and then says, "To desire stronger evidence is to mistake the nature of the question."

Dr. Prideaux who lived 250 years ago, maintained that it was Artaxerxes, surnamed Longimanus. Others were of the same opinion. Dr. Adam Clarke coincides in this same belief.

Among the reasons for believing that Ahasuerus was Artaxerxes, two may be named. In the history of Esther, as we shall see, he judged righteously concerning the Jews and favored them when they were in great jeopardy. He also was favorable to this people in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah. The other evidence is, that the chronology of Esther's time in the Bible is between 462 and 453 B. C., and Rollin gives this as part of the time in which Artaxerxes reigned.

The most probable reason for the surname Longimanus given by historians is that his right hand was longer than his left. As already seen his father Xerxes was murdered. But Artaxerxes was not the next heir to the throne, as his brothers Darius and Hystaspes were older. He was assisted by his uncle Artabanus in killing Darius, and then he ascended the throne. Next, finding that Artabanus was plotting to drive him from it he killed him. Then the sons of this Artabanus were in the way. Forces were raised, a bloody battle fought, and the enemies of the king vanquished. The next year he fought a battle with the forces of his brother Hystaspes, overcame him and thus through blood and carnage, secured possession of the empire. He reigned about 49 years, and died a natural death.

#### STATE OF THE JEWS.

The idolatrous apostasy of God's chosen people together with

other criminal enormities was the cause of the captivity. Still God had witnesses; Isaiah and Ezekiel had foretold what would come unless there was a reform, and Jeremiah, a man of unblemished piety and conscientious integrity, pathetically warned and implored his countrymen to turn lest ruin should come. His entreaties and expostulations were delivered just on the eve of the captivity. He lived to witness the terrible catastrophe, and in view of it wrote in deep sorrow and mourning the Book of Lamentations.

Daniel went with the Jews into captivity, but he feared God and adhered unflinchingly to the right. He found favor with the Assyrian monarch and God wrought wonderful deliverances for him, and enabled him to foretell the rise and fall of empires, the coming of Christ and the glory that should follow. At the end of the captivity he was aged and it is doubtful if he returned to Judea.

From the termination of the captivity to the time of Esther about a century passed. Zeal for God and vital piety had somewhat revived. Ezra labored for the rebuilding of the temple, and when the foundation was laid amid the tears and rejoicings of the people, Haggai took up the "Harp of prophecy" and declared that "the topmost stone should be brought on with shouting, crying grace, grace unto it;" and that "the glory of this latter house should exceed that of the former;" also that Christ, "the desire of all nations should come;" and grace this temple with his presence. Nehemiah too was faithful. He was cup-bearer to king Artaxerxes. This office was conferred only on such as could be trusted. It was a place of honor; the one who filled it was near the king's person, and often could make requests and obtain favors for himself or others. This pious man had the broken down walls of Jerusalem repaired; became governor of Judea, then a Persian province, and was successful in reforming many of the bad practices of the Jews.

It was in the reign of Artaxerxes also that Esdras, as related in the Apocrypha, obtained a commission to return to Jerusalem with such Jews as were disposed and settle the Jewish government and religion according to their laws. It is interesting to observe that it appears from the commission that Artaxerxes was

not only just to the Jews, but had some knowledge and veneration for the God of Israel as he said, "Let all things be performed after the law of God diligently, unto the Most High God, that wrath come not upon the kingdom of the king and his son. Esdras Ch. 7. Such is a short sketch of the zeal and faith of the times, but when we come to the events of Esther, it will appear probable that as a whole an interest in the true worship and work of God was low as indeed it was through the four centuries that followed till the coming of Christ.

#### ESTHER BECOMES QUEEN.

The king in the third year of his reign made a great feast to the princes, servants and people. If this king was Artaxerxes Longimanus, the feast occurred soon after he prevailed over the factions against him as he came to the throne, as Rollin states that work was finished in the second year of his reign. The king and probably others were merry with wine and he sent for his queen, Vashti, to come into his presence, that he might show the princes and people her beauty. She refused, not wishing to be the gaze of a drunken court. The king put her away by divorcement; apprehensive that women might take occasion from this example of the queen not to submit to the most rigid authority of their husbands, letters were sent that each man should bear rule in his own house. Then fair maidens from every part of the realm were brought that from them the king might elect a queen. Esther, an orphan Jewish maiden, who had been adopted by her uncle Mordecai, was among the number. She was fair and beautiful; the king chose her and she became his queen.

#### HAMAN OFFENDED.

Haman was the first or highest minister of state. Mordecai, a Jew, who had been a captive in Babylon, was keeper of the king's gate. He refused to bow to Haman as he passed out or in. Why did he refuse? Blair thinks it was because Haman was an Amalekite, a race at enmity with the Jewish people. But it is by no means certain that he was an Amalekite. Calmet thinks that this obeisance was not merely civil respect, but a sort of divine honor, such as was sometimes addressed to the Persian

monarchs themselves. This probably was the true reason. Haman was proud and wicked. Mordecai could not respect him, and as to showing him divine honor, that would have been idolatry.

#### DECREE FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF THE JEWS.

Haman was offended at the want of respect, reverence and homage of Mordecai towards himself. He was "full of wrath." It is written of the king that on the refusal of Vashti to come into his presence as before narrated, he was "very wroth, and his anger burned in him." How terrible is anger! The highest authority asserts that "it resteth in the bosom of fools." Also that "the wrath of the king is as messengers of death." And "the king's wrath is as the roaring of a lion." Violent anger is not only mischievous to those who are made to feel the effects of the irritated person's revenge, but not unfrequently the angry are the greatest sufferers. Anger has even proved fatal. History records that Valentinian, Emperor of Rome for eleven years, became so angry simply at the solicitation of some ambassadors, who plead the innocency of the people they represented and against whom the Romans were at war, that his eyes, voice, color and gestures expressed the violence of his ungoverned fury, and while his whole frame was agitated with convulsive passion, a large blood-vessel suddenly burst in his body, and in a few moments he expired in the greatest agony. This was A. D. 375. [See Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.*] Also the Sultan of Turkey, named Solyman, about 1572 came to Germany with an army, invested the town of Zigeeth which held out with the greatest bravery, refusing to surrender and bidding defiance to the invaders. The Sultan was so angry that he expired from the intensity of his rage. [Abbott's *History of Austria.*] Death by anger is not only hard dying, but terribly disgraceful.

Had Haman planned only the death of Mordecai, possibly he might have succeeded with no injury to himself. But Mordecai alone was not enough to gratify the malignity of his feelings, and he knowing that he was a Jew, at once determined the destruction of all the Jewish people. How many Jews there were at that time it is impossible to tell. Some 80 years before

the account of those that returned from the captivity, Ezra Ch .II : v 64, gives the number as forty two thousand three hundred and sixty, besides seven thousand three hundred servants and maids and two hundred singers, v. 65. It might be safe to estimate them in the time now being noticed at one hundred thousand.

Haman went to the king and made charges against the Jews that their laws were diverse from all people. This was somewhat true, yet nothing in their favor in the judgment of this idolatrous prince ; they worshipped the God of heaven according to God's own laws. No other people did this. Then he charged that they did not keep the king's laws. The king heard attentively. Then Haman made a bold request that there be a decree for their destruction. And lest the king should fear because of a loss to the government from the tax that came into the Treasury from this people, he offered to remedy that by paying ten thousand talents out of his own funds.

This sum at the lowest estimate of a talent was more than ten and a half millions of dollars. It is by no means incredible that he offered so much. Wealth was abundant in the Persian empire, denoted in the metallic image by the breast and arms of silver. Dan. Ch. II. In those times silver and gold were more plenty than now. In Solomon's reign over five hundred years before, these were so common that they were used in a great variety of ways. And in those ages persons were found immensely rich. Herodotus mentions Pythius in the Persian Empire, who had wealth amounting to twenty-seven and a half millions. We have also an account of Cræsus, who had over fifteen and a half millions. Ridorus had more than five millions. Lentulus had sixteen and a half millions. And one named Apicus, four and a half millions, and when this became reduced to about four hundred thousand dollars, he deemed it too little for his demands, and terminated his life by poison.

Ahasuerus confided in Haman and readily acceded to his request. The decree went forth for taking the life of every Jew in the empire, young and old, on a certain day. It is almost incredible that a ruler of a great people should decree the massacre of such a portion of his subjects on so slight evidence of wrong on their part. But authority and power in the hands of

despots and tyrants and men of consummate wickedness is dangerous in the extreme. God-given rights are wrested, chains and prisons and death inflicted on the unoffending and the innocent. And so late as 1770 an affair transpired in Europe almost parallel to this decree of the Persian monarch. There was war between Turkey and Russia, and the council of the Grand Seignior determined to exterminate the Greeks entirely as a punishment for their defection. They were saved by the mediation of Hassan Pacha.

The circulation of the decree caused the greatest consternation among the Jews. There were mourning, weeping and wailing. Mordecai clothed himself in sackcloth, and cried with a loud and bitter cry. Could the threatened blow be averted? It was easy for him to see that it was hopeless for him or any considerable number of the most worthy of the condemned people to undertake to have audience with the king and plead his mercy. But his sagacity enabled him to see that there was one plan that might succeed. This was for Esther, the queen, to go to the king and make supplication. He communicated this to her. There were difficulties in the way of this, and she stated them. If one, no matter how near the king in relationship or honor, should go into his presence uninvited, it was certain death, unless at the time he should be pleased to receive him. And she had not been invited for thirty days. Courage and perseverance are equal to the greatest difficulties, and he insisted that she should make the effort. Then hope began to cheer him and faith to strengthen. He informed her that if she did not act, she would not escape being destroyed, but deliverance would come to the Jews he thought from some other quarter. Then using an argument as powerful as any that could be employed he asked, "Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?" A question often worthy of the consideration of rulers, ministers of the gospel, and many in more private situations. What are the designs of Providence concerning thee? What is the special thing in which thou art called to act at seeming hazard for the good of others, the public and the world? Our late President who was assassinated, understood for what he had come into power. So have many ministers of Christ.

Esther saw her duty. She resolved to act. She directed Mordecai to gather the Jews of that place and let them fast three days and nights. She and her maidens would fast likewise. And she said, "I will go in unto the king, which is not according to the law; and if I perish, I perish." What was the encouragement? Outwardly it was not much. It has been called "The forlorn hope." But God was in the heavens. None of the names by which he is known are found in the book of Esther, but he was in the history. If zeal for the Lord of hosts was low as undoubtedly it was, prominent Jews had not forgotten those faithful men Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai and Zerrubbabel, who had lived and acted valiantly but a very few years before. In connection with fasting there must have been confidence in the Lord Jehovah, perhaps some prayer and trust.

#### ESTHER'S EFFORT.

On the third day of the fast the time had come for Esther to go in unto the king and plead for her people. She arrayed herself in her royal robes, which were in all the richness and gorgeousness of a wealthy eastern court. She went gently forward, one moment perhaps hopeful, the next fearful and desponding. The eye of the stern monarch sees her. Will he frown and order instant death, or will he bid her approach and listen to her petition? Much was depending on the decision of a moment.—At the battle of Waterloo the serried ranks of the allied army against the French under Napoleon seemed about to be defeated when Wellington expressed the wish that Blucher would come with a re-enforcement, or that night would come. Who could but have wished and prayed that God in whose hand is the heart of the kings of the earth would have interposed in the case now being narrated? An early king of France, who was a papist and his queen a protestant, in the hardest part of a battle with his enemies, addressed Heaven and said, "God of queen Clotilda, give me the victory and I will be a protestant." And many might have prayed, "God of the hosts of Israel, give queen Esther success, and save the Jews from slaughter."

She must succeed. Jehovah answers prayer "in the secret place of thunder." She must succeed, Haman's plan be over-



turned, or what becomes of God's promises that in Abraham's seed all of the families of the earth should be blessed, and the sceptre should not depart from Judah till Shiloh come?

We resume the narrative. The king extends the golden sceptre as a signal for Esther to approach. Her heart is filled with gladness and the heavens rejoice. "Give praise to God" and "laud him all ye people." The queen drew near and touched the top of the sceptre.

Then the king asked what was her request, promising to grant it if it took half of the kingdom. Favorable moment was it not? No, the queen, who was endowed with much wisdom, was aware that the time had not yet come to present her petition. The way must be fully prepared or the whole might fail. So she simply asked that the king and Haman come that day to a banquet she had prepared. Both came, and the king again asked what was her request. She saw that she was gaining his confidence, but she was not sure the proper time had come. She requested therefore that both come to a like banquet the next day.

Things moved fast in the next twenty-four hours. Providence superintended in preparing the way for the direct accomplishment of the downfall of Haman and the deliverance of his chosen people.

Haman on retiring from the first banquet walked in pride and with a glad heart. But passing Modecai at the gate all his fancied bliss forsook him as Mordecai refused to bow to him. He hastened to his family, told his wife of all. She with others counselled him to erect a gallows some seventy-five feet high, and the next day ask the king to have Mordecai hanged thereon. Agreed, said Haman.—The wicked are rash and in a hurry; so their plans for the discomfiture of the righteous often defeat themselves. God takes time to bring about his purposes. The good work under his direction and are sure to succeed.

That night God troubled the heathen king. Sleep departed from him. "Shushan was perplexed" at the decree that had gone forth, and doubtless the king's mind was in conflict. He ordered the chronicles read to him that he might know of past matters. It was found recorded that about two years before, two persons in the palace had committed treason and sought the

king's life; that Mordecai on discovering the plot had given information, the king was saved, and they punished with death; and that for this Mordecai had not been rewarded.

In the morning Haman went to the court to ask that Mordecai be hanged. Probably the king was aware that this or some mischief was intended. He anticipated him by asking "what should be done to the man whom the king delighteth to honor? Haman thought that must be himself, so he replied, "let him be arrayed in royal apparel with a crown upon his head; let him ride through the city, and one proclaim before him, 'Thus shall it be done to the man whom the king delighteth to honor.' " "Do this to Mordecai," said the king. It was done and Haman to his unspeakable mortification and distress, was thus obliged to proclaim before this Jew the honor of the king. Thus "God putteth down one and setteth up another."

Haman tried to find relief by pouring out his complaint to his family and friends. They proved "miserable comforters" as they began to predict his fall. But in a moment he was called by the king's officers to the second banquet that Esther had prepared. He went out and left his home forever.

Injured innocence then could be heard, and the cause of the right vindicated. The queen was asked to speak. She presented the case of her people, stated they were sold, to be slain, and to perish. With artless simplicity and the tender winning grace of her sex, she plead for deliverance from the cruel decree. She told the king that wicked Haman was the one who had plotted the whole enormous crime.

Ahasuerus began to see what justice required. He immediately ordered that Haman be hanged on the gallows he had prepared for Mordecai. "He that diggeth a pit shall fall therein."—"Harm watch, harm catch" is a modern proverb. Perillus was the first person burnt alive in the brazen bull he had made for the punishment of others. Some engaged in the gun-powder treason in England early in the seventeenth century, in attempting to escape, were blown up by powder on which sparks of fire happened to fall.—And he, who invented the guillotine in the French Revolution of 1792 was the first to feel the keenness of its edge. The decree was reversed as far as it could be, the

Jews saved, Haman's possessions confiscated, Mordecai raised to fill his place as prime minister, and the city of Shushan and the Jews everywhere filled with joy and gladness.

This is all we have of the account of Esther. Her public acts so far as published were performed in a short space of time. They were however important. The weal of multitudes was involved in them. Joan of Arc turned the tide of war against the English and in favor of the French, when Henry VI. was contending for the throne of the latter country.—Isabel of Spain assisted Columbus in fitting out vessels to discover the American continent. And Elizabeth ruled the British realm with great ability. Many others of the sex have done nobly, but Esther excelled them all.

---

#### ART. VII.—THE MILLENNIUM.

The fragment; \* entitled "Christian Growth," was designed to show that the human race was placed in an earthly probation for growth, as seeds are placed in the soil for germination, and that the growth already attained, as well as that more perfect development foretoked for the future, results from the operation of celestial influences,—influences not always nor every where uniform in kind or degree, but varying as Providence has seen best that sunshine and rain should vary on different portions of the earth,—and that the ultimate development of humanity is provided for through Christianity alone.

From the views there presented it follows that the promised triumph of Christ and his gospel to which the church has given the name of millennium, will be an integral part of the gospel dispensation, — not a substitute for it, —not something that comes after it. It will be the ripening of the "full corn in the ear" — the perfection of that which is now seen in the germ.

\*See page 69, of the present volume of the Quarterly.

The propagation of an opposite view which places the millennium after a literal resurrection and the renovation of the earth by fire, and makes it consist in a visible reign of Jesus with his saints for a thousand years, has been the source of many extravagant follies and heresies. But for this, Millerism, with its resulting materialism, could never have taken root to darken the church by the shadow of its gourd-like growth. This theory denies the facts of history by declaring that the race only waxes worse and worse and manifests no tendency to progress. It perpetuates degrading interpretations of the Scriptures by substituting a materializing literalism for the truth which they meant to teach. Like the ancient Jews it insists that the Messiah's kingdom must be a temporal and material one, with the Saviour in a local capital swaying the sceptre of the world from the throne of David; and it joins the Pharisees in denying that Jesus is now setting up his kingdom because it "cometh not with observation." By denying that Jesus has come to destroy the works of the devil, and teaching that this will be done only at his second coming, it contradicts the New Testament. It impeaches Providence and inculcates a view of the gospel plan of redemption which makes it little better than a failure. While parading the success of missions as a sign of the speedy close of the gospel age, it treats the hope that animates Christ's chosen band of missionaries as a delusion.

That this doctrine impeaches Providence appears in this. The enterprise and scholarship of the Christian nations hear the voice of Providence saying, "Perfect your mastery over nature; make her yield up all her secrets; use all her powers in the spread of civilization, in the service of peace and righteousness." But these theorists impeach Providence, by assuming that all the wonderful discoveries in science, which are annihilating space, giving ubiquity to thought and making human power and ingenuity almost omnipotent, have come too late to be of service in the spread of knowledge or of Christianity. Long before man was created, God was storing in the depths of earth, treasures of wealth and sources of power which man has just begun to bring forth and put to use, and which seem to have been specially reserved by Providence for this and coming ages, and for the

nations who will employ them in subduing the earth to the dominion of the Messiah. Yet this theory declares that they were garnered there, not to serve in building up Christian civilization, but solely to add fierceness to the heart of the last conflagration. Human pity, expressed in philanthropic efforts and in political and religious reforms, is giving promise that, enlightened and commissioned by divine love, it will yet triumph over opposing affections and lift up the weak and the crushed. This promise millenarians refuse to see or they dismiss it as a hollow pretence. Providence has interposed in behalf of human freedom. Along the track of history we see nations are led, however slowly into the light of ideal justice and liberty,—an ideal remote as yet, but which we see may be realized whenever men shall become intelligent and be controlled by love.

That the gospel is designed thus to inform and control men, the theory of a millennium after the resurrection denies, and thus wars against both Providence and the gospel. It takes all the significance out of the great Master's order to the church—"Go ye into all the world." It belittles or nullifies the meaning of the promise that Christ shall have the heathen for an inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession. It takes for granted that the gospel, inaugurated by the realization of a thought so stupendous as the appearance of the Infinite Sovereign in the form and condition of his sinful subjects, as their Mediator and Saviour, is to cease its redeeming power, before it has had half as long to save as idolatry had had to corrupt mankind. It assumes that the plan of redemption is to have no mature development, but is to fade from the earth while it is budding with civil, social and intellectual as well as religious awakenings full of richest promise for the future, and while those whom the gospel has most highly blessed are sensible that it has not yet fully displayed its saving power any where, and while they see that by the force of culture and example, it may work a far more complete as well as more general salvation in coming centuries than is possible in this.

The assumption that the work of the church in obedience to the command to "disciple all nations" is very soon to end, is nothing less than the charge that God will abandon the scheme

of saving men through Christ crucified as at best a partial failure. It is not strange that in early ages of confusion and persecution, when the minds of men were not free from the influence of Jewish and even pagan ideas this theory was welcomed. It is not strange that devotees of popery, who keep a relic of idolatry in the worship of images and the adoration of the consecrated wafer, should hold this notion also. It may have been for a time at least cherished by Luther, amid the appalling cruelties and corruptions of his time, but any mind that holds it at the present day must be a victim of ignorance or of uncandid prejudice.

One, stumbling upon the materials for a building—piles of stone and brick,—lying in indiscriminate confusion, might innocently mistake them for rubbish of which the ground should be cleared. But only ignorance and stupidity could pronounce the same decision after those materials begin to take shape under the hands of the workman. Or a traveler arriving along paths of spotted trees, at some locality where a pioneer in the wilderness had just gathered his first harvest, and looking over the solitary clearing, with its blackened stumps already sprouting amid the stubble, and into the lonely hovel—a poor shelter against the winter's cold or the savage dwellers in the wilderness,—might be pardoned for predicting, "Here is a wretched experiment just coming to its end." But such a prediction applied to the work of the hardy settlers of New England, and repeated from year to year, after annual harvests begin to wave where the dank forest trees tossed their arms, stately mansions to replace the temporary cabins, and groups of children to be training in the schools to carry forward their sires' work and more than fill their places, would not have been more signally refuted by the intention of the pilgrims and the results of their toils, than this millennial theory is contradicted by the revealed plan of the gospel and the course of Providence.

More and more it appears an unworthy and wicked travesty of trust and truth, as each successive age brings its testimony to the power of Christianity. Christians are rising to a clearer apprehension of the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom, and of the grandeur of the promise "Lo I am with you always," which is increasingly the inspiration of the church, and which will yet

marshal its united hosts for aggressive action as victorious armies are wont to be aroused by the summons to battle and the assurance of victory.

“But,” it may be asked, “does not prophecy indicate that a grand consummation is drawing near?” So it certainly seems. And has not the world already seen several, since the Christian dispensation began? First, when Jerusalem and the Jewish dispensation came to their prophesied termination, and again, in the predicted destruction of the Roman Empire? And was not another the end of the dark ages and the rise of protestantism which began with Wickliffe and Huss and culminated with Luther?

We trust they have not read amiss the prophetic visions nor the signs of the times who look for wondrous things in the coming kingdom of the Son of man. The Lord is coming in grander than material changes. Earth shall have a purification more sublime, and more needed, than any by material fire! Nay, the Lord has come “to send fire on the earth and what . . . if it is already kindled!”\*

Christian toiler, thou art on the road to a millennium. Its be-tokening earthquakes and falling stars are around thee in the convulsions that shake the moral and political world. The command to thee is to be—“looking for and hastening the coming of that day of the Lord.”† Act so that each to-morrow may find it nearer than to-day. Act under the inspiration of the grand thought that thou art helping on the time when from the remotest region of the earth the last tribe of savage men shall have exclaimed as did the converted son of China, “This gospel was made for me!” Nay more, for the time when from the whole world the influence of idolatry shall have disappeared as completely as that of our Saxon ancestors has faded from the Christian minds of Europe and America; for the time when Greek and Papal superstitions shall have ended; when organized tyranny shall have dropped its gory sceptre and hidden its grim and sinister visage; when doubting and

\*Luke 12: 49.

†2 Pet. 3; 12.

unbelief concerning the character and work of Jesus shall all be dissipated and every successor of them who wagged the head derisively at the cross shall be shamed into silence; when the Jews seeing that the cross has become the sceptre of power as well as the symbol of mercy to the whole world, shall bow at last in penitence and homage. Then as the stars, though still holding their positions in the sky, are extinguished by daylight, so all the civilizations of the past and the present, though keeping their places in history, will fade from view in the sunshine of that universal civilization whose glory shall be the brotherhood of man and the headship of Christ.

---

#### ART. VIII.—THE PHILOSOPHY OF DIVINE WORSHIP.

We can conceive of no tangible system of religion, either true or false, except as worship is its fundamental element. The character of any system of religion, is accurately portrayed in the character of its worship, whatever the pretensions or doctrines, the disguises or drapery of the system may be. True worship constitutes the great centre of human duty about which all other duties cluster like grains of steel about a magnet, and these will be properly performed if worship itself is acceptable and constant. To ignore or neglect worship, is to draw the bolt of centripetal force and hurl the soul without the attraction of a central sun into the void of infidelity.

The capacity for spiritual growth is in exact proportion to the clearness of our conceptions of the nature of true worship, and a knowlege of its philosophy is essential to the formation and growth of a symmetrical Christian character. Some devotional minds seem to leap at once as if by intuition into the true idea of perfect worship; but generally the study of God's word, the searching of our own hearts, and a long course of training in spir-



itual life lead us to a knowledge of those spiritual things which are spiritually discerned.

#### WHAT IS WORSHIP ?

The term worship is applied to that adoration or reverence, which springs from the necessary constitution of the human soul, toward some being or object conceived as divine. Worship is false when it is offered to an impure or unworthy object, and when offered to God in an impure or unworthy manner. True worship is the adoration of the heart, offered in a proper manner to the living and true God. It implies a rational conception of God and of his divine authority, an obedient disposition of heart toward him as God, and a voluntary and active exercise of the powers of the soul in rendering unto him the glory due unto his name. Subjectively, it is the exercise of mingled fear, respect and affection; objectively, it manifests itself in acts of prayer, praise and thanksgiving. When acceptable worship is performed, the Holy Spirit bears witness with the soul by actual communication; and that lifting of the soul to God and special recognition by him is called communion with God. Worship is essentially the same whether offered by saint or seraph, on earth or in heaven. A higher degree of intelligence, purer associations, freedom from depravity and earthly hindrances, clearer conceptions of the plan of salvation, closer union with God, and a more absorbing interest in spiritual things—all these may conspire to make the worship of heaven purer and holier, but they can never change its essential character. To be a devout worshiper here is to learn on earth the celestial song and to feast on angel's food; for God sends royal robes and heavenly crowns to invest the contrite soul in his presence, yet worshipping this side the river.

#### MOTIVES TO WORSHIP.

As worship is the voluntary adoration of the heart, the soul must be stirred by the purest motives in its approach to the veiled mysteries of the inner sanctuary. The rewards of virtue and the penalties of disobedience are not the highest motives to worship but they serve to awaken the soul from its apathy and neglect. Moral obligation lays the iron hand of the task-master upon us and

demands obedience, but it fails to melt the heart or fill the soul with devotion.

Our nature demands communion with God and longs after pure and exalted worship at times ; but its demand is unsatisfied, and an aching void is left because it cannot lead itself to God. When there are no such longings, there is a consciousness of degradation and of a failure to answer the ends of our being. A soul without worship is an ocean without tides,—stagnant, loathsome, full of venomous reptiles, reeking with noisome and corrupting vapors. Whatever the aspirations of the soul after purity, it can never realize them without the aid of the Divine Spirit. The ocean needs its storm and the wind its gust. So the will and judgment, the emotions and sympathies, must be shaken and persuaded by an eternal force ; and “we love Him because he first loved us.” Nothing but the love of Christ can melt the heart and inspire affectionate reverence toward a holy God. Through sympathy with the man of Calvary we learn to seek God’s glory first ; then penalty, reward obligation and aspiration all urge us to commune with God.

#### CONDITONS OF WORSHIP.

God has fixed the conditions of his own worship, and we can neither alter nor abridge them. He has even required us to distinguish between an exact outward performance of the act of worship and the inner worship of the heart. A corpse may be galvanized into activity, but it is a corpse still. A dead heart may put on all the outward activities of worship and still be rotting with corruption. “They that worship God must worship Him in spirit and in truth.”

First, God requires a pure outline of Christian doctrine, without which we can have no just conceptions of worship. We cannot innocently beignorant of sin, the law, the penalty, the atonement, pardon, holiness and heaven. God himself has given us our hand-book of instructions, and will not accept our worship unless we use it as our guide. To prefer the speculations of reason to the authoritative truths of revelation is an insult to God which He will not allow. He will accept no acts of worship offered in needless ignorance of his own revealed truth, nor in defiance to it,

and the false plea of honest ignorance will not deceive the Divine Spirit while God's word is before us.

True worship must also accept Christ as the only medium of approach to God; not as a theory, but as a fact; not as a doctrine, but as a Savior. Humanity possesses no self-elevating religious principle, whatever its wants and aspirations may be; and if we reject Christ as the Divine Word "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

A proper condition of heart must always precede or accompany worship. Sweet water cannot come from a bitter fountain, nor pure worship from an unconverted heart. When the sinner has tasted the delights of forgiveness, the heart must be kept pure, or else the stream will be turned from its course and the soul deluged with hypocrisy while flattering itself that it enjoys a heavenly watering.

The law of God is not made void though we are saved by faith. True worship is suspended, and the gift remains upon the altar until the heart is right with God and man.

#### THE EFFECT OF WORSHIP.

The effect of worship is reflex upon the mind and heart of the worshiper. If the object of worship is conceived as degraded and immoral, the effect is seen as in the heathen world, in the degradation and immorality of the worshipers. Among the worshipers of Jehovah, there is a great diversity in spiritual development. If there is equal fidelity, this diversity depends upon the clearness of our conceptions of Him as a divine and holy being. Divine worship begets a peculiar exaltation of feeling which tends to the permanent elevation of the human soul. As in institutions of learning and elsewhere, communion with noble and well-developed minds expands the intellect and enlarges the capacity of our mental being; so communion with the Great Teacher expands the heart, develops the moral nature and calls into exercise all the higher faculties of our spiritual being.

Not all real exaltation of feeling is the effect of divine worship. There is a pleasant mental intoxication which is often mistaken for it. Spiritual exaltation comes only from the inner

sanctuary. Neither the frenzy of the sybil, the excitement of the political campaign, nor the pure and lofty inspiration of the poet is the legitimate offspring of holy worship, but each of these is real. That effervescence of poetic feeling, so often and so blindly sought in social worship, may be real and yet spring from other sources than heavenly worship.

So-called Liberal Christianity may deify and exult over the noble and moral in man, until it has raised the stream of lofty feeling as high as the fountain of depraved nobility and unsanctified refinement from which it derives its own inspiration; but lacking a Christ, it can never raise humanity above that point, nor can send the holiest aspiration to the Searcher of hearts, nor readily cure a sin-sick soul, nor teach a degraded sinner to sing the song of Moses and the Lamb. Repudiating that heart worship which is in spirit and in truth, consistent with the error it dismisses from its system Christ, Revelation and Regeneration. Outside of the pale of its own refinement it is shorn of its strength. It cannot grapple with depravity nor elevate the degraded heart for want of a fountain higher than the hearts it designs to elevate. Its mental inspiration cannot produce the best spiritual states nor the highest moral results. Only God's own act of acceptance and blessing can accomplish such a result, and none but Christian experience can teach the contrite soul when God has really accepted the worship. This is a good test of the character of our worship. If there is no high moral result the worship is not acceptable.

If there is that exaltation of soul which affects the moral state, it is first attained by a single act of worship. The reflex influence of that act is to rectify the various disorders and induce courses of moral action in accordance with the will of God who accepts the worship. Thus God's will is made the standard of action; continued, these courses become habits, they are then crystalized into traits, the moral character is thus renewed and purified, and virtue produced by the reflex influence of worship upon the soul. From God and through Christ, and from no other source, can this moral renovation come. Holiness, then, is the result, first, of forgiveness and grace bestowed by the divine act alone; then, of hearty soul-renewing communion with

God, dependent in all cases upon a voluntary obedience to the command to "worship God."

#### FORMS OF WORSHIP.

God has instituted various forms of worship, each of which enjoined in Scripture has its uses, and none of which can be spared from the exercises of the Christian. In all forms of worship communion with God must be the result, or else worship dies and leaves only the corpse of formality. The various forms of worship are adapted to different minds and to different states of the same mind, furnishing both milk for babes and meat for strong men. The different departments of mind are not forgotten in the divine plan. Public worship is adapted to spiritualize the intelligence; social worship, to develop and sanctify the social qualities and quicken the emotions; family worship, to chasten the finer social affections; private devotions, to cultivate the conscience and strengthen the sturdy virtues. Family and private devotions are not seen upon the surface of society, but are none the less necessary, since God has commanded prayer in the closet, and pronounced a curse upon "all the families that call not on the name of the Lord."

The benefits of social worship arise from interchange of experience, from social sympathy, and from spiritual blessings in the divine presence. The exercise of prayer, singing and exhortation are worship only so far as they inspire or assist in our communion with God. Prayer is more difficult than exhortation, because it is more purely spiritual. Exhortation is necessary because Christ has required a confession of himself before men, and social meetings are appointed for that special purpose. To confess Christ elsewhere, and deny him where the world know we have appointed to confess him, is to keep back at least a part of the price; and shrinking here throws a doubt upon the sincerity of our confessions silently made elsewhere. One of the chief benefits of social meetings is found in the searching of heart necessary to a confident confession of Christ, and in the fact that the world are apprised of our profession, and watch us to see if our course is consistent,—thereby stimulating us to watch ourselves. These spurs to faithfulness in the Christian

life are lost by inactivity and silence. To be passive spectators of the worship of others is not worship. To be amused and instructed is not worship. To enjoy the exhortations and prayers of others is not worship to us, unless we are thereby stimulated to personal communion with God.

There is ordinarily no valid excuse for silence in social meetings. Absence of feeling would excuse a sinner from repenting or a Christian from every other Christian duty as well as from this. To hide the one talent is impious, and to plead weakness and want of power to edify is to set aside God's plan of edification "out of the mouths of babes and sucklings." There is no excuse for being at such a distance from Christ as to have no feeling, and one neglect cannot justify another. Worship is the same in essence, in condition and in form for male and female, nor is social worship an exception to this rule. This must always remain true until either the elements of worship or the constitution of the mind is altered in favor of one sex or the other.

To make social worship spiritual and profitable should be the intelligent aim of every church. Formal ten minute speeches at a social visit would be exceedingly unpleasant, and would subject the speaker to the charge of egotism. For a few to monopolize the time in a large company, would exhibit a want of good breeding, and would break up the whole idea of sociability. Why should persons take liberties in social meetings which would subject them to deserved criticism elsewhere? Yet this abuse is common, and meetings are often called social, which are as formal as a meeting of the diplomatic corps. The aim should be to worship God with as much freedom from constraint as would be felt in communion with earthly friends, at the same time not forgetting the solemnity of God's presence.

There may be so much excitement as to distract the attention and interfere with heavenly communion. The whole object of social meetings may also be defeated by silence and formality. It is not more of thoughtless boisterousness that is needed, but more of free and living spirituality. Silent prayer, at the expense of vocal prayer and exhortation, is not social worship and cannot take its place, and if it were practised universally, it

would effectually break up every social meeting. No one has a right to set an example which, if followed, would prove injurious in the extreme by destroying a necessary and useful means of grace.

In public worship, exercises are judiciously intermingled for the purpose of inspiring worship and securing communion with God. Without that end in view there is no worship in being present. Inattention or frivolity in any mind may destroy the whole idea of worship, and that person cease to be a worshiper. Preaching may tend directly or indirectly to inspire devotional feelings. Doctrinal and instructive preaching, by enlarging and vivifying our knowledge of the obligations binding us to God, does this indirectly, and through the reason, judgment, and will, incites men to put forth voluntary and intelligent acts of worship. More spiritual preaching does this directly, but all preaching should be doctrinal or should spring from the solid doctrines of God's word. Preaching which does not tend to inspire a hearty communion with God fails to be worship. Preaching which exalts human goodness, which exhibits the creature more than the Creator, which covers up or displaces the great doctrines of the cross, instead of being worship, becomes sacrilege in the speaker, and to the hearer also so far as he endorses the error. It is not the fact, but the kind of public religious services which constitutes public worship; and all true worship recognizes "Jesus Christ and him crucified" as the only hope of the sinner.

#### WORSHIP IS ACTIVE AND NOT PASSIVE.

The state of mind necessary as a prerequisite to worship is a state of positive personal activity, and there is no such thing as worshipping God by proxy. The first act of worship offered by the convert is accepted only after the most painful activity, in repenting, searching the heart, and seeking after God. Passive states of mind, as well as active ones, are often to be perceived in social meetings;—and these passive states are a great enemy to true devotion and often the greatest obstacle to be overcome in worship. It is inconsistent to wait for feeling, when one's own passiveness is what stifles feeling. It acts like a dead weight upon the interest of a meeting for Christians to depend upon

others to incite them to an active state of mind which it was their duty to secure previously in the closet. If the interest is not permanently smothered, much time is wasted in recovering from the deadening influence. The error is extensive and mischievous, that to be made to feel by external pressure, to have the emotions excited and passions aroused, while personal inactivity prevails, is to worship God acceptably; but all this may be experienced when no act of worship has been put forth. Others embrace as great an error in supposing that God excuses them from all participation in social worship and makes them passive spectators. Passive perception of truth is worship in no sense, and must be acted upon before God deigns to commune with us. Social meetings are not meetings of worship to passive spectators who put forth no acts of worship themselves. Here again preaching fails to be worship if it presents no vitalizing, self-acting principle and develops no activity of soul.

#### INCENTIVES TO WORSHIP.

There is in the heart, resulting from depravity, a strong repugnance to spiritual labor which needs to be overcome. With this unconquered the soul cannot engage in worship, and the great task of the ministry is to overcome this repugnance in both Christian and sinner. Herein is the secret of true ministerial success, and victory here is a precious acquisition. The means adapted to this end are many and important. Above all, and lending its influence to all others, is the Holy Spirit; inciting men to activity by both ordinary and unexpected methods,—with or without the human means,—or by means seemingly unadapted to that result. Joy and prosperity, or sickness, affliction and death, as also the exercises of prayer, singing, exhortation, conversation and example, often accomplish the same result and become the occasion of spiritual activity. Ministerial labor, also, in preaching and in social and private interviews, is adapted to secure a victory over sloth and indolence.

Through ignorance or want of earnestness on the part of Christians, much of the vital energy of the ministry is wasted in tugging at the short end of the lever to raise the church to a position which it ought voluntarily to assume. The struggle



to incite passive minds, is not only painful and exhausting; but it is interminable and hopeless, until Christians learn to worship God out of the abundance of their own hearts. To neglect the use of judicious means and then expect success from the labors of the ministry, is to demand of the ministry the performance of the individual duty of the whole church, and a cumulative influence for good, as great as the united influence of the whole. Such a course on the part of the church effectually clogs the wheels of progress. It even demands this of the ministry while the church exerts a pernicious counter influence in favor of inactivity and death. This opposing influence is often so strong as to overbalance all ministerial influence and check the growth of the church for years, and sometimes it even acts as a sling until the right arm of the church is withered and dead. Dependence upon external means as incitements to worship develops a low type of Christian character and a very imperfect standard of devotion; since no acts of worship can be attempted without external force, and more of honesty than of intelligence is apt to appear in that overstrained activity which is the opposite extreme. A character so inconsistent and undeveloped can never be of much use in the aggressive work of saving the world. It is too intermittent, too unstable, too dependent upon others, and too much wrapped up in selfish feeling, to make a mark for good upon the solid granite of worldly hearts. Each church should be a battalion of soldiers, all minute men; not dependent upon the minister for strength, but ready to stand by him in aggressive warfare, and with him to assault the lines of the enemy. An intelligent, working spirit is needed in the churches, in place of the effeminate cowardice which is so often exhibited.

#### THE HIGHEST TYPE OF WORSHIP.

Duty and interest both require us to strive to attain the highest type of Christian character and the greatest excellence in spiritual worship, nor should we be satisfied with the attainment of a fixed standard of excellence. The motives to the attainment of that higher type of worship are not selfish but have direct reference to the will of God for his own sake and for the sake of humanity, not ignoring self. The enjoyment contempla-

ted is not sought after as the great end of worship. It takes pleasure in solid communion with God, and finds its purest joy in growth in grace and in "perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord." Its effects are not over demonstrative. It delights in substance rather than in shadow. Its boldness is quiet and its reserve of integrity is uncompromising. It is capable of earning a martyr's crown, a soldier's laurel, or a patient sufferer's meed of praise. It neither shrinks from the cross nor bears it with ostentation. If need be, to glorify God, it exalts the lamb into a lion, and, in the spirit of the lowly one, it tames the lion into a lamb. It is not fitful but constant; not dependent upon circumstance or place, its temple is everywhere. It is lowly in exaltation and exalted in humility. It is not gloomy but cheerful, not egotistic but intensely individual, not cowardly but inflexible, not obtrusive and reckless but strongly aggressive. Its foundation is in truth. Its intelligence weighs every act, its energy meets every difficulty, its manly perseverance overcomes every obstacle. Its activity and zeal are according to knowledge. Its incentives to action it carries within itself, and these are never weak or wanting in time of need, nor imperious and exacting when wisdom requires suffering instead of doing. It fears no enemy, sacrifices principle for no friend, bows only to God, and sees a brother in every humble worshiper. Such is Christian character, the result of the highest type of Christian worship. When earth is exchanged for heaven it knows already how to join the songs of the glorified. Few if any on earth attain to that highest type of Christian worship, but having the ideal set up before us in the Scriptures, we should "press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

## ART. IX.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

**THEOLOGICAL INDEX.** References to the Principal Works in every department of Religious Literature. Embracing nearly Seventy Thousand Citations, arranged under two thousand Heads. By Howard Malcom, D. D., L. L. D.—Boston : Gould & Lincoln. 1868. Octavo. pp. 488.

It is a great blessing to have a library, but it is scarcely less so to know how to use one. Books enshrine the wisdom of mankind; but that wisdom is like the ores and coal measures stored up in the earth,—available only when we have discovered and learned how to dislodge and employ it. Many a studious man would only be bewildered amid such a collection of volumes as may be found here and there, large and small, ancient and modern, looking out upon him from the shelves, speaking in so many varied tongues, and dealing with all the departments of human thought. To read more than a small fraction of the issues of the press is impossible to the most voracious literary gormandizer; to be compelled to search for the solid meat of literature among this mass of material, good, bad and indifferent, without reliable guidance, is a task that may well dishearten, and is a most expensive species of labor.

This volume, prepared by Dr. Malcom, will be an invaluable aid to those who wish to purchase books with reference to a specific department of study, or who desire to prosecute such study with the best helps and the least unprofitable expenditure of time. It grew up almost without intention under the author's hands, as the foundation of it was laid by the classification and arrangement of the contents of his own library for his personal convenience, at the beginning of his pastorate. The work was continued as his studies widened, as his reading became more extensive, as his necessities and opportunities prompted, until the number of citations is nearly seventy thousand. It is, therefore, eminently practical in its origin and design. It does not aim to be really exhaustive, but it does claim to constitute an adequate guide in its own department to nearly everything available which the theological and general religious student would need in prosecuting his inquiries, and its claim appears to be well founded. The arrangement of this multifarious information, under a great variety of heads, is such that there will be found very little difficulty in determining whether the precise thing wanted can be had, and if so, in what author it may be found. There is nothing else that proposes to meet just this want to be found in the language; and the want is so real, so pressing, so general, and is so well and fully met in this work, that it will be regarded almost as indispensable for the ready use of general religious literature as a Concordance is to the ready use of the Bible. We commend the work with a special emphasis, and shall be surprised if it does not find a place at once on the study table of the great mass of studious clergymen of all denominations.

SERMONS PREACHED UPON SEVERAL OCCASIONS. By Robert South, D. D., Prebendary of Westminster, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. In Five volumes. Vol. II. New York: Hurd and Houghton, 1867. Octavo. pp. 531.

We hail the appearance of this volume with high satisfaction. It is the second installment of the "Library of the Old English Divines" which Messrs. Hurd and Houghton propose to publish. It is a large and important undertaking and we trust it may not lack encouragement. The mechanical excellences of this edition are of the very highest order, the price is reasonable, and no better guarantee of faithful and judicious literary supervision could be afforded than is given in the fact that Professor Shedd takes the editorial responsibility into his hands.

Of South as a man, a writer and a sermonizer, we spoke at some length in a notice of the preceding volume. A prelate of stalwart intellect, of varied learning, of positive opinions, of strong will, of unshrinking boldness that sometimes went to the very verge of audacity; a thorough loyalist who scorned democracy and taught the divine right of kings; an unequivocal churchman who hated the Papists and never tired of satirizing the Puritans; a logician whose arguments were weighty even when they issued in wrong conclusions; a vehement partisan though keeping clear of petty policy and double-faced management; open and straightforward in his attacks, and charging upon hostile opinions and their advocates with a vehemence that fell little short of fury; master of a style that has been rarely equaled in clearness, force, pungency and effectiveness;—he was a man to be felt, respected and feared, and his sermons are remarkable for their fruitfulness and vigor. No preacher could properly accept them as models. They are sometimes over-crowded with argument, now and then they suggest the prize-ring by their belligerent tone, and the bitterness and the irony fail to embody the spirit and temper of the Great Teacher and Example.

But these drawbacks do not render the sermons anything less than eminent specimens of pulpit literature. They most richly deserve study for what they are in both substance and form. They exalt the function of the preacher in the reader's eye. They brace up the intellect. They show the value of vigor. They make mere cant and common-place appear contemptible. They illustrate the high ministry of words when embodying and giving momentum to thought. Few preachers could read them without advantage; those collected in the volume before us present an admirable variety in subject, and many of them deal with the great themes which the pulpit of every land and century will find coming up to claim its attention.

HISTORY OF THE UNITED NETHERLANDS: From the death of William the Silent to the Twelve Years' Truce—1609. By John Lothrop Motley, D. C. L., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France; author of "The Rise of the Dutch Republic." In Four Volumes. Vols. III. and IV. With Portraits. New York: Harper & Bros. 1868. Octavo. pp. 599, 632.

The public have waited without complaint, though not without much interest and some anxiety, for this fresh installment of Mr. Motley's splendid

contribution to our higher historical literature. From the time which witnessed the appearance of his "Dutch Republic," his rank among modern historians has been fixed by almost universal consent, and the particular vein of history which he set himself to work was shown to be one of unexpected richness and value as the treasures came forth at his effective call. The narrative is continued in these volumes from the point where it was left at the end of Volume II., and carried forward over a period of about twenty years, ending with the admission of the Republic into the family of nations by the treaty of 1609.

This story of the Netherlands reads almost like a romance as it has been traced by Mr. Motley's graphic pen, though no one can fail to perceive that the narrative has all the fidelity and severity of truth. The Netherlands were little more than outlying provinces, united by feeble bonds, scanty in apparent resources, with no inspiring history to recall and no great end distinctly in view, when they opened the conflict with Spain and struck at the absolutism of the Papacy. The power arrayed against them was that which had long controlled Europe, and was as desperate and unscrupulous as it was egotistic and august. France and England, whose aid was often sought by the colonies, and whose real interests lay in the same direction, promised much but did little, and each in turn declined the annexation of the Netherlands to their own domain because they dreaded the quarrel which would attend the gift. And so in the face of difficulty and peril the colonies united against the mightiest political sovereignty of the continent, when it was especially animated by the pride, the superstition and the cruelty which have written the history of the Romish Inquisition in letters of blood. And they fought out the long battle of more than forty years, growing more patient in suffering, more resolute at the end of every fresh disaster, more fertile in expedients, more lofty in aim and purpose, bringing out and organizing a fresh energy, creating a navy that was almost supreme on the sea, developing a limited and petty foreign trade into an extensive and profitable commerce, becoming more protestant, puritanic, and really religious in faith and spirit as they put their opposition to Romanism into heroic deeds,—until they had worn Philip II into his grave, broke the power of Spain and struck its imperial arm with palsy, dared to defy both the French and English thrones whose smile they had vainly pleaded for, conquered a twelve years' truce whose terms they dictated to the Spanish sovereign, and stood forth a great and vital power among the nationalities of Europe.

Mr. Motley tells this story with equal care and enthusiasm. Bent on historic justice as though he were only a critic or a judge, he yet pictures the struggle as though he were simply a dramatic artist. His scholarly tastes and his sympathy with the great issues of the living world always act in harmony and have a reciprocal interplay. When he chooses, his style is like that of a rare essayist; when he wills otherwise, there are vigorous colloquialisms by whose aid he sets off characters and incidents with peculiar effect. There is not a particle of straining after fine writ-

ing, and when his literary excellence is most strongly marked he ever preserves the calmness which suggests a fund of reserved power. Both for the high lessons which this significant chapter of history teaches and for the quickening and suggestiveness which the author's part of the work has to offer, we hope for a wide circulation and a careful study of these volumes.—When the history of the Thirty Years' War, upon which Mr. Motley is now engaged, shall have been completed, the author will take his place without dissent by the side of Prescott and Bancroft—a trio of contemporaneous historians quite sufficient to vindicate the eminence of America as a producer of standard literature, and prophetic of something still nobler in the future. The volumes are issued in the same style as their predecessors—a statement as satisfactory to the public as it is creditable to the publishers.

LANGUAGE & THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE: Twelve Lectures on the principles of Linguistic Science. By Wm. Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanskrit, and Instructor in Modern Languages in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868. Crown Octavo. pp. 489.

During the last twenty-five years the study of Language has been prosecuted with fresh earnestness, on new lines of inquiry, and with a thoroughly scientific spirit. The results are marked and grateful. Especially in the department of Etymology has the progress made been decided, and it is prophetic of still more significant advances. Guesses have been displaced by critical philological investigation, and he who wishes to indulge his fancy and exercise his speculative faculties is compelled at length to choose some other field, or take the risk of being laughed at for his false analogies and his unsupported statements. The devotion of so many years to this department of study by Noah Webster, and the valuable acquisitions which he made, did not a little to exalt this field of inquiry, and impel scholars toward it. And the more recent works of Trench, and Marsh, and Craik, and Max Muller, and de Vere, and other eminent European philologists, whose studies have proved so interesting and fruitful, have at last rendered it perfectly proper to speak as this book does on its title-page, of "the principles of linguistic science."

This volume, sent out by Prof. Whitney, is the product of extended study, patient and detailed research, independent thought, careful elaboration and revision, and the free and invited criticism of other eminent philologists. In style and method it is less scientific than the work of Muller, it affords less curious information than the volumes of Marsh, it is less popular than the treatises of Trench; but it possesses very largely the merits of them all, and as a single treatise for the use of undergraduates and cultivated readers generally, it seems to us superior to any other single work on the same subject extant. The discussions are sufficiently full to meet the wants of these two classes, and they cover nearly the whole philological territory which has been advantageously traversed. The author is no copyist. He thinks for himself on every

branch of the subject,—alternately approving and dissenting from the authors who have preceded him in the survey, and always having his reasons ready for his reader. Some of his views are eminently fresh and suggestive. He has no pet theories to defend or justify.—He seeks the truth; and while he rules all irrelevant testimony out of court, he listens patiently to every witness having any material evidence to give.

The order of his discussion is natural. He tells us, first, how and in what sense language lives and grows; then, how growth and other causes bring changes in form and contents; he then develops the methods in which and the causes through which languages separate into dialects; next, he groups the languages of the earth into families, and points out the evidences which prove relationship, etc., etc. The discussion in the closing chapters, of the origin of language and of its bearing upon the question of the unity or variety of the human species, will be found particularly interesting, as also the statement of the relation of language to thought.—On each of these last-named topics he has evidently thought much and read extensively. Never ambitious to appear original, he has yet not a few fresh things to say; readily acknowledging his obligation to previous writers, he points out the extreme and untenable positions which some of them have quite too confidently assumed.

But such a book cannot be adequately described and epitomized in a brief notice. If what we have written shall induce any of our readers to purchase and study this treatise, we are sure they will thank us and profit themselves.

**THE OLD ROMAN WORLD: the Grandeur and Failure of its Civilization.** By John Lord, LL. D.—Second edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1888. Octavo. pp. 605.

Those who listened to the course of Lectures delivered by Dr. Lord on the Roman Empire will be especially interested to see them in this more expanded and complete form; while nothing of the glow and fervor and picturesqueness and epigrammatic force which distinguished them as they were brought out on the platform will be missed as these well printed pages are examined. Dr. Lord is not apparently a patient explorer of the more remote and recondite sources of historic knowledge, nor does he stand in the front rank of philosophic thinkers who readily construct a true philosophy of history out of the common facts of bygone life. He is no impassive observer, and when he speaks he often lights up his portraits of historic characters with the red or white glow of personal feeling. He seems often more like the advocate than the judge; he paints with high colors and describes more or less in panegyric and invective. He is an intense realist. The men and women with whom he deals are in his eye actual personages, and he can never think of them as wax figures or features in a panorama done with oil paints on a canvas. He puts his emotions as well as his thoughts on to the page, and when he is sketching manners, or following the movements of a campaign, or analyzing a statute, or reporting an orator, the verdict of

the writer over what is presented mixes itself into the glow of the rhetoric and bristles even in the statistics.

But a book written thus has its merits as well as its drawbacks, and these merits are obvious in this volume. Every thing is vivid, impressive and real. The old Roman life seems to come out from the misty past and stand forth fresh and clear. It is like unearthing Pompeii and letting the light of the nineteenth century stream into its rutted thoroughfares and ornamented dwellings. No one can be dull or indifferent over this book, and no one can close it at the end of the reading without definite ideas of that great empire whose imperialism was the terror of the earlier ages and the wonder of the later.

And Dr. Lord does not write at random. If he does not enter upon original and independent investigation, he makes a free but skilful and careful use of all the materials accumulated by others. The facts lying behind his theories are ample, and he has studied them attentively. He may possibly be liable to the charge of plagiarism; but if he is, that is better by far for his reader than though he had merely given us an imaginative Roman Empire under the name of a history. The views presented are in the main, eminently just, the statements are reliable, the glory and the shame portrayed really belonged to the period and the personages which he sets before us, the lessons which he draws out are the lessons that are really taught, the moral effect of such a study is thoroughly wholesome, and we hardly know where else the general reader would go to find, within the same compass, so much well-arranged, well-digested and well-served information on the subject as is compressed within the covers of this admirably-printed and substantial looking book.

THE HISTORY OF THE GREAT REPUBLIC, considered from a Christian standpoint. By Jesse T Peck, D. D. With thirty-four fine steel portraits. Sold by subscription only. New York: Broughton & Wyman. 1868. Royal Octavo. pp. 710.

Mechanically considered, this is a superb book. It lacks nothing in the way of beauty, richness and excellence. Turning the pages is but spreading a feast for the eye,—a feast which is served in several courses and made up of most attractive and tempting displays of paper, type and engravings. In this respect nothing more need be asked—nothing materially better can well be given. A few gift books display more daintiness, splendor and luxury, but even these scarcely yield a completer satisfaction to the reader.

Of the contents one must speak with more qualification. It is a very good compendium of American history, though, aiming at something far higher, it has less value of that sort than though it had been compiled with that end in view. It contains not a little information, which might have been better classified, its spirit is thoroughly religious, its patriotism unequivocal, its appreciation of what is distinctively American,—when it is not too self-complacent—is akin to veneration, and the author is thoroughly persuaded that his task is both unique and important. He be-



believes himself attempting to write the history of his country from a stand-point occupied by none of his predecessors, and indeed from the only stand-point which allows one to interpret his country truly. He insists that there are "profounder principles and a loftier purpose in the origin, structure and development of the Great Republic, than any heretofore distinctly recognized by historical writers." And so he believed that the history of this country needed to be re-considered and re-written. He brooded over the subject; he waited for some one to articulate the great thought with which his nature was heaving; he called the attention of others to the matter; he saw the war close over the grave of the Great Rebellion and yet the silence tarried in the realm of his meditation and study, while the superficial and misguided story-tellers multiplied; until, urged by others, and most of all by his own intensified conviction of what was due to the truth, to religion and mankind, he took his pen to interpret the significance of the great drama of life which finds its stage on the western continent. He accounts himself the first among historians who has grasped the true theory of history and sought to evolve and vindicate and illustrate it. That theory is, "that God is the rightful, actual Sovereign of all nations; that a purpose to advance the human race beyond all its precedents in intelligence, goodness and power formed this Great Republic; and that religion is the only life-force and organizing power of liberty." A very Christian theory, certainly; but is it wholly new? we have met it often, not precisely on the pages of Bancroft or Hildreth or Greeley, it is true, but urged by men who think as profoundly as they, and whose writings are scarcely less likely to live and be a power than is this volume of Dr. Peck. It is chiefly this assumption of originality and superior discernment that will provoke criticism in some quarters and induce disappointment in others, and so lessen the usefulness of the volume. Because so much is assumed, some will meet the book with prejudice and shut it at once or read it with a hostile spirit; because it promises so much, it will awaken extravagant expectations in in others who will be chiefly impressed with the fact that it abounds in unfulfilled pledges. Putting aside all its pretensions and estimating it on its own merits alone, it may be commended as a wholesome, interesting and Christian presentation of the great facts and lessons of American history, which is worthy of a place in the library of all our households. One ought to rise from its perusal with a more elevated idea of the value of American Institutions, and a devouter gratitude to God for the gracious providence which gave us such a heritage.

**HISTORY OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.** By Abel Stevens, LL. D. Vol. IV. New York: Carlton & Porter 1867. 12mo. pp. 522.

This volume completes Dr. Stevens's work as the American historian of Methodism; and we lay it down with the conviction that this ecclesiastical body has been scarcely less fortunate in having at this period such a man as he to tell its story than it was in having such a man as Wesley

to give shape to its organization and direction to its quick forces when it was setting out on its unique and effective career. He has rare abilities, and they are combined in him in such a way as to make them all contribute to the end at which he aims. He is equally skilful in narrating facts and generalizing them; in portraying a single man and exhibiting the philosophy of a broad movement; in reproducing the enthusiasm of a camp meeting and unfolding the grave issues that hang on the deliberations of a General Conference; in translating the experiences of a pioneer circuit-rider and setting forth the work of some royal preacher when the pews of a metropolitan church are packed with critical listeners. A thorough Methodist, full of the zeal which distinguishes the devotion of that people to their own denomination, his spirit is yet eminently catholic and his religious sympathies are awakened and enlisted by whatever has an important bearing upon the success of the gospel. His volumes are never dry; every chapter has its animation; the enthusiasm of the men of whom we learn passes into the spirit of the reader; and while the story runs on in a similar channel, the special aspects are continually changing. The scholarly and philosophical reader will find much to keep his reflective faculties busy, and plain men and women will pore over the narrative till their eyes grow dim with tears and the hours wear away unheeded.

In the presentation of general and comprehensive views the earlier volumes take the lead; but in striking incident and specimens of moral daring, in the exhibition of marked characters, heroic struggles and eminent achievements, this volume is not behind its predecessors. The fact that it portrays so many men who have been prominent in the religious movements of this country and generation, and even of those who are still alive and active, will secure for it an extensive sale and an eager circle of readers. Asbury, Soule, Hedding, Fisk, Durbin, Cartwright, Young, Bangs, Simpson, "Father Taylor," and a host of others whose names are household words in other than Methodist circles, come in for a share of attention. Dr. Stevens has done his work in a manner that will win for him the favor and gratitude of all who would understand one of the most significant religious movements since the Protestant Reformation came in with the sixteenth century.

**THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, with Explanatory Notes:** To which are added a condensed view of the Priesthood of Christ, and a translation of the Epistle prepared for this work. By Henry J. Ripley, late Professor in Newton Theological Institution, author of "Notes on the Gospels," etc., etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1868. 12mo. pp. 213.

Prof. Ripley's Expositions of Scripture have been greatly prized for their learning, their clearness, their freedom from any manifest theological bias, their directness and elevation of aim, and especially for the docile and reverent spirit which they perpetually breathe. He understands the real function of the Expositor, and he never practically forgets it while busy with his work. He is intent on getting the meaning out of the text which

the Spirit of inspiration has put there; not to impart a meaning to the text which he thinks it ought to carry. When he opens his Greek Testament it is as a learner; when he writes out the results of his study it is that he may convey to others as clearly as possible what he himself has gathered. True enough, the state of mind and heart which makes him an evangelical Christian does not a little to invest the record with an aspect quite unlike that which it presents to the mental eye of a Tübingen critic; but, satisfied that there is a divine tone in this word of Scripture, he puts himself in the attitude of a reverent listener and a most conscientious interpreter,—appreciating at once both the sanctities and privileges of the office. He is both broad-minded and critical, rising with a ready power to the mastery of the general course of thought, and descending to the minutest details of expression with patient and careful search.

The best results of his study appear in this exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. What he states in his preface would have been readily inferred, that “this volume is the fruit of long-continued study of the Epistle in the original, to which study the various helps of biblical literature have been subservient.” His comprehension of the general and special aims of the document seems to lack nothing. His analysis of its contents and course of argument, found in his Introduction, is every way admirable, and goes a long way in expounding the Epistle by the rare force of the simple statement. The Notes are sufficiently full to satisfy almost any inquirer, and while they bring out the fruit of much scholarship and learning, they are plain in their style, wholly free from pedantry and illuminate just what was doubtful or obscure. The Essay on the priesthood of Christ is a fresh and thoughtful paper on a subject that has been extensively discussed, and the new translation at the end of the volume has been most conscientiously done.—Taken all in all, we have seen no other exposition of this Epistle which makes so near an approach to our idea of a model Commentary for ordinary use.

THE

# FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

---

No. LXIII. JULY, 1868.

---

## ART. I.—NATURE AND FUNCTIONS OF CONSCIENCE.

Upon scarcely another topic in the whole field of ethical science has there been in the past, and is there to-day, so much confusion of thought and contradiction of statement as upon that of the nature and offices of conscience. It has been designated in turn by as many different names as would serve to catalogue nearly all the classes of phenomena which the mind exhibits. It has been called an instinct, an emotion, a sentiment, a moral sense, a divine umpire, an infallible guide, the voice of God. Mr. Wesley calls it, "that faculty whereby we are conscious at once of our own words and actions and of their merit or demerit." Mr. Coleridge says: "Conscience is the ground and antecedent of self-consciousness." The Scotch philosophy regarded it as a moral sense. "The testimony of our moral faculty," says Dr. Reid, "like that of the external senses, is the testimony of nature, and we have the same reasons to rely upon it." President Mahan says of this faculty that "its voice is, and cannot but be recognized as, the voice of God in the soul." And if we turn to German writers we find no less a diversity of definition. Wolff viewed the conscience as a mere theoretical judgment. Mosheim classed it among the perfections of the understanding, while Crusius regards it as "an in-

nate instinct by virtue of which we feel ourselves bound to subordinate all our aims and acts to the will of God." Reinhard describes it as "a tendency we have of allowing ourselves to be guided in our actions by the thought of Deity." Kant defines conscience, in one place, as "the moral judgment in its act of self-criticism;" in another, as "the consciousness of an inner tribunal in one's self," and in yet another, as "the practical reason holding up before man in every case of a law his duty of approving or disapproving." He maintains that "it is not an acquired something, that there is no duty of seeking after one, but that on the contrary every man as a moral being has one originally in himself." Fichte holds that conscience is "the immediate consciousness of our specific duty," and which as such is the consciousness of our absolute primitive self, and above which there is no authority, but by which, on the contrary, every other must be proved and judged. All acting on mere authority, thinks Fichte, is in contempt of conscience. Dr. Schenkel defines [Herzogs Real-Encyk. Art. Gewissen] conscience as "the religious central organ in man;" but remarks elsewhere in the same essay, that, so long as man remained sinless, and in undisturbed communion with God, he as yet had no conscience. But Professor Wuttke of Halle says [Sittenlehre I., 379,] that "conscience is that revelation of the divine will which is given to the moral subject in his rational self-consciousness," and adds, in the same connection, that "the conscience exists in its full purity and vigor only in a sinless state. Professor Trendelenburg, of Berlin, ventures the safe definition, that conscience is the backward and forward working of the entire God-directed man against the partial, selfish propension of his nature.

But these questions and partial statements might be indefinitely extended without better accomplishing our object, which was simply to advert to the infinitely varied ways in which conscience has been defined. They will suffice to awaken in all reflecting minds one or more of the following convictions, viz., either that the same idea is expressed in strangely varied language, or that the thing attempted to be defined is of a very obscure, undeterminable nature, or that different men apply the same term to widely different functions of the soul. Whatever

ground there may be for the two former, there is doubtless more for the latter. The true key to the variety of definition lies in the fact of the widely variant sphere of spiritual activity to which the term conscience has been applied. One writer views it as a simple process of the understanding, another assigns to it a mere emotional character, while a third makes it to embrace both, and to consist in the harmony of the two. As a general fact the field to which conscience is assigned increases both in extent and in the complexity of the spiritual processes which it embraces, in proportion as the writer assigns more of moral self-sufficiency to the soul and less of importance to objective and subjective Revelation. And for a very evident reason. For if man possesses in himself an unerring guide, a faculty capable of discovering the moral law, and of intelligently applying it to all the vicissitudes of life, where is the absolute necessity of a revealed law, or the great importance of the enlightening influences of the Holy Spirit? How wide the difference between the opinion of some, that conscience is simply a religious emotion, and that e. g., of Rousseau and Fichte, that it is an infallible guide!

But is this conflicting use of the word necessary or even justifiable? Is it not practicable, and if so, then very desirable, so definitely to determine to what precise activity of the soul the term is applicable, as to be enabled with assurance to say of this or that spiritual phenomenon that it does or does not fall within the sphere of conscience? Such is our conviction, and to realize it shall be the aim of this paper. And it is scarcely needful to observe that we design to use the word conscience, not in its loose and popular, but in its accurate and true sense, as expressive of the moral activity of the soul. The question before us then is: What is the precise faculty or function or series of functions of the soul to which the term conscience is strictly applicable?

The words faculty and function we use purposely, rather than part or department; for the soul is not like a machine or other material object, capable of being surveyed and distributed into sections. It is a unit, and all its phenomena are activities, not of this or that of its parts, but of its whole self.

It is not so well to say that it has understanding, imagination and feelings, as that it understands, imagines and feels. These words designate simply different directions of activity in the same substance. After itself, there is nothing else that we can predicate of the soul but its activities and the resulting habits. The inquiry is reduced, therefore, to this: Which of the activities of the soul is the conscience?

And we answer, first, negatively, that it is not any supposed one which confers on us this idea,—that there is such a distinction as right and wrong, good and evil. This idea does not come to the soul through its own activity, for it is one of the essential elements of its own existence. A soul is a rational, accountable spirit; but such a spirit without the idea of right and wrong is inconceivable; hence, this idea inheres originally in every human soul, and cannot be generated within itself or received from without. Without it there may be embryonic or idiotic capabilities of soul, just as in the seed there may be the capability of a tree; but in neither case is the soul or the tree, as yet, an actual fact. Even as in mathematics the whole superstructure rests on a few elementary axioms, so the idea of moral good and evil stands along side of these inborn ideas of existence, liberty, causality and divinity, as one of the fundamental elements of moral intelligence. Whatever, therefore, the conscience may have to do with the idea of right and wrong, it does not generate it or communicate it to the soul.

But is the conscience that activity of the soul by which we determine what is right or wrong, by which we classify actions as good or evil? No. And for the reason that the activity here called into play is exclusively intellectual, whereas the conscience, as is generally admitted and as we shall for the present assume, is a moral and religious function. But let us examine this matter. A classified knowledge of the moral law may be obtained in different ways. As soon as, by the aid of the intuitions of reason, the soul reflects on the relations of the finite to the infinite, the creature to the Creator, it perceives that they imply submission, reverence, etc. The duties of man to man may also be partially learned in the same way. It may be, and is in fact, largely obtained by tradition and by parental instruc-

tion. And whatever is communicated to man in this way is accepted as right until he sees satisfactory reasons for rejecting it. And, finally, it is derived by Christian nations, in the main, from Revelation.

Now, in all these cases, what is the nature of the object received, and what is the precise activity of the soul which is concerned in receiving? Surely that which is received is not feelings, emotions, sentiments, for these are not directly communicable from without; they are generated by the soul itself under the influence of ideas or truths. For what is the uniform procedure when we would work a change in the feelings of our fellow? Is it not to convince the understanding, to present things to him under a new or specific aspect? Is it not to show him the reasonableness or desirableness of a change in his thinking or acting? But in all this, the receiver, that to which we address ourselves, is the understanding, and it is only through this that we hope to reach the feelings. The divine procedure in the scriptures is of the same kind. Our learning the moral law, therefore, from any or all of the above sources, consists simply in receiving truths, facts, ideas, by the understanding. And this is a purely intellectual process, wholly devoid of moral character. For the essential sphere of morality and religion is not the understanding, but the heart, the emotions. A man's understanding may be excellently furnished with all attainable knowledge of the moral law, and yet he may remain utterly destitute of morality and religion. This, we say, is possible; and how often do we see it approximated in real life! How numerous the cases of men reared by Christian parents, in the midst of Christian associations and furnished with the highest intellectual culture, who live in utter disregard of their intellectual convictions and indulge in all kinds of immorality and sin! To receive moral instruction, to perfect one's views of duty, is in itself, therefore, no more a moral or religious activity of the soul than to analyze ores or to calculate eclipses. Consequently, the faculty by which we are able to do this—the understanding, the judgment—cannot be the conscience.

Having failed to find the conscience in the reason or the understanding, we now inquire whether it is an element or activity



of the will. The truth is doubtless in the negative. For a volition is in itself absolutely destitute of moral or religious character. To walk, to eat, to praise, to curse, to perform charities, to plot treason, are all and equally acts of volition, and yet they have no moral trait in common. To choose evil rather than good is as really a volition as to prefer good to evil. Since, therefore, some volitions are regarded as good, and some as evil, and some as indifferent, and since the moral quality is not in the naked volition, we are forced to suppose some associated element, and to look for the good or evil in it. But what is this associated element, and how is it related to the conscience? Let us look for it in a particular case. Suppose that, starting on a journey, a gentleman hands his servant a sum of money, ordering him to cast it, that evening, into a certain charity box. Now what are, or may be, the workings of the servant's mind during the day? First and chiefly there is in his soul a something, an instinct, a feeling, a sentiment, prompting him to perform the act in the letter and spirit of his orders. But suppose him to be personally interested in another and equally charitable association. In thinking of this he is prompted, by a different feeling, to violate the letter of his instructions, and to give the money to this cause. But now, reflecting on his impoverished family and the needed clothing which, with this money, he might purchase for his sick children, he falls under the influence of another feeling,—paternal affection,—and is again tempted to prove false to his trust. Furthermore the mere love of money, or the thought of the pleasures of the cup which he might therewith procure, brings him under the momentary sway of still lower impulses. And a great variety of other feelings might be supposed. The consequence is that he finds himself in perplexity, and a prey to conflicting impulses, each, in turn, clamoring for the ascendancy. When he thinks of the simple right of the case every other motive shrinks to impotency. When his attention is turned to the possible tipping within his reach, his low appetite springs up and, for the moment, casts his higher impulses into the background. And so of the others.

Now what is the nature of this inner struggle? What are

the relations of these contending emotions? Evidently their mutual relation is that of superiority and inferiority. Neither the man himself, in his cool moments, nor any one else, would have the least difficulty in determining which was the highest and only right impulse. But to what were they severally related? Not to the understanding, for that was not for a moment disturbed—the moral judgment remained steadily the same. They did not clamor for conviction but for action. It was to the will that they were related; it was the choosing power that was thrown into perplexity. But under what circumstances does the will, that central spring of all the active powers of the soul, determine itself to a specific act? Though absolutely free, it never decides but in view of some reason or motive. And this reason is always a something, a feeling, a sentiment, which, at the moment of the choice, seems to the soul more pleasing than anything else. In the most prosaic, thankless, painful action that is ever freely undertaken, there is always a feeling that to do it is more pleasing than to leave it undone. The stern Roman patriot was pleased rather to sacrifice his own son than to countenance military insubordination. The Christian will suffer his sinews to be torn from the bones rather than endure the remorse of apostasy. To retain the enjoyment of the love of God is more pleasing than to escape the horrors of the rack. Before every determination of itself, therefore, the will chooses between conflicting impulses—between acting and not acting, or acting in this way rather than in that. And this impulse or motive in favor of which the will decides, constitutes that uniformly associated element of every act for which we were seeking, and in which the moral quality must reside. The impulses, motives, which bear on the will constitute an ascending series, beginning with the low instincts of animal gratification and terminating in the serene atmosphere of our innate love of right. Not to yield to any inferior impulse, but always to choose the act which we believe to be right, and which consequently corresponds to this highest impulse, feeling, taste of the soul, is to act morally, religiously. So that it is not mere volition but volition in accordance with the highest motive that is moral. Whoever so acts, or purposes to act, is immediately conscious of a peculiar feeling of

peace and satisfaction, whereas a contrary determination occasions contrary feelings.

This, all will admit, is the experience of the healthy mind. But that it is likewise the case with the unhealthy, the bigoted, the superstitious, is almost too evident to need illustration. Suppose, however, a single case among thousands of possible ones—that of a sincere but ignorant Catholic, reared under priestly influences, and honestly believing that the Bible is a difficult book, easily misinterpreted to the detriment of the soul, and consequently only safely used by a learned clergy. To this man a stranger offers a Bible. Now what shall he do? What are the motions of his conscience? Surely there can be no question but that, so long as his convictions remain as they are, his conscience must refuse, and he must reject the book. That he should receive it was right in the absolute, though relatively to his own judgment it was wrong. The key to this is found in the fact that conscience relates, not to the absolute standard of right as it exists in the mind of God, but to the more or less imperfect standard as it exists in the convictions of the individual. The conclusion, then, to which we are brought is, that there is implanted in the soul by the Creator a peculiar emotional capability which is gratified or shocked according as we obey or disregard our convictions of right. And it is this alone that fully corresponds to the idea of conscience. Our formal definition of conscience, therefore, is, that it is that emotional susceptibility of man which is gratified and confers peace, or is shocked and occasions remorse, according as he conforms to or violates his personal convictions of right.

The difference between this view and that most generally taken consists in the fact of the exclusion of the intellectual and critical function. And in its favor we are able to cite the authority of some eminent names. That it is substantially the view of Dr. Rothe appears from the following strictures of Prof. Wuttke, [*Sittenlehre*, Vol. I. p. 384]: “That the conscience has a subjective nature is only so far true as it constitutes an element of rational personality, but it is entirely erroneous in Rothe to reduce it to an individual, subjective something, and entirely deny to it an objective character.” That kindred views

were entertained by Dr. Auberlin is evident from the following passage [Herzogs Real-Encyk. Vol. IV., p. 733,]; from which it might also be inferred that he regarded the term conscience as applicable more strictly to non-Christians than to the regenerate. He says: "That which in the ante-Christian state was the conscience, is now the spirit, namely, the element of intercommunion between man and God, or worship; for that which by Christians is attributed to the voice of God within them, is attributed by conscientious worldly people to the voice of conscience. The chastening of the Spirit corresponds to a reproving conscience; the comforting of the Spirit to a good conscience; grieving the Spirit to violating the conscience, etc." Dr. Ulrici, of Halle, affirms substantially [Herzogs Real-Encyk. Arts. Sittengesetz and Vernunft] the following principles: Conscience is simply the feeling of obligation as an object of consciousness, that is, a conscious feeling of obligation. Man is a conditioned, finite being. His will chooses outwardly between a number of possible actions, and inwardly between a like number of specific impulses and ends. The impulse chosen becomes the motive of the act. His choosing is an act of self-determination. In the motive chosen lies the good or evil. It is no more undeniably a fact of consciousness that we choose between motives than that we choose between them as good and evil, right and wrong. The distinction of good and evil must, therefore, in some way be given to the soul. But where? Deep within us we possess an original, though gentle and delicate, feeling of obligation which, when we are meditating on proposed actions, designates some one of them as the right and binding one. Now whence this feeling of obligation? It comes not to us from without, but springs up in the depths of the soul itself. It is not an all-swaying, necessitating feeling, but is an appeal rather to our freedom. According as yielded to, or resisted, it becomes a feeling of pleasure and peace, or of discomfort and unrest. And herein is suggested its origin. It arises out of the promoted or disturbed, divinely ordered harmony of the powers of the soul. It is the soul as affected by its own destination, constitution. It is a revelation of the purpose of life so far as discoverable by our own powers, and a guide instructing us how

we should act to realize it. It is in the interest of human freedom that the moral law is given to man and nations only in a general and more or less definite form. It is for man, by the aid of natural or revealed light, to systematize and apply it for himself. Thus the moral law, in its subjective form, lies as an object of consciousness *immanent* in the depths of the soul, and it is on this basis only that the transcendent law finds foothold and play-room. But the feeling of obligation—the conscience—is not to be confounded with the religious feeling. The latter is the soul as affected by the activity of God; the former is the soul as affected by itself—by its own promoted or disturbed harmony. The feeling of obligation is in itself an exclusively subjective feeling.

These citations will secure our definition against the charge of novelty. Let us now examine it in itself and in contrast with some of the views more generally taken. The more common view, which is well expressed by Dr. Wayland, [Moral Science, p. 49] is, that conscience is “that faculty by which we discern the moral quality of actions, and by which we are capable of certain affections in respect to this quality.” This makes conscience a compound, consisting in a union of the judgment, the will and the sensibilities, thus including two elements which are utterly devoid of moral quality. It makes it refer not to relative but to absolute right. Moreover we do not discern by conscience, but by the understanding. Conscience does not modify our discernment, but prompts us to act as we have already discerned.

Dr. Mahan says [Moral Phil. p. 36]: When the mind “is conscious to itself of having really obeyed or disobeyed the law of right, it knows absolutely that it will and must be the object of the corresponding approbation or disapprobation of the conscience of every moral agent in existence, to whom its conduct may be known. The reason is, that each moral agent cannot but be aware that his own moral judgments are but the echo of the conscience of the moral universe.” But no finite being can ever be conscious of this; and it is not true that he who has the approbation of his own conscience is sure of the approbation of others. Was the conscientious slaveholder conscious of univer-

sal approbation? This view makes conscience not only judge but an infallible one.

McCosh propounds [Intuitions, p. 298] this difficulty: "How are the existence of sin and the wrong decisions of conscience consistent with the necessity which attaches to our moral convictions?" But the only necessity there is, is that of the naked subjective intuition of right and wrong, and it is not conscience, but our finite, fallible judgment, that decides as to what acts are right. In another place, however, the same author virtually admits that the judgment is not included in the conscience, for he says [p. 300]: "The conscience, it is to be remembered, is a reflex faculty, judging of objects given to it by the other powers, and the representation given it may be incorrect." Now what but the powers of the judgment are these that are other than, and present objects to, the conscience? When, therefore, he speaks of conscience as judging, he must mean feeling.

But how does our definition, as above proposed, harmonize with good usage, with the conception usually embraced under the term conscience?

In Euripides, a murderer, when asked what disease was destroying him, replies: "My conscience; for I feel that I have done wrong." In Cicero we find the expressions; *grave conscientia pondus*, *conscientia peccate*, and *angor conscientia*, which evidently refers simply to the unhappy feelings arising from violated convictions. Seneca speaks [Ep. 43] thus of the scourgings of violated conscience: "If thou doest well, let all know it; but if evil, what profits it that no one knows it since thou thyself knowest it? O wretched man! if thou despise this witness." Elsewhere [Ep. 97] he says: "It profits not sinners to remain undiscovered, for even though while undiscovered, they may have prosperity, yet they cannot have peace." In Horace this peace-giving approbation of conscience is described as a "brazen wall," and the condition of its enjoyment as "being conscious of no sin, trembling for no crimes." In the Old Testament, the idea of conscience is often embraced under the word heart. Job says, 28: 6, "My heart shall not reprove me so long as I live." In 1 Sam. 24: 5, we read that "David's heart smote him be-

cause he had cut off Saul's skirt." In the account of the fall, the shame of Adam and Eve, before God and each other, is simply the fruit of a condemning conscience.

In the New Testament the conscience is often mentioned, though it is curious that it never occurs in the words of Christ, and only once in the four Gospels. When such of the accusing Jews as had no consciousness of sin were invited to stone the guilty woman, they are said, all, to have been "convicted (condemned) by their own conscience." In the expressions, Heb. 10: 2, "conscience of sins," and 1 Pet. 2:19, "conscience toward God," the word is evidently used in the senses of consciousness and conscientiousness. Elsewhere in Paul's letters the term is used variously, usually in its strict sense, but sometimes, as in 2 Cor. 4: 2, in that of judgment. But of the many predicates of conscience in the New Testament, such as *good, pure, void of offence, weak, seared, defiled, evil, convicting, witnessing*, not one confounds it with the understanding, or makes it anything more than a consciousness—a feeling more or less clear and intense as to our moral condition,—the harmony of our life with our convictions. A good or pure conscience is the feeling resulting from a consciousness of obeying believed duty. When conscience is void of offence, it condemns not; when weak, it is a prey to an erring judgment; and when seared or defiled, it has been shocked and dulled by frequent violation. And such also is the modern popular use of these phrases. To what but to the feelings consequent on the violation of or fidelity to, convictions of right, do the people refer in the expressions, a good, a clear, a guilty, a condemning conscience? They refer, not to absolute, but to relative right—not to their own convictions, but to those of the person spoken of. No one supposes that a Jew's or Turk's conscience condemns him for violating the Christian Sabbath.

Wherever we turn, therefore, whether it be to the classical, the biblical or the popular use of the term, we find confirmations of our proposed view of the conscience. Whatever does not clearly harmonize, is readily reconcilable, with the submitted definition. Moreover this view of conscience escapes many difficulties and contradictions which are involved in other theories.

Those views which include in the conscience a dialectic process, deprive it of its sacred character and make it partake of all the uncertainties and follies of individual opinion. If conscience was designed to discover to us the moral qualities of actions, it signally fails in its purpose. For it teaches no two individuals precisely alike, and guides whole nations into contradictory practises. While the Christian feels bound to practise charity toward, and fellowship with, all men, the Brahmin regards it as in the highest degree abominable to act thus toward any one outside of his own caste. And it cannot be doubted that in both cases the conscience is equally followed; for vast and entire societies of men do not for centuries cling fast to opinions which shock the general conscience. But when the dialectic function is excluded from conscience, and it is viewed as simply a varied form assumed by our consciousness according as we perform or violate believed duty, all these difficulties totally vanish.

Furthermore, this view tends more than others to awaken a consciousness of our dependence on God. It sets a boundary to intellectual presumption and reduces man to that state of moral poverty which is everywhere assumed in the Bible. Man possesses in himself an intellectual framework and a consciousness of right and wrong. But left to himself, he is but an intellectual pigmy, and when unaided from without, can obtain of the infinitely varied and infinitely enduring relations which he sustains to God and his fellows, but little and very indistinct knowledge. And he finds himself in infinitely varied conditions for obtaining such information. The Christian scholar stands in the mellow dawning of moral day. The savage of interior Africa gropes in seemingly utter intellectual and moral night from birth to death. But in both cases the moral phenomenon is actually present. None has ever been found so benighted but that tradition has taught him that some things are right and some are wrong, and, in his God-given nature, the comforting or discomfoting feeling of a gratified or violated conscience will assuredly arise according as he follows or neglects his feeble and perhaps erroneous convictions. And suppose that in fact he does practise conscientiously, as whole nations have done, some things which in themselves are monstrous, such as human sacrifice, in-



fanticide, the murder of aged parents, etc., what does this prove? Not that his moral consciousness leads him to crime; not that his conscience is at fault; for this does its duty—prompts to follow conviction; but simply that he understands erroneously his relations to the universe; that his judgment needs more light. But the most learned and pious Christians are also often in the wrong conscientiously; for no two of them ever absolutely agreed as to every point of practical duty. And what does this prove, but that the most enlightened needs ever to struggle upward into higher light? He who best fathoms the mystery of his destiny and delves deepest into the divine Word, will come nearest to a perfect understanding of the moral law. But all, the most gifted as well as the most benighted, must ever lean on the arm that is stronger than they—must ever be helped by something outside of themselves, to bring their moral apprehensions in closer conformity to the absolute standard.

But another circumstance in favor of the proposed view of conscience is, the cheering light which it throws over the dark problem of heathen salvation. It does not require impossibilities of the helpless pagan, namely, that in order to salvation, his conduct must conform to an absolute law; but, on the contrary, it leaves open to him such a practicable path to salvation as would be presupposable from the justice of God. It does not make of God a respecter of persons, but places all men under a like equitable moral system. The most degraded has but to follow the impulses of his consciously felt higher nature, that is, to inquire what is, and to practise what he comes to believe is right. And the most enlightened has but to do the same. The question no longer merely concerns the formal outward act, but demands whether it conforms to convictions—not whether it is absolutely, objectively right, but whether it is so subjectively, that is, intentionally or morally. Thus, in some sense, each is a law unto himself. And what Christian shall presume to measure the deserts of all men by his own objective standard, and to say what, and what outward conduct, in those who live under a different dispensation, shall exclude them from among the children of God? The inestimable blessing of Christianity is for such as have, or might have had, a knowledge of it. Others

are differently taught and differently judged. When Christians violate conscience and are penitent, they are forgiven, and though they repeatedly sin still they may repeatedly be restored. Suppose a Gentile sins also, and under the compunctions of conscience is truly sorry; may not God, in some way, give also to him renewed inward peace? What can justice require of each but that he shall be a true man under his peculiar circumstances—that he shall follow the behests of his inner monitor? Nor can it be justly objected, that this view derogates from the importance or sacredness of the divine standard of objective right. There is in fact such an immutable and divine standard; but none save God knows it to perfection, and every inference of reason and revelation emphasizes the truth that God judges human actions not so much by their outward form as by the spirit that prompts them—not so much by their body as by their soul. And, finally, it might be urged in favor of the proposed definition, that it divests conscience of a perplexingly complex character and reduces it to a simple primitive activity of the soul. And should it be objected that the only difference between this and some other definitions lies simply in the more or less restricted sense assigned to a word, still then the importance of the difference is not annulled. For words are the caskets of ideas, and so long as they are falsely labelled they will communicate their own erroneousness to the thinking of whatever minds they enter. If, according to the definition proposed, the emotive nature includes and explains all the phenomena usually embraced under the word conscience—if the judgment, the logical faculty, as such, has no moral quality, why then confound the two? why include an element that may as well, and even far better, be excluded?

A brief grouping of the bearings of this essay, and it shall be closed.

1. The conscience is a simple and exclusively moral or religious activity of the soul. It stands between the judgment and the will, receiving formulæ from the former and issuing mandates to the latter, but neither includes nor is to be merged into either of them. Says Prof. Chadbourne [*Nat. Theol.*, p. 279]: “We may mistake in our judgment right from wrong, and, as

free moral agents, we have power to do violence to our conscience; but conscience never fails to demand what the judgment pronounces to be right."

2. The conscience is subjective, relating not to absolute but to relative right. It relates solely to its possessor. "Another's conscience," says Dr. Rothe, "restrains or constrains me not at all, but solely my own. Where an appeal is made to conscience, there all further debate is cut off, there all objective arguments are powerless. Whatever is to me a matter of conscience is for me a sanctuary which another dare not touch." One person can never have conscientious scruples for another. The phrases "public conscience," "national conscience," etc, refer to that general harmony of conscience in a people or community which uniformly results from a common teaching.

3. The conscience is faithful in its functions. It always warns against believed sin. If its voice is not heard, it is because it is drowned beneath the clamor of inferior impulses.

4. It is always binding and should always be obeyed; for it is never a sin to do a believed duty, though it chance to be an absolute wrong; and it is always a sin to do a believed wrong, though it chance to be an absolute right.

5. Conscience is always, and for every moral agent, the safest guide under his actual circumstances; for it always prompts to seek after correct views of duty and to practise them so far as believed. If he disregards it and comes thus, by unfair dealing with himself, to entertain wrong views sincerely, the sin is in the neglect of conscience by which he fell into them, but cannot be in his conscientiously practising them when once sincerely believed.

6. It is the most sacred manifestation of the soul. It is here that the new life begins. "The Holy Spirit," says Auberlen, "beginning from the inmost centre of the conscience, constantly gains wider and deeper possession of the whole man." In authority it stands high above all political and ecclesiastical law. It should enjoy perfect liberty, and all laws which interfere with it, except so far as to safeguard a similar liberty in others, are unjust and infamous. The understanding may be instructed, but the conscience not forced. The great Reformation was es-

entially a protest against outwardly imposed authority, and in favor of obeying conscientious, personal convictions, wherever they might lead.

7. Like our other faculties, conscience is subject to the laws of growth. Use strengthens, disuse dwarfs it. As he who studies and admires works of art is delicately and discriminately sensitive to the beautiful, so he who seeks after and loves righteousness is deeply, keenly sensitive to the morally good. The religious element of his nature assumes its just supremacy, and gives tone to all the subordinate activities of the soul.

---

## ART. II.—THE SINNER'S WORK IN HIS SALVATION.

To preacher and hearer the process of the new birth unto spiritual life is of intense interest. The methods of preaching and of hearing depend upon our views of this subject. There is a class of theologians who believe and teach that man is passive in this transition from death unto life; that God regenerates him by sovereign grace, and that faith and repentance are results of this regeneration. Some act consistently with this doctrine, and hence, never appeal to sinners, never urge them to repent, and oppose all missionary efforts to convert the heathen, or special labor to convert sinners, as being futile and an attempted interference with God's sovereignty. Others preach, argue and persuade just as if the sinner had ability to act, believe, repent and submit to God, though they believe that he really has no such ability, and never can have, until he has been renewed by the power of God. Though it may seem absurd to teach the duty and necessity of action while they believe such action impossible, and urge responsibility while they deny ability; yet the world may well be thankful that they practise so like Christ and the apostles, however much they may differ from them in doctrine. Such inconsistency is to be greatly preferred to the teachings which exactly harmonize with the doctrine of human in-

ability. Men are sufficiently inclined to excuse themselves from responsibility, without being told by expounders of the divine law that they can do nothing, not even so much as to believe God and submit to Christ.

Then there are those who earnestly insist upon human ability and responsibility, and at the same time describe the acts which God commands the sinner to do as entirely above his ability to perform. To this class belong theologians of the Arminian school. They teach that the sinner is abundantly able to believe the gospel and repent of his sins, and yet they represent acceptable faith and repentance as containing elements which are above the capacity of an unrenewed heart. It may be interesting to review the statements of these doctors of theology.

#### THE CALVINISTIC THEORY.

“Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation, so as a natural man being altogether averse from that which is good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself or prepare himself thereto.” “The effectual call is of God’s free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive therein, until being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it.”

“The grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts.” “Repentance unto life is an evangelical grace, the doctrine whereof is to be preached by every minister of the gospel, as well as that of faith in Christ.” (*Westminster Confession of Faith.*)

The points stated here to which attention is directed are these: 1. By the fall man has wholly lost all ability to will any good. He has only power to will evil; his only freedom is to do wrong. 2. God effectually calls the elect, whom he renews, but they are wholly passive in that renewal and all the steps thereto. 3. Faith is a grace, which is a consequent of regeneration; hence regeneration precedes faith and is the source of it. 4. Repentance is also a grace, and a fruit of regeneration. Hence it is vain to demand faith or repentance of the sinner

until he has been regenerated by the power of God, in effecting which the sinner is wholly passive.

#### THE ARMINIAN VIEW.

The Arminian statement of these doctrines, differs materially from the Calvinistic in most points, but runs into the same contradictions in developing all the factors of the scheme. We quote from Richard Watson, a recognized authority among Arminians.

“This appears to be the plain scriptural representation of this doctrine, and we may infer from it: 1. That the faith by which we are justified is not a mere assent to the doctrine of the gospel, which leaves the heart unmoved and unaffected by a sense of the evil and danger of sin, and the desire of salvation, though it supposes this assent: nor, 2. Is it that more lively assent to, and belief in, the doctrine of the gospel touching our sinful and lost condition, which is wrought in the heart by the Spirit of God and from which, springeth repentance, though this must precede it: nor, 3. Is it only the assent of the mind to the method by which God justifies the ungodly by faith in the sacrifice of his Son, though this is an element of it; but it is a hearty concurrence of the will and affections with this plan of salvation, which implies a renunciation of every other refuge, and an actual trust in Christ, and personal apprehension of his merits; such a belief of the gospel by the power of the Spirit of God, as leads us to come to Christ, to receive Christ, to trust in Christ, and to commit the keeping of our souls into his hands, in humble confidence of his ability and his willingness to save us.”

This statement of faith sets forth: 1. That no faith is acceptable unless it contains the element of affection for Christ. 2. That this characteristic of faith is wrought in the heart by the Holy Ghost. Now, can any one tell how a sinner comes to love Christ? Does the carnal, unrenewed heart love him? When he does attain to love of Christ, what more is requisite in order to regeneration? Is it possible for him to have an affection for the Saviour until he is regenerated? Is such affectionate confidence a condition, or a result of regeneration? Is it possible for a sinner to exercise this affectionate confidence? If not, is he required to do so in order to the reception of the grace which renews his heart? If no other faith is acceptable

to God, how does the Arminian theory differ from the Calvinistic, which plainly asserts that there can be no love in man's soul for Jesus until he is regenerated, and no faith without love, and hence no faith until after regeneration? Are not Calvinists the more consistent, while demanding gracious elements in acceptable faith, to 'affirm a sufficient cause, a gracious or regenerate heart as the source? Is it possible that the element of love in faith, can exist, except it proceed from a regenerate heart?

But the Arminian theory is, that God gives to every man a gracious ability to repent, choose life and believe. Jameson, on the 24 articles, says: "Calvinists believe that when God's grace is given to the sinner, to the extent that he has power to choose that which is right, then he is regenerated. Arminians believe that grace may, and really does, restore the power to choose the good, but that this is always *before* regeneration." This gracious ability, they teach, is bestowed upon all men, and that, by virtue of it, all men are able to believe and choose to come to Christ. Mr. Watson, in his Institutes, credits infant baptism with being the medium through which this grace is imparted. He says: "It (baptism) conveys also the present blessing of Christ, of which we are assured by his taking little children in his arms and blessing them; which blessing cannot be merely nominal, but must be substantial and efficacious. It seems too the gift of the Holy Spirit, in those secret spiritual influences by which the actual regeneration of those children who die in infancy is effected, and which are a *seed of life* in those who are spared, to prepare them for instruction in the word of God as they are taught it by parental care to incline their will and affections to good, and to begin and maintain in them the war against inward and outward evil, so that they may be divinely assisted, as reason strengthens, to make their calling and election sure."

So they think it necessary that ability should in some way be inducted into man, added to his natural powers, while he yet lies powerless and passive in the most absolute sense, without power to choose, or desire salvation, or take any steps thereunto, while in this condition. God gives a gracious ability to will, believe, repent and seek salvation, and then demands that the sinner should use it and live. And when we object to these

statements of the case, and assert that man has ample power to believe God and repent of sin, and that the help which God graciously affords him is to persuade and assist him to use rightly the powers which he possesses, they gravely ask: Do you deny the influences of the spirit in bringing sinners to believe and turn to God? So accustomed are they to contemplate the Spirit as working upon a passive subject, that they cannot conceive it possible that he should address man's intelligence, as man reasons with man, and appeal to his will, as one man presents motives to another man; and that sinners are helped to believe by the Spirit, as one man helps another to believe by presenting argument and testimony clearly and forcibly before his mind. It seems to us, that the doctrine of gracious ability is even more difficult to defend than that of regeneration before faith. For if the Spirit must needs work in a sinner, so as to give him such new powers to will and to believe while he is passive and yet powerless, it is unreasonable that he should leave him still unregenerate. If he begins this work of new creation, if he invades the citadel of men's personality and works this great change, so as to lift him from such perfect inability and death why not finish the work and make him a new man? Reason and Scripture are against the notion that, after having done so much and the more difficult part of the work, He should leave the soul after all, in carnal bondage to rebel and be finally lost. Then there is not a single passage of Scripture which fairly interpreted, favors the idea of this gracious ability.

There is another class of theologians who teach that true evangelical faith is the product of two forces or agencies, the human and divine;—that the Spirit presents the truth to the mind, and as the mind accepts it and welcomes the teachings, it attains to faith. This view is entirely in harmony with the word of God, which teaches that faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. The gospel every where addresses sinners as if they were capable of weighing and feeling the force of testimony, and blames them as guilty of great sin if they do not believe. This treatment of the wicked proves their responsibility, and that proves their ability. Thus far there is



harmony in their argument. But their path is not quite so clear when they speak of the relation of faith to regeneration.

Careful attention to the difference between the elements of the faith which precedes and is a condition of regeneration, and those in the faith which the regenerate exercise, is necessary to escape difficulty at this point. We are told that faith is a condition of regeneration, that it logically precedes it; and yet where saving faith exists, regeneration at that instant necessarily occurs; that such faith is really regeneration. They assert that at the very moment the soul apprehends Christ, believes in him as the gospel requires, the affections necessarily gush forth to him in love and adoration. Such statements imply that there is a curative power in faith which lifts the soul up to God, and causes life to spring up within it. The Scriptures speak of God's purifying our hearts by faith, and of our purifying our own hearts by obeying the truth; but in both cases the grace which cures is ascribed to God and not to faith. Faith is a condition, just as taking medicine is a condition of gaining advantage from it. Faith is the receptive act, but not the curative power as this doctrine implies.

Nor does it *necessarily* follow that God regenerates the soul the moment the sinner believes. It may or may not be a fact that he always does it, but there is no such necessary connection between faith and being born of God that renewing grace could not be withheld from the believer for a time, and even forever. The new birth is of God; faith, according to the belief of this class of theologians, is of man aided by the Spirit. Hence the renewing power does not come out of or from faith, but from God; and if God wills to delay that act of the new creation an hour, a week, or a year, after the sinner believes, would any necessary relation between faith and that act of grace be destroyed? Why could not God require the sinner to believe for a time before he renews his heart? What evidence is there that faith so essentially contains regeneration that it always and inevitably brings it into the soul in and with itself? If it is so, then faith is regeneration, and not a condition of it. Then we must inquire, what the condition of such faith may be? Is it repentance? Is it a lower order of faith? Or has it no con-

ditions? Is man to do nothing in order to its possession? Why is the sinner commanded to believe that he may be saved, if faith is salvation? Did the faith of the Syrophonecian woman heal her, or was it the virtue which went out of Jesus? Did the jailor's faith save him or Jesus in whom he believed? Does salvation come from within or from above? There is plainly a confusion of ideas in this theory. It seems to affirm and deny that faith is a grace of regeneration. It does not come before it and as a condition of it, nor after it as a fruit of it, but both come together, and each is the cause of the other. The gospel does not so represent it. He that cometh to God must believe, and when he comes as an act of faith, Christ gives him peace and life.

#### FAITH ANALYZED.

An analysis of faith into its factors, and a careful attention to the respective capabilities of the unregenerate and the regenerate, will remove from this subject its most perplexing difficulties.

1. The first and lowest type of faith is the conviction of the judgment that the testimony or record concerning Jesus Christ is true.

Persons thus believing may have no conscience or moral sense of the claims of Christ upon them, or of their duty to obey. Their only recognition of obligation is purely intellectual, cold and inactive, and they have little or no sense of guilt on account of rejecting the Saviour. The feeling of *ought*, and *ought not*, which should follow belief in Christ, is not developed, and does not make up a part of their experience. This state of mind is frequently called faith in the gospel, and we cannot consistently call it any thing else. Thus in John 12: 42, 43, "Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue. For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Simon also had this faith,—Acts 8: 13; and James describes the same type of faith in his epistle, and calls it dead because it is alone. Some say that if it is dead, it is no faith at all, but the Holy Spirit says that it is faith,

and why should we venture to charge him with error? When we analyze faith and study its development, we shall see that the Spirit spoke advisedly, and was not in error in calling even the faith of devils real faith. Such faith millions of sinners have, faith without conscience of duty, and it is dead, not fruitful of life, not acceptable to God, even as dead works are not acceptable, though they are real works.

2. The next higher type of faith is attended with a conviction of obligation and sense of sin, but is not attended by a choice or will to forsake sin and submit to Christ.

We say the next higher type of faith, but do not mean that it is always the next in order of development. It may precede the conviction of the judgment that Jesus is the Christ. Many of the heathen have confessed deep and terrific conviction of sin. They have been in agony and despair on account of sin, from which they found no deliverance, though ignorant of the true God and of Jesus, the Saviour. Among the Jews the conscience was often aroused, and the sinner cried out, "O wretched man that I am;" the law gave them a knowledge of and remorse for sin, but they knew nothing of Christ. So that these moral emotions, this remorse for sin, may chronologically precede or follow the belief that Jesus is the son of God. But whenever it exists in conjunction with this faith, it imparts to it a higher nature; therefore we call it a higher type of faith.

Without the operation of conscience and this sense of guilt for violation of the law of God, it is unreasonable to suppose that any man will accept of Christ. Why should he seek a Saviour unless he is conscious of being a sinner? It is not the well, but the sick, who call a physician. Belief that we are guilty, and consequently lost is the only reason why we should regard a Saviour necessary; and if he is not needed, no one will ask his aid. But belief in God's testimony touching our guilt and danger brings strength, life, personal interest and active energy to the conviction of the judgment. When we feel that we need a Saviour, what before was to us a mere historic truth of no personal interest to us, becomes intensely interesting and important, and the belief in that historic fact at once takes a new position in the mind, it is no longer an ab-

stract truth, a mere historic fact, of no vital interest to us, but is now an object of personal hope and desire. Faith is no longer alone and dead, it has a degree of life and an element of active energy.

But this conscience of sin does not necessarily denote a willingness to receive Christ as a Saviour. It tends strongly in that direction, but another element yet must be added before the mind is in a receptive condition. When Paul reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled, (Acts 24 : 25,) so thoroughly was his moral nature stirred. Few men who have been truly converted, ever felt the remorse and fear that Felix did; yet he did not receive Christ. People are often so convicted of sin that they can neither eat nor sleep, and yet they do not become Christians. And why not? Not because Christ is unwilling to save. It is a reproach and slander upon Christ to intimate that he does not desire to save every man. The obstacle is in the sinner not in Christ. "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." Why was not Felix saved? For the time being he refused to submit to Christ. In this way thousands keep the Lord and salvation out of their hearts, though they believe without a doubt that Jesus is the only Saviour, and that they are sinners, condemned and lost, and without hope if not saved by him. Are they regenerated prior to such faith? Was Felix regenerated? Will any deny that sinners are capable of this degree of faith? And will they deny that such faith must precede regeneration? Paul says, (Heb. 11 : 6,) "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of all those that diligently seek him. "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?"—Rom. 10 : 14. The word of God is exactly adapted to produce this conviction of conscience in regard to sin. "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart."—Heb. 4 : 12. By the law is the knowledge of sin. The preaching of Peter pricked the hearts of those who heard. The preaching of the gospel is the chief means of arousing the consciences of

sinner. The Holy Spirit wrote the word, and dwelt in the apostles, and dwells in the church and ministry now, to effect this very result. It works mainly through these channels, to convince the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment. The preaching of the word convicts of sin in proportion as the ministry and the church are filled with the Holy Spirit. And though the Spirit is not limited to this mode of operation, the experience of the church proves that when the Spirit is grieved, and departs from the saints, sinners are careless and have little or no conscience of sin; and when the church is filled with the Spirit, sinners feel the truth prick their hearts, their wicked thoughts and motives are revealed, their consciences aroused, and they confess the word to be sharper than any two-edged sword.

So faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God, (Rom. 10: 17,) and not by regeneration. Nor is it the gift of God, any more than thinking, reasoning, or even breathing, is the gift of God. The facts believed, and the evidence of their truth, is the gift of God, but the act of believing is the act of man. Hence it is always urged upon man as a duty to believe, and he is charged with sin for not believing, and it is no where taught in the divine word that the act of faith is the gift of God. To a certain extent, faith is a necessity when proper evidence is presented, but in a large degree it is voluntary. It is prevented by prejudice, lack of candor, hatred of the doctrine proposed, refusal to hear the evidence and to consider the testimony and admit its real force. An honest, candid and attentive mind is demanded in order to believe, and this implies voluntary choice. While men cannot believe without testimony, they often do not believe when there is ample testimony. But when they are candid, willing to be convinced, and convicted of sin as well, the mind is in a receptive attitude, and the gospel is exactly adapted to convince the judgment, arouse the conscience and develop the feeling that they are sinners, and that Jesus is the only Saviour.

3. The next degree of faith is seen when the will acts in obedience to the truth believed.

Many have not the shadow of a doubt as to the fact that Jesus

is the Christ and only Saviour, but are destitute of conscious guilt, of any purpose to obey him, or to seek life in him. And many have had a deep sense of guilt and still refuse to seek life in Christ. So devils believe and tremble, and so men believe and resist the Holy Ghost. They are not in a receiving, but a resisting state of mind; they do not come to Christ with their heavily laden hearts but go away from him; they do not welcome him as Saviour but refuse his grace. Thus the Saviour declares, (John 5 : 40,) "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life;" and then, (Rev. 22 : 17,) "And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely;" and (Rev. 3 : 20,) "Behold I stand at the door and knock, if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in and sup with him, and he with me."

If the Scriptures teach anything plainly, they teach that the will of man may and does effectually exclude Christ from renewing the heart and saving from sin. But when the sinner does submit to Christ, believing that he is able and willing to save, the work of salvation quickly follows, for Jesus is waiting to be gracious. But this submission of the will is not forced by God, nor does it necessarily follow belief that we are lost sinners and that Christ is the only Saviour. There is no compulsion about it at all. There are influences and motives from above, and from our own souls, to induce us to choose, to submit the will, but submission may be and often is refused. God acts in harmony with the laws of the human mind in connection with our turning to Jesus, and leaves us freely to choose life or refuse it.

Some imagine that when sinners have the right kind of faith they must choose Christ of necessity. But all the faith that is possible before the choice of the will, cannot force such a choice. Every one at all familiar with the laws of mind will admit that. If they mean that the right kind of faith includes the choice of the will and cannot exist without it, then it is absurd to say that such faith produces this choice. That is equivalent to saying that the choice of the will necessarily produces the choice of the will, and that such a choice cannot exist without being followed by itself. If any possible degree of faith before the submission of the will necessitates such a submission,

the act of the will ceases to be voluntary and responsible, and becomes involuntary and irresponsible. But it is a well known fact that men often do have all the faith that it is possible for a man to have before he wills to obey the truth believed, and yet he refuses to obey, and persists in that refusal unto death. When they knew God, they glorified him not as God, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts were darkened, and God gave them over to believe a lie and be damned.

But when the sinner chooses to obey the gospel, resolves to accept the life which he believes that he needs, and submit to the Saviour whom he believes to be the only one able to save him, he puts himself into a new relation to the truth, he turns his face towards it, makes it more immediately and personally his own, seeks to apply it to his own case, and draw the full advantage of it to his own soul. This of course adds vitality and force to his former convictions of judgment and conscience, so that he believes more heartily than before; this re-enforcement of will stirs the whole soul, and he thinks, feels and sees as he never did or could until now.

This effect is enhanced by the spiritual approach of Christ given to such a soul. He comes in, his face shines directly into the heart that is turned towards him, he sheds upon and into that heart gracious influences which make sin and salvation more real than they could before be conceived. The obstacle of a resisting will is now removed. That obstacle excluded light, excluded Christ, kept the mind paralyzed and blinded, so that truth was seen as in twilight. Now the obstacle is removed, the door is thrown open, the light shines directly into the soul, no hindrance keeps back the grace which creates anew unto good works, and the mind thinks, feels, repents and wills better than before.

This act of will may be called one element in saving faith, or repentance, or whatever one pleases to call it. It matters little. We need not quarrel about words, the idea is distinct and individual, and is so recognized in Scripture. Any degree of faith without it will not save, but faith in Christ as Saviour and a conscience of sin, followed by this choice of the will, does bring

the sinner and Christ together, and results in a change of heart and a new life. And we prefer to so analyze the operations of the mind as to mark the specific acts in their order, so as to detect any defects which may prevent acceptance with Christ, and fix the mind of the sinner upon the specific mental act which is required in order to bring him wholly to Christ. Sometimes the difficulty lies at one point and sometimes at another; and to every defect a lack of faith often confuses the mind and affords the inquirer no relief. Sometimes the fault is in the will, sometimes in the conscience, and sometimes in not believing that Jesus is able and willing to save on the conditions of the gospel. One point where inquirers usually stumble is, after they have a sense of sin, and believe that Jesus is the only Saviour, and sincerely seek to serve and obey Him, they fail to believe that He does accept them and the consecration which they have made, and accepts them then, at the very time that the consecration is made. Light and peace will not fill the soul until that appropriating act of faith is exercised. Nor is that appropriating act possible until the will has yielded to Christ, for Christ never does accept the soul until that submission occurs, and to believe that he does would be delusion. Right here the Christian teacher should be able to assist the soul which seeks salvation.

Now the teachings of Scripture, and the conscious experience of every believer who has analyzed his mental processes in conversion, agree with this statement,—that, up to the point where the will submits, the sinner is not regenerated, and when the will of one who believes is yielded to Christ, he is always renewed and saved. And that up to this point the mind, or heart, has not possessed, or exercised the element of love, and that love does not enter the soul until after the faith and the choice described, exist; and that it always does enter the soul as soon as such faith and submission of the will are exercised. Previous to this crisis in experience, the sinner may have a conscience of sin,—a belief that he is lost while out of Christ, and that Christ is able to save,—a fear and sense of obligation,—a conviction that it is right to obey Christ, and wrong to disobey,—a desire to be made holy and to love God and holiness,—to



have a new heart and grace to resist sin,—and also to have a will to seek and obey the Saviour. All this an unregenerate man may possess, and always does possess before he is renewed, and before he feels his heart moved by love. But when he does possess all these elements, Christ always accepts the consecration, creates him anew, and gives him love, even the spirit of adoption, whereby he cries, “Abba, Father.”

These facts lead inevitably to two important conclusions. 1. The sinner cannot exercise faith which contains, or is accompanied with love. 2. The faith which he can exercise, and which does not contain the element of love, is a condition of regeneration, and when exercised is always followed by it.

4. The next type of faith is that of the Christian, which works by love.

The love of God is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit, but the world cannot receive the Spirit, “because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him;” but the Christian knows him, “for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you.” The possession of love gives life and inspiration to all other exercises of mind. We can believe more, Christ becomes more personal, precious, near to us, after we love him, so that the Christian has a warmth and power in his faith which is impossible to a sinner. And it seems unreasonable to speak of the faith, which is the condition of acceptance and regeneration, as the same as that which is ascribed to the Christian, and follows regeneration. By doing so, many have been confused and bewildered in regard to faith, and have been forced into unbelief through a wrong representation of belief. For when a penitent is assured that no faith is acceptable to Christ as a condition of pardon, which does not contain the element of love or affectionate trust, he cannot believe his teacher, and at the same time believe that Christ accepts the very best consecration that he is able to make; for he knows that he has no affection,—no love for Christ. His heart is hard, dark, filled with fear, conviction of sin, of duty, and a desire to be renewed,—and to love, but he knows that he does not love, mourns that he cannot, and feels that he ought not to believe that Christ accepts him because he does not love.

If Christian teachers would carefully distinguish between the

type of faith which precedes and is a condition of regeneration, and that type which follows, and which is inspired by the love which the Holy Spirit sheds abroad in the heart at the time and in the act of regeneration, the way to Jesus would be less difficult than it sometimes is made, and some who now fail of life might be saved.

Moreover, when this distinction is made, there is no more reason for theologians to fall into the absurd error of making regeneration the condition and antecedent of faith. No one denies that man has ability to do some things, to think, and to have some opinions and desires about salvation. He has moral sense, conscience and will-power. Now when man does the very best he can to seek reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ, using all the helps which God graciously gives him, is God offended with him, or pleased? Is this effort one which God would have him make, or desist from making? Is it a sinful or a righteous effort? Is such effort conducive to salvation or prejudicial to it? Does God give more grace to those who thus strive, or curse them for their efforts? Would any man dare to say to such a striving and seeking soul, "Desist; your efforts are all sinful; wait until God renews your heart?" There can be but one answer to these queries. If we seek the Lord, believe as best a sinner can, submit all to Jesus, he will accept us, and renew the soul, giving the spirit of adoption so that we henceforth shall have the faith which works by love.

---

### ART. III.—DOES MORAL AGENCY CONTINUE AFTER DEATH?

The question before us is one of more than ordinary interest, and must present to every reflecting mind a variety of phases, each of which is important as well as interesting. It opens up to us the whole broad field of the unexplored future, and suggests inquiries startling in their significance. It must embrace the question of human responsibility here, and grasp the problem of human destiny hereafter.

Like all questions relating to the unknown hereafter, we must depend for a solution, not upon formal statement and classified definition by the Author of existence, but, rather, on the processes of ordinary reasoning, joined to the suggestive declarations of divine revelation. Pursuing these modes of inquiry we believe a satisfactory solution of the problem may be reached without serious difficulty.

And, first, it is important to define what is understood by the term "moral agency" as here used. We understand it to mean, simply, *the power of voluntary choice as between different objects presented to the mind.*

We assume that man as at present developed is in the possession of this power, a voluntary actor in the field of morals, constantly exhibiting his entire freedom to choose on all questions relating to responsible existence here, and salvation hereafter. God most unequivocally recognized that freedom in the creation and first manifestation of himself to man. He declared to our first parents the wise rules which must govern their existence, pointed out clearly the paths of happiness and misery, the one entered by the gate of obedience, the other by that of disobedience. God simply communicated his will, plainly declared certain consequences as the result of certain acts, and then left to man the decision of the important questions affecting his destiny. God's manifest justice must certainly proclaim that man was punished because he chose to disobey, when he might just as freely have chosen an opposite course. So, each accountable individual in the universe is but another Adam, and forfeits his paradise, not necessarily because Adam sinned, but, "after the similitude of Adam's transgression," because he himself chooses to disobey God's commandments.

Granting, then, that man in his sphere of earthly existence possesses the power of free choice, the simple question before us is, will that power continue after death, and when he becomes an inhabitant of eternity? As an important step in the investigation, it will be necessary to inquire into the nature of that occurrence which we call death, and ascertain, if possible, the effect thereby produced upon our relations to the future world. What is it, and how are we affected by it? We answer, that

death is essentially *dissolution*, and that it has the same signification both in the material and moral world. It is a disintegration, a separation of parts, whether applied to the animal man, or the spiritual life which is essential oneness with God. That course of conduct which is in harmony with the divine will, which best secures the end for which God created us, which ministers to our highest happiness, and secures the welfare of mankind, is denominated *life* in the Word of God, while its opposite course is denominated death. As harmony with God and holiness, a unity of thought and feeling, attested by the witness of God's Spirit with ours, is life in the highest sense, so the opposite course of those of whom it is said "God is not in all their thoughts," is the way of separation from God, or death.

That the term as used in the Scriptures refers to separation from God and heaven is evident, plainly, from the fact that those upon whom the penalty of death is pronounced are uniformly spoken of as alive, and subject to the most vivid consciousness in the future world, where the mental anguish is likened to the "worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched." That the term is intended to convey the idea of a condition furthest removed from holiness is evident from its frequent use, the manner of Paul, who refers to the wanton woman as being "*dead, while she liveth.*"

All nature teaches us that physical death is only a dissolution, or separation of parts—a change of elements. We view with satisfaction the fragrant flower by the way side, and prize it for its blooming life of beauty, but anon the frosts of autumn come, and its leaves fall withered upon the earth, and we call it dead; but we mean by this that the elements of its life, operated on by a hostile agency, have been separated, the combination before existing destroyed, the relation of parts changed, and the flower, as such, gone to decay. The elements of life are not destroyed, but still exist in other combinations. We may cut down the sturdiest oak, dig out its roots, gather its branches and tiniest leaflets, and make of the whole a huge bonfire, till roots and trunk and branches and leaves are all consumed, and yet we have only produced a separation of the fluids and gases

and more ponderable substances. The fluids have simply evaporated and live in moist air, the gases have only changed their abode, the solids remain in ashes, and the various invisible elements have sought a place somewhere with their affinities. .

We believe we enunciate a true principle when we say that all life is caused by a union of elements, a combination of agencies; so its opposite, death, is simply the reverse, a resolution of those elements, a separation of those agencies. From the divine record of the creation, we learn that God made man of the dust of the earth, but it was only powerless dust, mere pulseless clay, until he breathed into the inanimate form, and existence sprung from the union, for the man "became a living soul." At death this order is reversed, soul and body separate, and, in the language of inspired wisdom, "The dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it." The man, who is of the earth, earthy, the "tabernacle of flesh" goes down to the grave in corruption, while the "inner man," the immortal soul, created in the image of God, departs to the habitation of that "house not made with hands, eternal, and in the heavens."

Temporal death, then, being only a dissolution, a separation of soul and body, we next inquire, How are we affected thereby? In the separation of mind and matter, does any essential change of organization take place in either, or in both? That such change, essential and complete, does take place with the material man is certain, for each day repeats the sad lesson that "all flesh is as grass," and that man cometh forth as a flower to-day to be cut down to-morrow. It is important to keep in view the fact that life in man is a result of the union of body with soul, of matter with mind, and that the body itself contains no principle of life, but that, in this aspect of death, "that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts: even one thing befalleth them." But not so with the soul,—it sprang from the very Fountain of Life, claiming an infinite parentage, and finds in the divine existence the pledge of its own immortality. If it can be truly said that God created man in His own image, it must certainly follow that the image resembles the original in its essential and characteristic features. That could scarcely be called

an image at all which possessed only the minor and unimportant features of the pattern, with few if any of the distinguishing attributes. If man is immortal in the characteristic image of God, we believe it logically follows that he is also unchangeable in his organization.

To change the essential structure of the human soul would be to destroy its identity, and a destruction of identity necessarily carries with it practical annihilation. A changed existence must be a different existence, in effect a new creation. The change which the spiritual realizes at death is not an essential one of existence itself, but only of the conditions of existence, becoming adapted to a different atmosphere, furnished with different surroundings, infinitely better, or infinitely worse. Eternity obviously finds us with the same mental organism, the same tastes, feelings and desires, the same individuality with which death leaves us. Henceforth, change is going on only in the sense of development, the character of which is doubtless affected by the surroundings.

If a savage gorilla fresh from the wilds of Africa, could be suddenly transplanted to civilized society we should expect no change from the animal to the human, though probably, as a gorilla, he could be improved by the surroundings. All the change of place, and hot-bed development in the universe can never change a being of one distinct species to a being of another species. No amount of culture has yet succeeded in making a man from a monkey, though it has frequently made a better monkey. Change of location and climate never made a camel a horse, or a horse an elephant. Development in the same species is possible, but a radical change of nature and organization in nature, is an utter impossibility. The sharp point of fact pricks the airy bubble of fancy, and proves the "modern development theory" to be the very essence of nonsense. Reasoning from analogy, then, can we consistently suppose that, because at death the soul has met an entire change of outward condition, the soul itself is changed? Most assuredly not; but manifestly the mind exists as the same harmonious whole in eternity as in time. The memory, the reasoning powers, the perceptions, the conscience, and the will exist in the same re-

lations that they have ever maintained, only in a more perfect state of development. The plant is not essentially changed, but the soil is much improved.

If this be true, then it necessarily follows that the same mental processes take place in a future state as in our present life, viz., the perceptive faculties perceive, the reasoning powers weigh the testimony presented by the understanding, the conscience approves or condemns, and the will decides,—in a word, God has made no change of structure, and imposed no law of necessity on the mind which did not always exist in perfect agreement with the wise man's declaration, that "where the tree falleth, there it shall be." If, then, our faculties are retained in their relative harmony, only better instructed and more perfect in action, it must certainly follow that the power of choice exists as it has ever existed. To argue to the contrary is to assert a destruction of certain faculties of mind, or its equivalent, a suspension of their exercise. All our observation here shows that, when, through bodily disease the exercise of any mental faculty is in the least degree impaired, the man is proportionately imbecile and imperfect. It is a perversion of the design of the Creator in man's formation—a consequence of sin attached to diseased flesh. It is regarded as a calamity, and so God's word expresses it. Shall that which is such a calamity among men here be conferred as the greatest blessing in eternity. But if man in the future shall possess the power of free choice, the inquiry at once arises whether he may not then choose the ways of evil, and an unlimited succession of Edens lost because of transgression be again enacted. We naturally ask How shall we reconcile this seeming possibility with the uniform representation of the Scriptures that in eternity man's condition is a finality, and admits of no change, either of place or moral purpose? We apprehend that all seeming difficulties will disappear when we contemplate the proper distinction between the *existence* of power, and the *exercise* of that power. That power does often exist, as a hidden force, potent in its nature, without being called into exercise, may be shown by any one of a thousand familiar illustrations which nature furnishes for our inspection.

We have often stood upon the bank of a river and watched the current as it flowed onward to the sea; and who, as thus he has looked, has failed to reflect that if the current were directed to the wheel of the factory it would set in motion a thousand whirling spindles. But the stream flows silently on, though freighted with the power of a thousand giants, and finds no room for its exercise,—*the factory is not there!* Such, in part, will obviously be our relations to the future world. The ordinary powers of mind will exist, and, we believe, be active too, only the action may terminate on a new class of objects. The perceptions will manifestly be no less active than on earth, but will just as manifestly rest on a very different field of vision. The will, with none of its powers abated, will exercise that power, but by no means necessarily choosing between the same classes of motives that are presented here. The current of the river, though failing to exercise its power upon the great driving wheel of the factory, for lack of opportunity, may nevertheless wield that power in other directions, and bear upon its bosom the vessel freighted with a valuable cargo. Human freedom does not depend upon the actual choice of a particular object, but upon the ability to choose some object.

We may readily conceive a multitude of cases where a certain class of motives may be presented which are so completely in harmony with our previous desires, and so potent in their influence, because leading to the possession of some object which we have desired to obtain, that to a moral certainty we shall now choose what we had previously determined to choose upon first opportunity. Such we conceive is to be precisely our condition in the future world, for it is most certainly true that we fix the place of our habitation there by the successive acts of previous volition. The saint becomes an heir of heaven because he has chosen in life to become one; the sinner as surely inherits perdition because he has chosen the course inevitably leading there. In either case, the motives being mainly in one direction, and such as accord with constant desire, the mind having chosen to be placed in the midst of such surroundings, it seems clear that choice will be in one direction, and yet no faculty of mind be changed or impaired in its action.



In the world of happiness, we believe we shall perceive but one class of outward motives. There will be no objects there of a sinful nature to tempt the soul with a desire for possession,—no subtle serpent to deceive with the proffer of forbidden fruit,—no father of lies to silence the voice of conscience by ingenious falsehoods! In this absence of temptation we see illustrated the infinite goodness of God in providing for man a complete salvation from sin, instead of a simple restoration to divine favor. The Word of God every where teaches that we have gained far more in Christ than we lost through Adam, that “where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.” A plan, securing a restoration of the race to a condition essentially like that of our parents in Eden before the fall, would necessarily also have left the race subject to like influences, and in danger of like ruin. But, instead of this, no fact is more clearly revealed than that the future condition of man is irrevocably fixed, whether the state be one of happiness or of misery.

That all which tends to induce sin is excluded entirely from heaven is explicitly stated by John, as the revealer of heaven’s mysteries. He says, “God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.” And still more explicitly,—“And there shall in no wise enter in any thing that defleth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie.” The unchangeable nature of the future life is clearly taught in the impressive parable of the rich man and Lazarus, and by familiar declarations of a positive nature throughout God’s revealed Word. Christ asserts this changeless state when of the finally impenitent he says, “these shall go away into everlasting punishment, “and of the righteous, they shall inherit “life eternal.” John says, that “the smoke of their torment ascendeth forever and ever,” when he refers to the final condition of the lost in misery. The most solemn warnings and most urgent appeals of Scripture are based on the certainty of probation and possible change here, and a fixed abode suited to a fixed character hereafter.

But it may be urged that this expressed certainty of a changeless state in the future, would seem to imply the destruction of

volition, and place it beyond the power of man to change his attitude before God. We are to bear in mind, however, that the certainty of an event does not prove its necessity. Because it is certain, and God has indicated that certainty, that man will not become a sinner in heaven or a saint in hell, it does not necessarily follow that the power of voluntary choice is either destroyed or arbitrarily controlled. The destruction of moral agency involves the exercise over the mind of a superior power sufficient to compel action invariably in accordance with the will of the superior power. In other words, that we must act, not because of choice on our part, but because a superior power has chosen for us. But is it true that such an occurrence takes place at death, that manhood is dethroned, and the responsible creature formed in God's own image, changed to a mere negative existence, without conscious individuality? Most assuredly not, for if heaven shall hold for the redeemed constant joy, and God's favor afford perpetual delight, they must be conscious of a constant desire, a perpetual choice for that which heaven holds, and God loves. This constant consciousness of choosing what God loves is the secret spring of the Christian's happiness here on earth, which Paul described as "unspeakable and full of glory." Feeling how complete is God's holiness, how supreme his wisdom, we know our highest good is best secured when in thought and feeling we are "changed into the same image," and the choice of the Christian is constantly to will what God wills, and heaven begins in the soul when we love to pray "not as I will, but as thou wilt." No true child of God deliberately desires to sin, or to be exposed to temptation, but, on the contrary, his constant, anxious prayer ever ascends; "Lord, lead me not into temptation, but deliver me from evil." The brightest sky on which the Christian pilgrim rests his longing gaze is that in which is set the rainbow of divine promise, revealing "an inheritance, incorruptible, and undefiled, and which fadeth not away." He longs for the beautiful land on which

"There falls no shadow, rests no stain,"—

where "the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at

rest." He would fain cross the river and join the glorified throng whose feet press the streets of the New Jerusalem, and mingle notes of praise with the myriads of voices which fill the air with melody, while all the redeemed chant the sublimest hallelujahs to God and the Lamb! If such ardent desire for holiness and expectant longing for heaven fill the Christian's mind here, where the world, the flesh, and the devil conspire to lead us into sin; where, though we would do good evil is present with us, what must be the character of our desires yonder, where increased facilities for a better knowledge multiply at every step, and where our vivid perceptions of truth will lead us to see the exceeding sinfulness of sin, as viewed in the light of God's infinite love and boundless mercy! As the regenerated soul here oftentimes shrinks from contact with known evil, so there the redeemed soul will loathe and abhor all evil, sharing the feelings of the divine mind which cannot look upon sin with allowance. To suppose man likely to choose evil in heaven knowing its absolute antagonism to all holiness, and in the absence of all temptation to sin from without, the whole mind filled with a consciousness of danger from evil, realizing by the bitter experience of the past as even angels cannot realize, the ruin which sin ever brings upon the soul,—to suppose man to choose under the most favorable conditions for holiness what he has sought through long years to avoid, even under conditions most favorable to sin, is a supposition more in keeping with a disordered imagination than creditable to either a sound reason or a loyal faith.

But the practical query may be fairly raised, whether the lost soul will have supreme desire for evil, as the redeemed has supreme desire for holiness, or whether it will desire holiness as an object of choice. In other words, Will the abode of lost spirits be more favorable to holy obedience than this present world, where good influences and powerful incentives to virtue are by no means wanting? The question, we think, admits of but one answer. It is evidently true that, as in heaven all outward motives to sin are absent, so in the realm of the lost all outward motives to holiness are unknown, while sin in its lowest depths, and depravity in its most corrupting stages of develop-

ment, make the very atmosphere pregnant with the influence of moral evil! The influence of the Holy Spirit is withdrawn, and, familiar only with the image of sin within the heart, surrounded by examples of sin, the sinner will choose sin and love iniquity in eternity, as he has chosen it in time. That the lost may have transient desires for forgiveness and heaven, springing from the selfish wish to escape certain consequences, we do not doubt, but a "godly sorrow" unto repentance, sufficient to change character, is, in the nature of the case, impossible. The sinner has chosen his condition with all its known and probable consequences; with his character and his surroundings he will manifestly continue to choose for a perpetual succession of years what he has chosen for a single year.

But this difficulty may perhaps be suggested in regard to the changeless state of the righteous, viz., That if it be true that the memory exists in the future, as it does evidently only in a more perfect state, it must follow that a constant acquaintance with evil experienced in the past is kept up; and, it may be asked, if mental association with the evil through the medium of the memory will not induce wrong desires and lead to sin. We believe not, from at least two considerations:—

First, many, if not most, of the temptations to sin assail us through the medium of a depraved and corrupt physical nature; as waters, to exhibit power for results must first find a channel in which to gather their force, so temptation, to be efficient for evil, must find an appropriate channel by which to reach the heart. But in heaven we are entirely divested of mortality, and no longer subject "to fleshly lusts which war against the soul," and which "work in our members, to bring forth fruit unto death." Corruption shall have put on incorruption, and the material give place to the spiritual.

Second, in our purified state, and with our quickened spiritual vision, where we "see as we are seen and know as we are known," such will be our conception of moral evil and the enormity of transgression, that past sins will only be remembered to be despised and to deepen our gratitude to God that we have been able through grace "to escape the corruption which is in the world through lust." We shall view the nature of sin

much as the somnambulist, suddenly awakened from his unconscious night-walking, views the dangerous precipice on the verge of which he has but just stood.

Memory will be to us a picture gallery of past events, holding very many upon which with purified vision, we shall look only with pain, and wish we might turn their unwelcome faces to the wall. We shall hardly be in danger of falling in love with that which so nearly compassed our ruin, and which can have no possible affinity for that which must constitute a place of entire holiness.

We have thus briefly examined this question of future volition, reasoning from analogy and the known constitution of the human mind, fortifying our position by declarations from the Scriptures, and at the same time not forgetting some apparent difficulties presented. If the conclusions we have drawn be correct, it follows that death effects no change, and introduces us to no condition materially altering the operations of the mind from its present voluntary action; and that, though radical and influential changes mark the conditions of future life, yet they are not of such a character as to interfere with moral freedom, but rather illustrate the wise and complete harmony between the freedom of man and the sovereignty of God.

---

#### ART. IV.—BINDING THE DRAGON.

No part of the Bible has given rise to so many wild conjectures as the Book of Revelation. In consequence of these many turn away from its pages as from a forbidden thing, and deprecate all discussion concerning its varied symbols. Yet it is accepted as an inspired book, and it contains within its own pages the key with which we may unlock its hidden mysteries.

Perhaps no part of this much tortured book has suffered more at the hands of commentators than that which relates to the subject of this article. The first mention made of the dragon

is in the twelfth chapter, which is as follows; "And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars: and she being with child cried travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered. And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads. And his tail drew a third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon it was born."

A similar beast is described in the succeeding chapter: "And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and I saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the names of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion, and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority." This description is more minute than the other, the only essential difference appearing in the fact that, in the latter the horns are crowned, while in the former the crowns are upon the heads. Most commentators suppose the first beast—the dragon—to be symbolical of Pagan Rome; the second, of the Papal power. The seven heads are supposed to represent the different forms of government under which Rome had existed. This would be fitly symbolized by representing the heads as being crowned. After old Rome was overthrown, some half score of small kingdoms sprang up, possessed of similar language, aims, religion and forms of government. This is fitly symbolized by preserving the main features of the beast, and placing the crowns upon the horns. In the eleventh verse another beast is spoken of, having but two horns, yet possessing the spirit and aims of the dragon. In the seventeenth chapter the dragon appears again in a lengthened description and the apostle's explanation subjoined; this renders it a most important chapter.

"And I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns.

And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornications: and upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." Of this the following explanation is added: "The beast that thou sawest was and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition: and they shall wonder whose names are not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, when they shall behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is." Rome was;—symbolized, as we have seen, by the great red dragon,—she was not;—that is, she was overthrown by the Barbarians,—and yet, she is; her prestige was restored by the popes,—symbolized by the scarlet colored beast.

"And here is the mind of wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth; and there are seven kings; five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh he must continue a short space. And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth to perdition. And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet, but receive power as kings one hour with the beast. The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues. And the woman which thou sawest is the great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth."

From this it appears that the apostle, in all these symbols, is contemplating Rome. The woman is the great city; in the first verse she is represented as sitting upon the waters, in the third she is seated upon the scarlet colored beast. The waters symbolize the peoples, nations, multitudes and tongues; hence the beast must symbolize the same thing. The city of Rome is seated on seven hills; it existed under seven forms of civil administration, and when its power was broken by the Barbarian, ten minor kings sprang up having similar ends, laws, language and religion. From all of which it appears that the term dragon, as used in the book of Revelation, is symbolical of Rome;—

hence the binding of the dragon must mean the binding of Rome, and casting the dragon into the pit and shutting him up must mean the effectual overthrow of that power. In making a wild beast symbolical of a nation, the apostle John follows the example of the prophet Daniel. In the seventh chapter, the prophet symbolizes the four great kingdoms of antiquity by four beasts : a winged lion stands for Babylon, a bear for Persia, a leopard having four heads and four wings is Greece ; while a nondescript beast, bearing a close resemblance to the dragon of Revelation, symbolizes Rome.

This mode of representing kingdoms is not fanciful or arbitrary on the part of the sacred writers. Nothing is more common, both in ancient and in modern times, than to represent kingdoms by symbols. The eagle is the chosen symbol of republics, the lion of powerful monarchies, the bear is occasionally used, as for Russia and ancient Persia, the elephant for Siam, a hybrid monster, web-winged, with barbed tongue and tail, stands for China, a peacock for Burmah, a white horse for Hanover, a winged lion for Babylon, and the dragon was the chosen standard for Imperial Rome.

Not only does the apostle John follow closely in the footsteps of Daniel, almost copying him in his symbol for Rome, but he also follows closely in the track of Isaiah, both as to symbol and other language. "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, the great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." Rev. 14: 8. 'This is almost an exact quotation from Is. 21: 9,—"Babylon is fallen, is fallen, and all the graven images of her gods he hath broken unto the ground." In Jer. 51: 7, 8, we read ; "Babylon hath been a golden cup in the Lord's hand that made all the earth drunken, the nations have drunken of her wine, therefore the nations are mad. Babylon is suddenly fallen and destroyed." In Rev. 16: 19, we find these words,—"And the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell, and great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath." This is paralleled in Jer. 25: 15,—"Take the wine cup of this fury at my hand, and cause all the nations to whom I send thee to drink it." After the



prophet has spoken for a time in bold and direct language concerning the overthrow of Babylon, he changes his style, and adopts the symbolical. In the fourteenth chapter, the following is found: "How hath the oppressor ceased, the golden city ceased! The Lord hath broken the staff of the wicked, and the sceptre of the rulers. The whole earth is at rest, and is quiet; they break forth into singing. Yea, the fir trees rejoice at thee, and the cedars of Lebanon, saying, Since thou art laid down no feller is come up against us. Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth; it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. And they shall speak and say unto thee, Art thou also become weak as we? Art thou become like one of us? How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God. . . I will be like the Most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to Hell, to the sides of the pit." In the twentieth chapter of Revelation there is a passage parallel to this; "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key to the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and satan, and bound him a thousand years; and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled."

The analogy between the apostle and the prophet is complete. Each sees a mighty empire approaching the just retribution of its crimes; both speak in unmistakable terms concerning the impending destruction; both employ symbols to give vividness to the picture; both describe the descent to Hell: the one calls his nation Dragon, the other denominates his Lucifer; both speak of the joy that follows the destruction, and, strange to say, both have been supposed by their readers to be dealing with a literal devil; whereas both were talking of the destruction of a great nation.

At this point we are met by a host of commentators, who

have believed and taught that the dragon here spoken of was the same old serpent which beguiled Eve. Veneration for the fathers in the church, and fear lest the foundations give way when one stone is removed, deter many from original investigation. But the cause of truth demands it at our hands. It is claimed that John means to describe satan in the text above quoted: "And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and satan." It will be observed, however, that dragon is the leading word in this sentence, while the terms devil and satan are subordinate to it. This same thought is expressed in Rev. 12: 9, in slightly differing phrase; "And the dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil and satan." But the dragon of the twelfth chapter has seven heads and ten horns, and a tail with which he draws a third part of the stars of heaven. Such a monster "is called the devil and satan." Shall we charge the apostle with borrowing a symbol from Daniel, which by that prophet is explained to mean a great nation—even Rome—and making it mean the Arch-apostate? Shall we teach that dragon means Rome all along in the Apocalypse until we come to the twentieth chapter, and then assert, without a shadow of proof, that satan is meant? While considering the seventeenth chapter it was found that the seven-headed and ten-horned monster bore on his back a woman decked in costly apparel; this many suppose to be the Catholic church; but John says, "it is that great *city* which reigneth over the kings of the earth." Does the literal devil bear about upon his back a great city? Rome does not rest upon the devil's back, but upon the seven heads of the dragon, which are seven hills. Does any one pretend that the devil has really seven heads, and ten horns, and a long tail? Yet such was the monster upon which the angel laid hold.

The dragon is *called* the devil and satan, and with very good reason. 1. The dragon was the chosen standard of the legions of imperial Rome. 2. The terms devil and satan signify an accuser, an opposer, an enemy. Rome has always been an opposer to pure Christianity. She has ever pursued Christians for their destruction. Pagan Rome sought by every will to destroy Christianity, and Papal Rome has more than equalled her

in the numbers that she has caused to die for adherence to principle. 3. We may speak of a corrupt nation, an oppressive law, or a wicked institution, and *call* it an old serpent; we may brand it as devil and satan and not violate the usages of language.

Satan is not the subject upon which John is discoursing in any part of this book. He begins by addressing backsliding churches, he next considers the opposing forces, he contemplates the fall of old Rome, the rise, dominion, corruptions, and overthrow of the Papal power; a ten-horned monster having been used by Daniel to symbolize Rome, the apostle adds seven heads to the monster, calls it a beast, a dragon, a serpent, or satan, as suits his convenience; he sees it rise "out of perdition and go to destruction." To say that he means Rome in one place and devil in another is purely gratuitous. If such license be allowed in the interpretation of the Bible, there can be no end to the jargon which will be introduced. Indeed, it is because men have given loose reins to their imaginations that this book has been so wildly expounded by one portion of Biblical students and entirely neglected by another. If this subject had no practical bearings upon the actions of Christians, we might well pass it by as a venial sin, but such is not the case. Having cut loose from the meaning of this carefully defined symbol, endless vagaries are at once introduced. The world is then presented to view without satan to tempt or deceive; this requires a radical reconstruction of the probationary system which has been taught until the present time. It virtually ends probation, as we understand the term. The angel with a chain becomes, in the fervid imaginations of these expounders, the second appearing of Christ, and the souls of the martyrs are readily turned into the resurrection of the pious dead. As all this follows in the track of the overthrow of the Papal power, and as that event is daily expected, the Christian world is compared to the Jewish church, because it does not give up its comprehensive plans for the world's conversion and prepare its ascension robes.

We next devote a few pages to the consideration of the forces which are destined to effect the overthrow of this power. But, first, let it be distinctly stated what is meant by the Papal power.

Two things should be brought clearly before the mind, the church and the state. The symbols of Daniel and John have nothing whatever to do with the church as such. The body of a beast symbolizes "the peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues," which compose a great empire, such as Babylon, Greece or Rome. The heads of a beast may mean either forms of civil administration or distinct dynasties which rule over a part or the whole of an empire. A horn always means temporal power, physical force being lodged in the horn of the beast. Attention to these laws of symbolical language would have saved almost the whole body of Protestant commentators from supposing that the Papal power would cease to exist in 1866. If any reliance may be placed on what is denominated the day-year system, the Papal power will continue until A. D. 2015, as temporal power was not possessed by the popes before A. D. 755.

We speak of *Pagan Rome*, because old Rome was ruled in the interests of Paganism, and because both her people and rulers were supporters of idolatry. We speak of *Papal Rome* because both the rulers and the people are Catholics. The voice of Italy to-day is for unity, with Rome for the capital. This may be effected in two ways. The successor of Victor Emanuel may be appointed Pope, or the successor of Pius may be chosen king; one or the other of these measures will probably be resorted to by the statesmen of Italy, and thereby a new lease be given to the life of the Papal power. But the Catholic church is another affair; neither the dragon, the beast, the false prophet, nor the woman clothed in scarlet has any reference whatever to the Catholic church; it is true that the rulers of Europe, and more especially those of Rome, chanced to be supporters of that religion, and made it subservient to their ambition. But that was a mere accident, arising in consequence of the entanglements of the church with men possessing the spirit of old Rome or the Dragon. This spirit, which swayed the counsels of old Rome, which fired the breasts of her statesmen and generals, which dictated her literature and led forth her legions, this lust of power,—this thirst for universal dominion; this is the dragon, that old serpent *called*—and rightly so—the devil and satan,

whose seven heads were the seven hills and seven modes of civil administration, and indicate the locality of his power and the mode of exercising it;—this too is the dragon that is to be bound a thousand years. But the church freed from his power, “may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his station on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Pauls.” We turn from this digression to consider the forces symbolized by John which are to bind the dragon, or, in plain language, break the dominion of Rome. The forces may be considered under two general divisions; 1. The preaching of the gospel. 2. The physical force of the nations of Europe.

1. The preaching of the gospel. Under this head may be included not only the simple proclamation of the truths of the New Testament from the pulpit, but the general advance in education, science and literature which attends and follows the clear enunciation of these precious truths; the thought that is awakened, and the general activity and consequent strength which are developed where the Word of God is fearlessly proclaimed. This is symbolized in Revelation (14: 6,) by an “angel flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell upon the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people.” This same thought is followed up under the figure of a great harvest,—verses 14—16, “And I looked and behold a white cloud, and upon it sat one like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle. And another angel come out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud, “Thrust in thy sickle and reap; for the time is come for thee to reap; for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And he that sat on the cloud thrust in his sickle on the earth, and the earth was reaped.” Chap. 16: 12, is of like import. “And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the waters thereof were dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared.”

These three quotations may be taken as specimens of the symbols which are employed to denote the spread of the gospel. The first, that of an angel flying in the midst of heaven, has

its most complete fulfillment in the modern missionary movement. It doubtless dates back to the Reformation in the sixteenth century, out of which this later movement sprang. The passage of an angel through the heavens fitly symbolizes the facilities for rapid travel and intercommunication of thought which the moderns enjoy as compared with the ancients. The second symbol, that of the great harvest, doubtless symbolizes a great ingathering of souls, a great reformation yet to be enjoyed, more especially in Europe, prior to the overthrow of the dominion of Rome. We say this is yet future, because the "false prophet," described as the second beast, having two horns like a lamb, has not yet been developed and this revival is given after his rise.\* The third quotation, relates to the drying up of the great river Euphrates. By many this is considered symbolical of the overthrow of the Turkish empire, and it may be so. Such an event would give the advantage to the Christian population of the countries embraced within its limits, and greatly facilitate the conversion of them to the Christian religion. There is another view of this matter, which is not contingent upon the overthrow of the Ottoman empire. The conversion of Persia, and the founding of a Christian empire along the banks of the river Euphrates, would answer to the symbol with sufficient accuracy. Others have referred the symbol to the conversion of the Jews, but Ezekiel places their conversion and restoration, just prior to the war with Gog and Magog, which John places a thousand years after the overthrow of Rome. Any great movement, of either Protestant or Greek, made in eastern Asia, would seriously damage the prospects of Rome, and might be with propriety introduced as one of the causes affecting the overthrow of Rome. The dragon is a symbol of brute force, as opposed to intelligence; hence whatever in any manner causes men to think endangers the power thus symbolized. Free discussion upon religious topics after the Protestant method, involves the discussion of every other subject which is incompatible with such a despotism as has ever existed at Rome.

We come now to consider another class of symbols; viz.,

\*See F. B. Quarterly, Oct. 1866, ART. II.

such as suggest war. Luther and Hildebrand were antipodes; the one held the pen, the other the sword; the one was in Saxony, the other in Rome; the one thought and printed his thoughts and gathered around him the lovers of learning, the other organized the forces of Europe for the suppression of the human intellect; a contest which shook Europe for about one hundred and thirty years, ending in a drawn battle which has not since been renewed; or if at any time it may have been renewed, it has been under different pretences and upon other than religious issues. The truth is, the despots of Europe care very little about any religion; they are ready to espouse any or all by turns if their ambition may thereby be gratified. Although there has been, strictly speaking, no religious war for more than a century, and though there may not be another purely religious, yet such are the combinations of Europe, and such the situation of the principal belligerents, something like this must yet transpire. The stout Saxon still rules in Northern Europe, and the wily Italian still schemes at Rome. So much of Germany as stands for Luther and free thought, is, by its inherent force, antagonistic to Rome. At the present moment Bismark is the champion of Germany, a German empire is a fixed fact almost beyond a contingency. The immense amount of thinking done by the Germans when directed by such a mind as Bismark's will endanger the Catholic countries in Southern Europe; this will compel an alliance primarily for self-preservation, secondarily for the preservation of Catholicism because that religion is more favorable to despotism. All this is duly symbolized in the book of Revelation; the more prominent symbols we proceed to notice.

The sixteenth chapter is devoted to a description of seven angels which poured out their vials upon different prominent places, all of them having a relation to the one subject before us. The first angel poured out his vial upon the earth, and there fell a greivous and noisome sore upon the men which had the mark of the beast and which worshipped the image. This denotes a distressed state of the country; some such condition of the body politic as when the human body is annoyed by sores and consumed by ulcers. All of which may be fulfilled by suppos-

ing the land to be full of beggars, idlers, brigands, hordes of monks, and defaulters and defrauders in government employ and in mercantile operations.

The second angel poured out his vial upon the sea;—a great naval warfare. England and France may yet come to blows over the Italian question.

The third angel poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of waters; and they become blood. Severe battles along water courses are hereby signified fulfilled in wars between northern and southern Europe.

The fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun; and power was given to scorch men with fire. Perhaps the adherents of Rome find it seemingly politic to persecute, in a terrible manner all such as do not prove loyal to their cause as they have Protestants.

The fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast;—a war carried to the gates of Rome. The sixth angel has been considered above.

The seventh angel poured his vial into the air. Here follows a very good description of a protracted siege of Rome, carried on by the engines of modern warfare, bombarding, shelling, mining and exploding the mines. "And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, and the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell. And there fell upon men a great hail out of heaven, about the weight of a talent." Here ends the war with the total overthrow of Rome. The dragonic power here ends. The same thing has once before been symbolized, at the close of the fourteenth chapter, by a great wine-press out of which the blood came for the space of a thousand six hundred furlongs. But the most striking symbol of this great event is found in the nineteenth chapter. "And I saw the heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge (or rule) and make war." Some suppose this to represent the second coming of Christ. To this view we object on three grounds: 1. It is inconsistent with the dignity of Christ's second coming to suppose that when he comes he will come on horseback! 2. When he



comes again it will not be to engage in carnal warfare with the kings of the earth. 3. This symbol represents an event that shall transpire before the destruction of the beast and false-prophet; whereas John places the second coming and judgment at least a thousand years after that event.

We turn now to examine this symbol. It is in accordance with the genius of this book, as also with that of Daniel, to represent nations by some beast, domestic or wild. The lion, bear, leopard, ram, goat, dragon and a hybrid combination of some of these, have been used as we have had occasion to observe. These have been chosen because they contain certain qualities which characterize the nations symbolized, or because the people through their rulers had previously chosen them, or the prophet foresaw that they would do so. Keeping these points in mind, and looking for some animal to symbolize the great power of northern and central Europe, what animal would be more likely to be chosen than the horse? Throughout the pages of the Bible the horse has always been associated with war. The author of Revelation is contemplating some power which shall overthrow Rome. Hence its capacities for war are of the first importance. Again it was to be a just war. This may be fitly symbolized by a *white* horse. Here the white horse is pitted against the scarlet colored beast, or red dragon.

Again, in looking over the symbols of the different German nations, as they existed prior to recent events, it was found that a white horse was chosen to represent the kingdom of Hanover, the most central state of what is to be the German empire.

“*Faithful and True.*” A nation that has stood firmly for the Word of God, since the opening of the sixteenth century might well be called faithful and true, and more especially as at the time contemplated in the symbol, it is engaged in the overthrow of one of the most virulent opposers of evangelical religion.

“*On his head were many crowns.*” The petty kingdoms of Germany are consolidated into one empire.

“*He was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood.*” The usual apparel of warlike captains. “And his name was called the Word of God.” Germany arose from the thralldom of the popes through the translation of the Bible into the vernacular, and the

Reformation. The Bible is still her tower of strength, hence the propriety of the name.

“He shall smite the nations and rule them with a rod of iron.” The battle of Sudowa is a foretaste of this smiting. “And he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.” In the late wars Italy was an ally of Prussia. This was, as we may say, accidental because for the time being, Rome did not control Italy. The true policy of these nations is essentially hostile. Luther and Hildebrand now, or two centuries ago, were representative characters.

“And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings and Lord of lords.” This name, by some freak of the translators or printers appears in our version in large capitals. They doubtless thought Jesus Christ was meant, and so gave the name in large capitals. There is no foundation in the original for such an opinion. Germany has hitherto been under the domination of a host of small kings and petty dukes or lords. The king of Prussia through consolidation becomes king of these kings and lord of these lords. This was essential to any greatness of power. It is in accordance with Bible usage to denominate great kings in this manner. John describes the issue in the following graphic language: “And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that had worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth; and all the fowls were filled with their flesh. And I saw an angel come down from heaven having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and satan, and bound him a thousand years; and cast him into the bottomless pit and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled.”

Thus ends the old dragon power which arose in superstition some 750 B. C. and which endured in one form or another, with one great break, until after the close of the 2000 years. A thousand years later, the seven hills may bristle again with hostile weapons, but this is doubtful; Gog and Magog may arise with aims similar to those which ever characterized the dragon, but their time will be short; the world will roll on in its majestic course, counting off the centuries of Christ's everlasting kingdom until the great white throne appears and the years of the world are ended.

A misapprehension of the import of this symbol has led to the wildest vagaries and the most unscrupulous distortions of many portions of the Bible. So much time and space have already been consumed in the discussion of this matter that other topics of vital importance, standing in immediate connection with it, must be left to some future time. Suffice it to say, that the immediate results of the binding of the dragon will be to remove effectually all barriers to the evangelization of what are called the Catholic countries of Europe; and it will probably break all connection between church and state. Thereafter the church will be married to the Lamb instead of being forced into an unholy wedlock with the state. The great deception which Rome has practised upon the Christian world, that the church could not exist independent of the state, will have passed away; the dragon will deceive the nations no more.

The motives for keeping the mass of the people in ignorance, will have disappeared; while the overwhelming proofs which these contests shall afford that intelligence and cultivation among the masses are the greatest bulwarks of national strength, will cause the nations of Europe to vie with each other in affording facilities for the acquisition of knowledge, and the largest liberties consistent with personal safety. The reconstruction of Europe which shall follow this great revolution in her affairs may well be symbolized by the reign of the Martyrs.

## ART. V.—JESUS CHRIST.

*“Was Jesus of Nazareth identical with the Almighty Creator?”*

Such is the question found on the title-page of a pamphlet before us, written by Rev. A. P. Peabody, D. D., published by the American Unitarian Association of Boston.

The name of the author of this work, a name of wide celebrity, is a sufficient guarantee for its flowing and attractive style, its chaste and beautiful diction, its persuasive and convincing tone, its originality of thought, and apparently logical deductions. And if any thing more than the name of the writer were needed to seal it with high authority as a Unitarian work, it is supplied by the fact that it comes to the world from the press of the Unitarian Association. Our review of this pamphlet, and the frequent mention of the doctrinal views of our Unitarian neighbors by ourselves and others of a Trinitarian creed, need no other apology than the fact that we are acting in self defence. Trinitarianism is attacked daily and hourly by the Unitarian press and pulpit and social circle. We do not complain of these attacks. We do not see why any one should. In truth we like them. As a general rule (to which there are, of course, not a few exceptions) they are made good naturedly, and we doubt not sincerely. Whether made with argument, satire or ridicule, there is, so far as our observation extends, a good humor pervading them which disarms resentment, and a sincerity and ingenuousness which invite rather than repel discussion. We like this kind of investigation, and its earnestness and warmth add to its interest. We have no fellowship with a stiff, morose orthodoxy, however orthodox it may be, which is too good to be examined, too conceited to reply, or which has too many windows to dare throw a stone when a stone is needed. If our doctrine is not susceptible of defence it ought to fall. If it is, it will suffer nothing in the end by being attacked, examined, investigated. We hail these investigations as a harbinger of good. If the leading doctrines of the Christian church, now hoary with the frosts of eighteen centuries, are not immutable and eternal, let them fall, and let their places be supplied,

like false theories of science, by sounder doctrines and better creeds. If they are true and enduring, instead of sustaining loss they will come forth from their present ordeal, as they have done from all former ones, more vigorous and more resplendent than ever.

“Come let us reason together, SAITH THE LORD.” We concede, in the outset of this discussion, that there are some things connected with the doctrine of Christ’s divine character and mission, which we are not competent to explain; but this does not weaken the fact, provided that fact is stated and sustained on good authority. It would be wholly unreasonable to suppose that the limited dimensions of man’s intellect, even the greatest man’s, could fully comprehend this infinite truth; especially as Christ himself insists that we are to receive him by faith, and on the testimony of God. “The Father himself that sent me hath borne witness of me.” John 5: 37. “Blessed art thou Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.” Matt. 16: 17.

But though there may be inexplicable mysteries and real difficulties in harmonizing this doctrine with the Bible and reason, it is, we think, still more difficult to harmonize reason and revelation with any other view of the character of Christ. Indeed we think that those who deny the divine character of our Lord, are forced to some pitiable shifts in the support of their doctrine, or else compelled to deny the divine authority of the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles altogether. On the 19th page the following language occurs; “Those who maintain the supreme divinity of our Saviour, rest for this doctrine, if I am not mistaken, solely on single texts. They draw no argument from the general tone and spirit of the New Testament. They admit that the argument from this source, so far as it has any bearing goes against them. . But they deem it overborne by the clearness and weight of the single texts, which they quote in behalf of their dogma.” What right the author has to say that Trinitarians admit all this, we do not know. We do not now remember any Trinitarian, prominent or obscure, who has said this; nor do we see how it could be said in truth whether it would damage the argument of the Trinitarian or not.

*This work contends that it is not proper to offer prayer to Christ as an act of divine worship.* The writer says :

“I know not what could be more explicit than the following passage, where, speaking of the time when he should no longer be with his disciples, he says to them, ‘In that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name he will give it you.’”\* That the writer does not know any thing more explicit, we think is proved from the fact that this is the only passage he presents in support of this part of his theory. He mentions that Christ uttered these words while speaking of his departure from his disciples. This is true, and it is also true that he appears to have been discoursing of the blessings they should receive as a result of his departure from them. The whole narrative with which this text is connected, shows that the disciples were distressed about some difficult questions, and almost feared to ask the Saviour in regard to them. In answer to their suppressed inquiries, he speaks to them of the blessing of the gift of the Holy Spirit, which should so fill them with joy and so quicken their memories, that all these abstruse and difficult matters would be rendered perfectly plain to their understanding.† In addition to these instructions, he also enjoins it on them to present their petitions in his name—an injunction which those who deny his divinity often very consistently neglect to heed. That the disciples did not regard the instructions of the Saviour as a prohibition to pray to him; we think will appear when we come to consider their practice.

But why, it is asked, did not the apostles enjoin the offering of prayer to Christ, and enforce the command by example? We answer—If the doctrine of the Trinity be true, then all prayer to God is as really prayer to the Son as to the Father; and so the Trinitarian understands it when he prays; and so he interprets the New Testament commands to pray. There are comparatively few instances in which prayer is offered to the Father in

\*John 16 : 23.

†Comp. John 14 : 26 and 15 : 26.

distinction from the Son, and we almost marvel to find so many offered exclusively to Christ. But these words of the Saviour also plainly indicate a change in the practice of the apostles. "In that day ye shall ask me nothing"—is an admission that in this day ye do ask me some things at least. But were these questions prayers? We think not. Evidently the writer of this work would deny that those questions which they had been accustomed to ask the Saviour were prayers, for he does not admit that the disciples had ever prayed to Christ. If those askings were not prayers, then nothing is said in this passage about praying to Christ, and therefore it proves nothing.

Where God said to Ananias concerning Saul, "Behold he prayeth"\* and when Ananias said to Saul, "Be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," here is prayer offered to Christ. The proof is that Saul was a zealous devoted Pharisee, living according to the strictest practices of that sect that were celebrated for their numerous and long prayers to God. Saul, while one of them, walked in all good conscience, and was exceedingly zealous toward God. Of course he offered much prayer to God. When Jesus said to Ananias, "Behold he prayeth," there could have been only one thing new in this announcement, viz., that Saul prayed to Christ. And this the whole narrative shows. Lest these passages which we deem entirely incontrovertible, should not be duly considered, we beg leave to reproduce them.

"Who art thou, LORD? I am JESUS of Nazareth. . . LORD, what wilt thou have me to do? . . . And the LORD said unto him, Arise and go into the city and it shall be told thee what thou must do. . . . And there was a certain disciple at Damascus named Ananias. And to him said the LORD in a vision; Ananias, And he said behold I am here LORD. And the LORD said unto him arise and go into the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul of Tarsus, for behold he prayeth. . . . Then Ananias answered, LORD I have heard, by many, of this man, how much evil he hath done to THY saints at Jerusalem; and here he hath authority from the

\*Acts 9: 11 and 22: 16.

chief priests to bind all that call on **THY NAME**. But the **LORD** said . . . I will show him what great things he must suffer for **MY NAME'S SAKE**. And Ananias went his way . . . and said, Brother Saul, the **LORD** even **JESUS** that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me. . . . And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God. But all that heard him were amazed, and said, Is not this he that destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusalem, and came hither for that intent that he might bring them [that called on the name of Jesus] bound unto the chief priests? Acts. 9.

In ch. 22d, Paul relates these facts in a public speech in Jerusalem, substantially as given above, and adds that Ananias said "The **GOD OF OUR FATHERS** hath chosen thee that thou shouldst know his will, and see that **JUST ONE** and shouldst hear the voice of his mouth. . . and now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the **LORD JESUS**. And it came to pass that when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance; and saw **HIM** [Jesus] saying unto me, make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem, for they will not receive thy testimony concerning **ME**. And I said **LORD**, they know that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on **THEE** [Jesus] and when the blood of **THY** martyr Stephen was shed I also was standing by and consenting unto his death," &c.

In the foregoing quotations we think three things are made as plain as any words need make them. 1. That Christ was addressed according to the ordinary form of prayer to God. 2. That he answered prayer offered to him. 3. That all believers in Christ were known by their offering prayer to Christ, or calling on his name. In addressing the Corinthians,\* Paul designates all Christians as "All that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord." When Stephen was suffering martyrdom, for the name and sake of Jesus, he "looked steadfastly into heaven, and saw Jesus standing on the right hand of God," and prayed "LORD JESUS receive my spirit . . . LORD lay not this sin to their charge," and then fell asleep. His dying

\*Comp. 1 Cor. 1: 2, and 2 Tim. 2: 22.



words were a prayer to Christ. Our author notices this occurrence as follows: "This was not prayer. This was not an address to an invisible being, it was speaking to one whom he saw. The heavens were opened and he saw Jesus standing at the right hand of God. He had a vision of the risen Saviour with a countenance and gesture of welcome for his dying servant. He thus commended his spirit to one who had personally appeared to lead him through the dark valley to the mansion of eternal rest."

In this quotation, three items of proof are furnished that Stephen did not pray to Christ. 1. Our author says so, and he is good authority. 2. Christ was visible to Stephen. But cannot one pray to a visible object? If Stephen had addressed the Father at that time in the same words would it not have been a prayer, visible though he was? Could not Adam and Eve pray to a visible God as well as the Christian who sees by an eye of faith? 3. Not a prayer but a commendation of his spirit to the care of Jesus, who had come to accompany him through the valley and who beckoned him onward. Did not the Father come also on the same errand? Then why was the spirit committed to Jesus, if Christ was not equal with the Father? And which was it, the Father or the Son, that welcomed Stephen with countenance and gesture? All we know of this welcome and of the gestures is what our worthy opponent has supplied, the Scriptures being wholly silent on the subject. But the good Dr. does not even mention the last petition in Stephen's prayer—"Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." Perhaps it is less easy to explain away the fact that this was a prayer. Perhaps if our friend should undertake this, he would disjoint the narrative, and inform us that the gesticulation of welcome had ceased, and that this part of the prayer was addressed to the visible Father—we say visible, for Stephen saw God's glory and Jesus standing at his right hand. But this disruption would not obviate all difficulties even if it could be successfully accomplished as the same Lord. [Greek, *Kurie* from *Kurios*] is addressed in both portions of the prayer. And what less than a prayer is the concluding portion of the revelation of God; "Even so

come, Lord Jesus." "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all; amen." Yet this writer says, "There is not, in the New Testament, a single instance of prayer to Jesus." Suppose a dying Papist should address St. Patrick or the "Holy Virgin" in Stephen's dying words, would any one say he died a Protestant? What could be said of the Christianity of a Hindoo who should call on any other than the true God, in such language, while the death damps gathered on his brow?

But the New Testament record, ample as it is, does not close the history of prayer to Christ. The early fathers incidentally mention it as a Christian exercise. Tertullian, Hippolitus and Justin Martyr, and others who immediately succeeded the apostles, speak of it. Pliny, who was Roman governor of Bithynia, under the emperor Trajan, informed the emperor that the Christians whom he had tried, used to assemble and sing praise and offer prayer to Christ as to a God. The acknowledged candor of Pliny and the fact that this information was elicited "during the judicial trials of Christians, entitles this testimony to the fullest credit. Another authentic record informs us, that during the persecution of the Christians under the emperor Diocletian, a Christian city in Phrygia was destroyed, and the men, women and children submitted to their fate, calling on Christ, the God over all." From the days of the apostles until now, Christians generally have been wont to pray to Christ.

What an amount of confidence, what untold joy does it afford, to know that we can approach him in prayer who has borne our diseases, felt our infirmities, endured our woes and felt the full pressure of our temptations! How sweet to know that he who listened to tales of sorrow and granted relief to the petitioner, permits us still to come to him in prayer! And to know that this our elder brother is the Lord Almighty, fills the pious soul with transports of delight.

*Christ not an object of divine worship.*

"Christ did not present himself as an object of adoration. There is not, in the New Testament, a single instance of prayer to Jesus, nor is there a single case in which homage is paid to him in the way in which it is paid to God. There are indeed many ascriptions of praise to him; but they are always accom-

panied with a specific designation of his work and office as Mediator, and generally with an express reference to the eternal Father as alone supreme. But there are several instances in which persons are said to have worshipped Jesus. The word translated worship does not, however, necessarily denote the rendering of divine honors, but simply prostration, or other external marks of homage or reverence, such as are paid by inferiors to superiors." &c. pp. 16, 17.

This question of divine worship we have divided for convenience, and have already considered that part of it which relates to prayer. If we have succeeded in showing that prayer was rightfully offered to the Saviour, we have proved that he was properly an object of divine worship. If we can now show that acts of divine worship and that ascriptions of divine praise were properly offered to him, either in connection with prayer or otherwise, our argument will, we think, be doubly conclusive. A criticism is offered in relation to the word worship to which we will first attend. The Greek word most frequently rendered worship in the New Testament is *proskuneo*. This word occurs sixty times in the New Testament and is, in every instance, rendered worship. It is the word used by the adversary when he addresses the Saviour in Matt. 4 : 9, and Luke 4 : 7, where he solicits the Saviour to fall down and worship him. It is the word the Saviour uses in his reply, "It is written Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." The Saviour also uses it in his conversation with the woman of Samaria, John 4 : 20—24, and the woman uses the same word. Here it occurs nine times, and here the Saviour says, "They that worship the Father must worship him in spirit and in truth." It is the word used in Revelation, in those utterances where is described the worship of him that liveth forever and ever. It is also the same word that is used with a reference to idolatrous worship in Revelation and with reference to the proposed homage of Cornelius to Peter, and of John to the angel, and in the reproof of the angel who tells John to "Worship God." Once only it is used to denote a deep humiliation and abasement and homage of one man to another—a very wicked, and guilty, and cringing servant, no doubt, who was willing to offer divine worship

to his Master to appease his just indignation.\* There are at least fifteen instances in which this word describes the homage paid to Christ exclusively, though in one instance it was offered in derision.† Besides these there are a few instances where the worship of the Saviour is clearly shown in which this word "worship" does not occur.

When Cornelius offered to fall down and worship Peter, Peter forbade him. When the Lycaonians undertook to worship Paul and Barnabas, they refused their homage, and lectured them soundly for offering it. When John was receiving his revelation from the lips of the angel, he, no doubt, became bewildered with his glory, and verily thought that he was in the presence of him who had been dead but was alive again. And, in these attempts to worship the angel, he probably intended to worship Christ, at whose feet he had prostrated himself just previously.‡ But the angel refused to be worshipped and said "See thou do it not . . . Worship God." But Jesus never refused to be worshipped. The highest homage ever offered to him, he accepted, whether from his disciples or others. Was there no danger in this? Persons of Jewish extraction came and worshipped him. The Jews were greatly prone to follow the example of their heathen neighbors, and degenerate into idolatry. And yet the Redeemer who came to destroy idolatry and honor God, uttered to them no word of rebuke or caution against the idolatrous worship of himself. One woman who was not a Jew but a Gentile§ came and followed him, and cried after him, and cast herself down before him, and held him by the feet, and worshipped him. The Saviour commended her faith, gave her no hint that she was in danger of exchanging one form of idolatry for another, furnished no hint to beholders that there was any distinction between what this worship appeared to be and what it really was.

Once when the winds were blowing, and the disciples were tempest tossed, the Saviour came to them upon the waves. They

\*Matt. 18: 26.

†Mark 15:19.

‡Rev. 1: 17; 19: 10; 22: 9.

§Mark 7: 26.

saw him, thought him a spirit, and screamed with terror. Peter met him, treading the angry billows till his faith failed. Jesus saved him by a miracle. As soon as he entered the ship the wind ceased, and the awe-stricken disciples crowded around him, and with one consent they worshipped him\* without reproof. Rulers came, lepers came, the mother of Zebedee's children came, demoniacs came, but no friendly voice from him who came to redeem the world, warned them of the idolatry of worshipping him. After his resurrection the disciples worshipped him often; held him by the feet and worshipped him. And one of them, who had been filled with doubts, when he saw that it was indeed the Saviour, cried out, "my Lord and my God." After he ascended up on high, and they had watched his receding form till the parting cloud had received him, they worshipped him before they returned to their homes, there on the spot from which he ascended.† And all this was allowed, though the Saviour knew that out of it would grow an idolatry deeper rooted than paganism, instead of a pure Christianity, provided the worship of Christ is not Christianity itself. "Nor is there a single case in which homage is paid to him in the way in which it is paid to God." Can the distinction be pointed out? Can our Unitarian friends show how all men can "honor the Son even as they honor the Father," as commanded to do,‡ without offering him divine worship? What possible method of interpretation, short of absolute perversion of the text, can make this passage any thing less than a demand that divine honors be bestowed on Christ by all men? The Jews had charged Christ with having violated the Sabbath. He replies to them by affirming that he is Lord of the Sabbath, draws a parallel between himself and the Father in regard to their power and authority, and declares that the same honors as are conferred on the Father should be also bestowed on the Son, and adds, "He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father that hath sent him." Is not this equivalent to saying that no man offers acceptable worship to the Father who does not worship the Son?

\*Matt. 14 : 24, &c.

†Luke 24 : 52.

‡John 5 : 23.

But the command to worship the Son is not limited by the boundaries of the human family. When he bringeth in the first begotten into the world he saith, Let all the angels of God worship him.\* Compared with this it seems a small thing that men should worship him. Let not the oldest, the highest or the mightiest angel in all the host of heaven, decline to worship the "First-begotten" of God. Let all in heaven and earth bring divine honors to him, even as they honor the Father. But this is not the only instance in which this universal worship is demanded. "Let the same mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took on himself the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and, being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, [*Kurios*] to the glory of God the Father."† "For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, [*Kurio* from *Kurios*] every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God."‡ It is useless to say, as some have said, that these passages, instead of worship imply subjugation. They imply both subjugation and adoration. The fact that it may not indicate voluntary and heartfelt worship on the part of all, only, if possible, increases the force of the passage, as it shows that all who will not worship the Son voluntary, shall be brought, by the inflexible decree of Jehovah, to bend the knee to Christ, and confess him Lord. It also shows, in common with many other passages, that God is glorified when the Son is worshipped.

It has been remarked that the Greek word *Proskuneo*, worship, is clearly applied to the Saviour, in some fifteen instances in the

\*Heb. 1: 6,

†Phil. 2: 5—11.

‡Rom. 14: 11.

New Testament. Besides these, in Rev. 4: 10, the highest worship and praise are offered to him that liveth forever and ever, who was and is and is to come, and who created all things. As such ascriptions are sometimes made to Christ, this may or may not allude to the Son. In the following passages the very highest adoration is offered, both to the Father and Son. "After this I beheld, and lo a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb. And all the angels stood round about the throne, and about the elders, and the four beasts, and fell before the throne on their faces, and worshipped God, saying, Amen; blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might, be unto our God, forever and ever. Amen.

. . . . These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore they are before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple, and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more . . . . for the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters."\*

In other instances innumerable companies of angels, elders and saints, that worship before the throne, ascribe to God and to the Lamb all glory and praise.† The following may be regarded as a sample. "The number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever. Amen. And the four beasts said Amen.

\*Rev. 7; 9, &c

†Rev. 1: 5—13; 12: 10, 11; 14: 4; 17: 14; 19: 16.

And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth forever and ever.”\*

Who is the man that can read these most sublime passages of all the revelation of God, and pretend to find a distinction between the character of the worship offered to God, and that offered to the Lamb? Who, with these inspired words before him, can pretend that Christ is not to receive from all men, and all angels, and all other beings, in heaven, earth and sea, the highest homage and the most spiritual worship that the universe can offer now and forever more? Is heaven itself as well as all the Christian church below full of idolatry?

*But it is claimed that the Scriptures speak of Christ as a created being.* Let us see.

He is called “The only begotten of the Father.”† But this obviously refers to his miraculous generation when he became incarnate, and argues nothing in favor of our opponents, though often quoted. The passage is, “The word [which was God] was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory; the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.” But he is “The first begotten from the dead.” Yes, “That in all things he might have the pre-eminence.”‡ This evidently refers to his resurrection and not his generation, and is irrelevant. “The first-born among many brethren.”§ “In whom we have redemption, through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins. Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature; for by him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were made by him and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist.”||

The above passages contain two members which are exceedingly current among our Unitarian friends, in proof that Christ is a created being, viz., “The first-born among many brethren,” and “The first-born of every creature.” The latter, standing

\*Rev. 5: 11—14.

†John 1: 14, 18, and 3: 16, 18.

‡Col. 1: 18.

§Rom. 8: 29.

||Col. 1: 14—16.



as it does amidst the more glowing proofs of Christ's divinity, is only available to them, when detached. He who is declared to be the creator of all the beings and powers of heaven and earth, and to have made them for himself, would hardly in the same breath be pronounced a created being by any sane apostle. These clauses are not intended to assert that Christ was literally either created or born at all. His birth, even according to Unitarian doctrine, did not take place till 4000 years after the creation, and was not first in reference to time, unless he had a pre-existence, which Unitarians generally deny. The real sentiment of the passages is that Christ has the birthright of the oldest son, in the universal household, though a brother to the human race. That birth-right is the right to exercise dominion or rule and the right to hold the pre-eminence.\*

Another proof adduced, that he is a created being is, that he is "The beginning of the creation of God."† But when we read from the same pen that he was, in the beginning, and that all things were created by him, we can easily understand that "The beginning of the creation of God" does not mean that he was first created, but that he was the author or beginner of that creation. We have now, so far as we know, or believe, examined all the proof adduced that Christ is a created being.

*He is universally represented in Scripture as a subordinate being.*  
pp. 9, 13.

"The apostles speak of Christ as subordinate to the Father, even in those passages in which they ascribe to him the highest exaltation and glory; nay, in the very passages which are currently quoted in proof of his supreme divinity, on the alleged ground that such honor can be rendered to no created being." p. 13. In connection with this and many other similar statements, our author quotes, "Him hath God raised up." "God sent his son." "God hath exalted him and given him a name—to the glory of God the Father." "We have an advocate with the Father." "When all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also be subject unto him that hath put all things under him." These and other passages of a similar

\*Gen. 27: 29.

†Rev. 3: 14.

character are presented as proofs that the Scriptures universally regard Christ as an inferior and subordinate being, and neither the everlasting God nor equal with him.

Such passages do not conflict with the doctrines of those who advocate the divinity of Christ. In procuring the redemption of the world, Christ became veiled in humanity, "Made himself of no reputation and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."\* In undertaking the salvation of men, he humbled himself. He was made "perfect through suffering"—"Made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death."† Without this suffering he could not have been a "perfect" Saviour. In spite of all theories of rationalism, he was first in a condition of exaltation, above the angels; and, for the sake of redeeming man, he humbled himself to suffering and death.

True, as our friend contends, all power in heaven and earth was given unto him. And if the Father had undertaken the rescue of the human race by becoming one of them, He too would have been made perfect through suffering, no doubt, that he might make an atonement for man. And without the Son he could have done nothing; for it would require the concurrence of all the persons in the God-head, that grace should reign unto salvation. The darling enterprize of heaven in this day is the salvation of men. "Behold now is the accepted time; behold now is the day of salvation." And whichever person in the sacred Trinity should undertake that salvation, and the carrying out of the economy of grace, it is most certain that all power should be committed to him. As a consequence of this humbling of himself for this great work, we see how appropriate it is that he should say "My Father is greater than I" in one sense, while in another it should be said "He though it not robbery to be equal with God."

Is it not probable that this subordinate position of the Son—

\*Phil. 2: 7, 8.

†Heb. 2: 9, 10.

this veiling of the Divinity in humanity for men's sake, and redemption's sake, has often misled those who deny the vicarious nature of the sufferings of Christ?

*It is denied that Christ possessed or claimed divine attributes.*

After having furnished many passages in proof of this the Dr. says—"I might go on in this way and quote from every chapter in the gospels and from every verse in which our Saviour speaks, and show you every attribute of supreme divinity disclaimed over and over again from his own lips, without your being able to point to a single instance in which he claims for himself any exclusively divine attribute." p. 10.

The character of the passages quoted may be seen from the following samples—"My Father is greater than I." "I can of myself do nothing." "I proceeded forth and came from God, neither came I of myself, but he sent me." "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son." "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only." &c. &c.

A separate examination of these passages would be tedious. Besides a portion of them have been already considered under another head, and the general import of them explained. In short, it would be a strange Trinitarianism that would bring itself into conflict with these passages, by denying the personality of the Son, or the voluntary, official humiliation of the Redeemer, or that would pretend that there was a moral possibility that Christ could do any thing contrary to the will of the Father. The only apparent difficulty, is suggested in the doctrine that there is one single future event which the Father knows and the Son does not, and this we regard as only an apparent one. The text is only found in Matt., and Ambrose says that it is wanting in many of the Greek copies of Matt.\* Besides "to know" is sometimes used in the sense of "to make known," as 2Cor. 2: 2. The Saviour may have spoken this with a reference to his human capacity, or his province as the great prophet of the world, though this idea is promptly repudiated by our author. Or as "all is judgment committed to the Son, and

\*Luther Lee.

the Father judgeth no man,"\* so it may be that, in the divine economy and arrangement, the times and seasons may have been put in the power of the Father,† and not consistent to be communicated to man by the Redeemer as a part of the plan of redemption.

If the above passage destroys the omniscience of the Son, then, by a parity of reasoning, does not the following passage disprove the omnipotence of the Father?—"Jesus came and spake unto them saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."‡ To the suggestion of our author that such passages as these indicate that the power of the Son is a delegated power, and that he is therefore inferior to the Father, we reply, that if two or three coequal partners should commit to any one of those partners exclusive authority in any one department, this could not imply any inferiority or superiority on the part of any of them. But is not omnipotence, "exclusively a divine attribute?" And does not Christ claim this for himself in the passage just quoted? If he has all power in heaven and in earth, there can be no power above him. Paul says§ that the eternal power and Godhead are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made. Now if all things were made by Christ then the eternal power and Godhead of Christ are made known by this creation. That Christ is the creator of all things is asserted by the Scriptures in the most positive language, in numerous instances. "In the beginning was the Word, and . . . all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." "And the world was made by him."|| "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers: all things were created by him and for him."\*\*\* "God . . . hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son, whom he hath

\*John 2: 22.

†Acts. 1: 7.

‡Matt. 28: 18.

§Rom. 1: 20.

||John 1: 3, 10.

\*\*\*Col. 1: 15, 16.

appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds." "And, thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands."\*

"But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him."† If all things in heaven and earth, visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, powers and all other things were made by Christ and for him, and if his eternal power and Godhead are clearly seen from the things that are made, he must be omnipotent. He also had "power to forgive sins"‡ and power to work miracles which he wrought by his own power and on condition of faith in himself. And the apostles wrought their miracles in his name, in which name they cast out devils and healed the sick.§ He also "upholds all things by the word of his power," "and by him all things consist."|| This can be done by nothing less than Almighty power, therefore Christ must be omnipotent. "I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again." "Destroy this temple [body] and in three days I will raise it up." "What things soever he [the Father] doeth these also doeth the Son likewise."\*\* He is declared to be "the mighty God" and "the Almighty."\*\*\* Proofs under this head might be multiplied, but we regard these as sufficient.

Christ is also omnipresent. Unless he is, how can he fulfil the numerous promises made to his followers? For example, he says, "Lo I am with you always even unto the end of the world."†† As this promise is made to every individual Christian, Christ must be in every part of the world at once. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."††† "I will love him, [that keepeth my commandments,] and will manifest myself to him. . . If a man

\*Heb. 1: 2, 10.

†1 Cor. 8: 6.

‡Matt. 9: 6. Mark 2: 10.

§Acts 9: 33, 34; 3: 6, 16; 4: 10. Luke 10: 17, 19.

||Heb. 1: 3. Col. 1: 17.

\*\*John 10: 18; 2: 19, 21.

\*\*\*Isa. 9: 6. Rev. 1: 8.

††Matt. 28: 20.

†††Matt. 18: 20.

love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.”\* Here we have promises that Christ will be with every little company of two or three that may any where assemble, and also that he will make his constant residence with every one that keeps his word. To this he adds, “Without me ye can do nothing.”† And Paul asserts— “I can do all things, through Christ which strengtheneth me.”‡ We regard these, and all kindred passages, as proofs incontrovertible, that Christ is every where. “And no man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven.”§ What does this passage teach but that Christ was in heaven and on earth at the same time? And if so, was he not omnipresent? He was also omniscient. He knew men’s thoughts and hearts. “Jesus knowing the thoughts of their hearts said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?”|| “But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man for he knew what was in man.”\*\* “But there are some of you that believe not; for Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him.”\*\*\* He also knew things that transpired at a distance from him. “Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee. Nathaniel answered and said unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God.”†† “Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead.”††† He knew when his disciples had disputed by the way, Mark 9: 33, 34; and, in several instances, he pronounced persons healed when he was at a distance from them, and his statements proved to be true. He knew all things. Peter said, Thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love

\*John 14: 23.

†John 15: 5.

‡Phil. 4: 13.

§John 3: 13.

||Matt. 9: 4.

\*\*John 2: 24, 25. Matt. 12: 25. Luke 5: 22; 6: 8; 9: 47; 11: 17.

Rev. 21: 18.

\*\*\*John 6: 64.

††John 1: 48, 49.

†††John 11: 14.

thee.\* If the Saviour disclaimed "all exclusively divine attributes, over and over again, why did he not correct Peter's declaration when he said in so many words, "Thou knowest all things?" "In him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."† He is declared to be both "the wisdom of God and the power of God."‡ "All things are delivered to me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."§ "As the Father knoweth me even so know I the Father."|| If Christ searches the hearts and tries the reins of men, and knows all hearts and all thoughts and all that is in man, and is the wisdom and power of God; and if all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden in him, and if he knows the Father, even as he is known of the Father, he must be omniscient. And to us, notwithstanding the testimony of the Dr. this seems a strange way of repudiating the attribute of omniscience or any other attribute.

Christ is also eternal or self-existent. Dr. Peabody says; "Nor need we here consider those texts which imply, or seem to imply, our Saviour's pre-existence, for the question, whether he existed before his birth in Bethlehem is entirely independent of that of his supreme divinity." For obvious reasons, however, we will adduce a few texts which show his pre-existence. "All our fathers were under the cloud and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat and did all drink the same spiritual drink. For they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them; and that rock was Christ."\*\* "The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven . . . I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever. And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world . . . This is that bread which came down from heaven . . . He that

\*John 21: 17.

†Col. 2: 3.

‡1 Cor. 1: 24.

§Luke 10: 22.

||John 10: 15.

\*\*1 Cor. 10: 1—4.

eateth this bread shall live forever . . . What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven."\* "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory I had with thee before the world was."† "Before Abraham was I am."‡

This is certainly very strange language for a mere man to use. And no mere man but one who was stark crazy or the most barefaced impostor ever known would use it. Paul's language shows that Christ was with Israel in the wilderness, and the Saviour's own words, in many instances, show that he was in heaven with the Father before he was born in Bethlehem and before the days of Abraham. We will here only add the words of Paul, "Though he was rich yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." If he had no existence previous to his birth of poor parents in Bethlehem, and previous to his life of abject poverty here, it could not have been said by the apostle that he was first rich and then became poor. It is, however, a well-known doctrine among Unitarians, and generally prevailed, though not universally, that Christ was a mere man and the son of Joseph and Mary. And in a pamphlet before us, written by Rev. Wm. C. Tenny and published by the American Unitarian Association, occurs the following sentence. "As to his [the Saviour's] rank in the realm of being, there are wide differences of opinion among Unitarians. But for myself I do not hesitate to say, I believe him to have been the Son of Joseph and Mary, and the doctrine of his miraculous conception, gradually growing up as a legend in the age succeeding his wonderful life, to have attached itself to the fragmentary biographies of him in "Matt." and "Luke." What perfect havoc does such a sentiment make of the word of God! How totally unreliable does it render the Gospels, Epistles and Apocalypse! And what terrible and unmitigated falsehoods does such a sentiment put into the lips of the Saviour in whose mouth was found no guile.

\*John 6 : 33, 51, 58, 62 ; 3 : 13.

†John 17 : 5.

‡John 8 : 58.



The passages we have quoted above, not only totally disprove the exclusive humanity of Christ, but they also make one long stride towards proving his eternal existence. In proving his omnipotence we have shown that he is the creator of all things in heaven and earth. Of course then he existed before all things; and this also is declared in the Scriptures quoted. That being who existed before all created things is doubtless eternal, and if eternal he is self-existent. He who could say, "Before Abraham was I am," must have the past, present and future all before him, and live in them all. He, in whose life all time is thus annihilated, must be eternal. He, whose "throne is forever and ever,"\* must be eternal. He who "was in the beginning" and "before all things, and by whom all things consist," must be eternal.†

In Rev. 1: 8, 11, 17, 18; 21: 6; 22: 13, Christ declares himself to be him that was dead and is alive to live forevermore; the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last, the Almighty. In what stronger language need his eternity be expressed? In Isa. 9: 6, Christ, among other titles, is called "The Everlasting Father." Dr. Peabody, in commenting on this text, follows Rosenmuller and other learned expositors, and translates the title, "Everlasting Father," "the Father of Eternity." He says he "should render the passage, Wonderful, Counsellor, Strong, Mighty, Father of eternity; that is, Author of eternal life, [or, perhaps, Father or Author of an age—a new age or dispensation] Prince of Peace."‡ Whether these brackets and the members of the sentence included in them, were written by the Dr. or supplied by the publishing authority, does not appear. But from whatever source they come, they are evidently no part of the text, but a mere gloss. We ask now, who is eternal if the Father of eternity is not? And what words could prove Christ to be eternal if these do not?

"But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have

\*Heb. 1: 8. Psalms 45: 6, 7.

†John 1: 1. Col. 1: 17.

‡Page 20.

been from old, from everlasting.\* This language, which clearly expresses the eternity of him who is the theme of it, is thus applied to Christ. "And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judea; for thus it is written by the prophet; And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a governor that shall rule my people Israel."† This prophecy, applied to the Saviour, makes his goings forth to have been from everlasting.

A large class of passages might be here introduced with propriety, which show that the Creator of the worlds was from eternity. Christ is the Creator of the worlds and therefore all these assertions apply to him. I will close these quotations with one from Paul. "I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto: whom no man hath seen, nor can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen."‡ In regard to the analysis of this text we have only to say that we regard it as absolutely impossible so to construe the passage as to exclude all reference to Christ in this attribute of undervived immortality; more especially, since we have shown that the title, "King of kings and Lord of lords" is a common appellation of the Saviour.

We cannot well suppress our astonishment that a man so justly celebrated, both for candor and research, as Dr. Peabody, should have made such an assertion in regard to the divine attributes of Christ as the one we have quoted. In the productions of a rash or weak man, it would have been pronounced

\*Micah 5: 2.

†Matt. 2: 4—6.

‡1 Tim. 6: 18—16.

reckless. The Dr's position is taken to disprove the divinity of Christ and no small amount of stress is justly laid upon it. For, if all divine attributes were discarded by the Saviour, "over and over again," he is not divine. But if divine attributes are ascribed to him by the authority of inspiration, "over and over again," then he is divine. In all candor we would submit the question to our readers of all creeds, whether the preceding considerations do or do not prove that Christ was Omnipotent, Omnipresent, Omniscient and Eternal; and if either of these, is he not divine?

*Christ equal with the Father.*

All who oppose the doctrine of Christ's divine nature insist that it is a plain contradiction of his words to claim that he is equal with the Father, since he affirms, "My Father is greater than I." As we regard this objection as fully answered under its appropriate head we shall pass it with this simple recognition. If Christ possessed all the attributes of Deity, as we have already endeavored to show, he must be equal with the Father. "Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God."\*

If Christ in his own nature was not equal with the Father, would he have so taught as to mislead the Jews, and then never offer them a word of explanation or correction? When we consider that this same teaching has misled not the Jews only, but Christians generally in all ages of the world, how can it be possibly consistent with the holy character of the Saviour that he should have left his words unexplained?

"Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him and

\*John 5: 17, 18.

given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.”\* A part of this paragraph is quoted by Dr. Peabody who also alludes to the rest. He remarks that “according to many Trinitarian Commentators” the sense of this passage is, “Let the same mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who though in the form, the image of God, did not covet to appear as God, that is, did not exalt or magnify himself; but, on the other hand, humbled himself, and took upon him the form of a servant.” The Dr. however does not attempt to justify such a construction. Scott calls such an interpretation a Socinian one, and wholly discards it. Bloomfield says it is the interpretation of the Socinians but sustained by several Trinitarians whom he mentions; but says it will not bear an examination, and has been completely refuted by many moderns, and adds the following from Bishop Burnet: “It [the interpretation as given by Dr. Peabody] is extremely cold and insipid. As if it were a mighty argument of humility that though Christ wrought miracles—which they strangely think signified by ‘being in the form of God,’ yet he did not set up for supreme Diety!” So we think Paul could not be put into a more supremely ridiculous attitude than to be exhorting the Philippians to be very humble as Christ was, who, though so great and so powerful a man, did not covet to be God himself! But the Dr. says, that “However this passage may be interpreted, any possible inference from it in favor of the supreme divinity of Christ, is negatived by the sequel of the sentence, in which the apostle says, that on account of his thus humbling himself, ‘God has highly exalted him.’” &c. But how or when it was that this created and subordinate being was in the form of God, he does not tell us. His form on earth was certainly that of a man. Nor has the Dr. explained to us what can be meant by his exaltation to so elevated a condition, nor how all heaven, and earth, and sea, and all in them could pay worship and homage to Christ—a

\*Phil. 2: 5—10.

mere creature—without sinking the universe into the most horrible idolatry.

But to our mind, this passage proves, 1. That Christ had a pre-existence. 2. That his manhood was a voluntary humiliation. 3. That before he was in fashion as a man he was in the form of God. 4. That he rightfully receives honors and praises as exalted as those bestowed on God, and that it was no robbery for him to be equal with God. 5. That as his being found in fashion as a man, means that he became a man, so his being in the form of God signifies that he was God.

“Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?”\* “The second man is the Lord from heaven.” [ὁ *Kurios ex ouranou.*]† The first of these passages was spoken by Christ of himself; the second is the words of Paul concerning him. But who is the Lord from heaven who was in heaven before he was manifest on earth, and who, when he pleased, would return thither? Could this have been a less personage than the Father and Lord of all? “He is Lord of all,”‡ and so Peter declares him. He is “Lord of lords and King of kings,” by the testimony of Paul as well as that of the Revelator often repeated. “For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell.” “In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.” “For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.”§ The word *Theotes*, rendered Godhead in the last sentence, we have the best of critical authority for rendering divinity, or divine essence, or Deity; and we confidently believe that no good scholar, not even Dr. Peabody, will question that such a rendering is literal. Christ “filleth all things.” “Is all and in all.” Is “far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but that which is to come . . . head over all things to the church which is the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.”|| Is he less than God? We pass now from these direct testimonies to other proofs.

\*John 6: 29.

†1 Cor. 15: 47.

‡Acts 10: 36.

§Col. 1: 14; 2: 3, 9.

||Eph. 4: 10. Col. 3: 11. Eph. 1: 21—23.

1. He forgave sins; and who can forgive sins whose authority is less than infinite? He forgave sins for his own sake, and in his own name; and Paul also, when he forgave sins, did it in the person of Jesus Christ. And John directs his brethren to pray to Christ for the forgiveness of the sins of the brethren. And Paul further states that God forgives sins for Christ's sake. He gives repentance and remission of sins to Israel and we have redemption and remission of sins through faith in his blood.\* He gives power to believe, obey and be saved. He is the author and finisher of our faith, and to him the apostles sought for an increase of their faith.† In Rom. chaps. 7 & 8, Paul in various language and various forms, argues and declares that men are so bound in sin and unbelief, that they cannot become emancipated from its terrible power but by Christ; and that however they may will and struggle against it, it is in vain, until Christ shall make them free. In Eph. 2: 1—3, he teaches again the same doctrine. John, in chap. 1: 12, says that "to as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God," by regeneration.

Peter, in Acts 4th, informs us that there is no other name by which we can be saved. In cases too numerous to cite, we are taught, that men are bought, purchased, ransomed, redeemed, saved, healed, cleansed from sin, by Christ. Godliness is also represented as a baptism into Christ, putting on Christ, being in Christ a new creature, having Christ formed within the hope of glory, &c. To balance all these, we have the following from the pen of a Unitarian clergyman, and published by the American Unitarian Association.

"Christ's death had no special efficacy, no isolated office. It was the crowning sacrifice of his disinterested, devoted life for the good of men. And whatever of saving efficacy is in the life, work, sufferings, and death of Jesus, is wrought upon and within the heart; has no substitutional, sacrificial, in fine, purchasing power over and for us, but a touching, persuading, winning, converting power on the opened and sympathizing mind and heart of erring, estranged, sinful man. I lack words

\*Acts 5: 31. 2 Cor. 2: 10. Eph. 4: 32.

†Heb. 12: 2. Luke 17: 5.

to express my sense of the incoherence, irrationality and general shockingness of the common view of the atonement."

It is probable that the writer of the above paragraph in some respects misapprehends the common doctrine of the atonement. But on the other hand, he makes an open issue with the idea that the Bible is the word of God, an inspired oracle of divine truth. Christ is the object of faith and trust, and all spiritual benefits and blessings, present and eternal, are to be received and enjoyed as a result of exercising faith in him.\* "Who is this that cometh from Edom with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength?" The answer comes echoing back, "I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save." "Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine fat?" "I have trodden the wine-press alone; and of the people there was none with me."†

" All my trust in thee is laid ;  
All my help from thee I bring ;  
Cover my defenceless head  
With the shadow of thy wing."

All service and love are to be rendered to Christ. Christ often calls himself the Master of his disciples and represents them as his servants. Towards the close of his ministry he proposes, on condition of their strict obedience to all his commands, to regard them as friends, and not to call them servants hereafter. But he strictly prohibits them from calling any man their father, and from being called Rabbi, because Christ is their Master and they are brethren.‡ Paul says if he should seek to please men he should not be the servant of Christ, and exhorts his brethren thus: "Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as unto the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ."§ Thus both

\*John 3: 16—18, 36; 8: 24; 10: 38; 11: 25, 26. Eph. 3: 17—20. Gal. 3: 26. Matt. 12: 21. Rom. 15: 12. Psal. 2: 12.

†Isa. 63: 1—3. Rev. 19: 15.

‡Luke 17: 7—9. Matt. 23: 9, 10. John 15: 14, 15.

§Gal. 1: 10. Col. 3: 23, 24. 1 Cor. 7: 22, 23.

Christ and the apostles proceed on the principle that "No man can serve two masters;" and that the only master for them to serve is Christ.

More than this;—That service must be performed at the sacrifice of all wealth, honors, prospects, friends and life.\* Even all the duties of the gospel consist in yielding implicit obedience to Christ, and every departure therefrom is a crime. The rewards and punishments too, for the present and the future, are determined according to the services and obedience rendered to Christ or withheld from him.† These demands are not made of the low, the vulgar and the ignorant, but are claims set up against the world, by him who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and enforced on all men for his name's sake. And even more than this;—The path of duty which he marked out for them, he forewarned them would lead into poverty, scorn, hatred, perils and death, ignominious death. And these commands were to contravene the Jewish rituals which God had ordained, and change the order of the holy Sabbath, which he claimed authority to control.‡

But marvels accumulate as we continue to contemplate this part of our subject. One of the Saviour's principal demands was that his disciples should love him. Not love him as a master or a brother, but love him better than all else and so intensely as to be willing to die for him, and to be hated of all men for his name's sake.§ No outward obedience, no outward service or sacrifice could be regarded as a compliance with Christ's commands, but an affection deep, true, fervent, constant, intense, which should control the acts, could alone be accepted. These were not a service and a love which were personal, and which might terminate with the Saviour's death, but they were to constitute a religious principle, and to be perpetual. "This do in remembrance of me," and thus ye "show forth the Lord's death till he come." "The love of Christ constraineth us." "If any man love not our Lord Jesus Christ let him be Anathema Maranatha."||

\* Matt. 19 : 27—29 ; Mark 8 : 34—36.

† Foregoing passages and Matt. 25 ; 2 Thes. 1.

‡ Mark 2 : 28.

§ Matt. 10 : 22, 32—39. Luke 14 : 26 ; John 21 : 15—18.

|| Luke 22 : 19 ; 1 Cor. 11 : 24—26 ; 16 : 22 ; 2 Cor. 5 : 14.



These are lessons which with many others show us that all outward obedience is worthless unless Christ shall have the heart. Paul declares that he will glory in nothing save Christ crucified, and proclaims that neither tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril nor sword, should be able to separate the disciples from the love of Christ, not though they should be accounted as sheep for the slaughter and killed all the day long for his sake. But in all these he thinks they make a real gain, and are more than conquerors through Christ who loved them.

Paul loved his brethren so well that he was ready to die for them, but his love for Christ was so much stronger that he desired to depart and be with him, choosing even to be absent from the body that he might be present with Christ; even the chief attraction of heaven itself was Jesus Christ.\*

Was Christ the prince of tyrants that he should have demanded such obsequious service as even Nero and Caligula or Nebuchadnezzar never required? or was he divine, infinite, inferior to no power in heaven or earth? Who has a right to say, He that loveth father or mother, wife or children, more than me is not worthy of me? Would not such pretensions be supreme arrogance if made by an arch-angel? Would not such demands from any finite being be a more bold and daring assumption than any act of Herod? And who were these disciples that conferred their affections on a finite being, and spent their lives amid perils, and died a hundred deaths for Jesus—who but the most pitiable of all drivelling fanatics that ever lived or ever can live, if Christ were not divine? If he were not divine then would Paul have as great a claim for such service and love as Christ had, and Paul's death might as well be reckoned an atoning sacrifice for Jesus, as that of Jesus for Paul. And yet poor Paul while preaching and glorifying Jesus and dying daily for Jesus' sake, never dreamed of any such thing, and said he was nothing, and could do nothing, without Christ, (as Christ had said "without me ye can do nothing,") and that he could do all things through Christ who strengthened him. God demands no higher service, no greater devotion, no greater sacrifice, no

\* Gal. 6:14; Rom. 8:35—39; Phil. 1:23; 2 Thess. 1:12; 2 Cor. 5:8.

more fervent love, than Christ demands. Is he inferior to the Father?

Christ was the author of the resurrection. When about to raise Lazarus from the dead, he said, "I am the resurrection and the life."\* John makes a record of his having several times repeated—"I will raise him up at the last day."† Jesus said that those in the graves should hear his voice and come forth to life or condemnation.‡ "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die even so in Christ shall all be made alive."§ In this passage it is distinctly stated that the resurrection of the dead comes by Christ; and as the language admits of no equivocation, standing as it does in the midst of a discourse on the literal resurrection, we will submit it as positive proof. The various instances in which Christ raised the dead by the exercise of his own power, and in which the apostles raised the dead in his name, and especially his resurrection of himself|| already mentioned while speaking of his power, show that he "has power over death," and has "the keys of death, and of hell."\*\* "For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them even so the Son quickeneth whom he will."\*\*\* In the department of the resurrection we have in this last passage an equality established between the Father and the Son, and the resurrection of the dead clearly indicates almighty power, and argues that he who can quicken, or raise from the dead whomsoever he will, is infinite.

Christ is the author of eternal life. In several instances in John's gospel it is said that the Son hath life in himself, and in one instance it is said that "In him was life and the life was the light of men."†† "And this is the record, that God hath given

\* John 11: 25.

† John 6: 39, 40, 44.

‡ John 5: 28, 29.

§ 1Cor. 15: 20—22.

|| John 2: 19—21; 10: 18.

\*\* Rev. 1: 18.

\*\*\* John 5: 21.

†† John 1: 4.

us eternal life, and that life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son hath not life. And we know that the Son of God hath come and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life.”\* “He became the author of eternal salvation to all that obey him.”† “The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.”‡ Add to this testimony that he is “The Father of eternity,” as we have shown already, and what other proof do we need that he is infinite and therefore equal with the Father? For who but an infinite being can be the author of eternal salvation, and the giver of eternal life. When we consider that eternal life does not mean unending existence, but is a term used to designate the everlasting reward of the righteous, then all the hallelujahs of the redeemed, which ascribe salvation to the Lamb, become proof texts on this point.

He is the judge of the world and the final dispenser of rewards and punishments.

“For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; . . . . And hath given unto him to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.”§ Here we have the fact that Jesus is the judge of all men declared in connection with the doctrine that he raises the dead. That is—Christ will raise the dead and judge them. The reason is rendered, “Because he is the Son of man.” He partakes of human nature and knows how to sympathize with it, and is therefore qualified to exercise all the clemency towards human infirmities that mercy can claim and justice allow. In the description of the general judgment, given in Matt. 25, Christ is the judge. See also Acts 17: 35, Rom. 14: 10, 2Tim. 4: 1, 2Cor. 5: 10. In these and many other Scriptures, this position is so fully sustained that none can call it in question without betraying an entire want of confidence

\* 1 John 5: 11, 12, 20.

† Heb. 5: 9.

‡ Rom. 6: 23.

§ John 5: 21, 22, 27.

in the New Testament, as a truthful record, to say nothing of its inspiration.

In connection with the judgment, comes the meting out of the rewards and punishments of the righteous and the wicked. It is Christ that says, "I give unto them [my sheep] eternal life." "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna." "He shall be clothed in white raiment, and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life." Christ will say to the righteous, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was an hungered and ye gave me meat," &c. "I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory." "But to those on the left, the same Son of man will say, "Depart ye cursed" &c. "For I was an hungered and ye gave me no meat, thirsty and ye gave me no drink," &c. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." In the parable of the tares and the wheat, "The Son of man shall send forth his angels and gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints and to be admired in all them that believe." "Behold I come quickly and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be."\*

We have not exhausted the proofs on this point, but have quoted enough from different inspired writers to show that by

\* John 10: 28; Rev. Chaps. 2 & 3; Matt. 25; 2 Tim. 2: 10; Matt. 19; 2 Thess. 1; Rev. 22: 12.

his own words and by the words of the apostles, Christ is to mete out to the human race in the last day their eternal destinies; that he shall superintend the transactions of that day, give the word of acquittal, commendation and of welcome to those who shall enter the mansions he has now gone to prepare for them,\* and shall himself place the crown upon their heads when they shall sit down upon his throne,† and that those who are not written in his book of life,‡ shall be punished by him and banished from his presence and glory. Also that this shall be done according to the record of his own book, and that those justified and condemned, shall be rewarded and punished according as they have obeyed and loved him or disobeyed and abused him; and that the acts of men shall be judged of according as they had a personal bearing towards Christ, and not the Father. In short, this whole matter of the judgment is treated, in the record we have quoted, as though it were the legitimate business of the Son, by the concurrence of the Father, and not by any commission which he has received as a subordinate. Nor can we understand how any being who was inferior to the supreme Governor of the universe, could represent himself, and be represented by others, as acting such a part in the world's eternal destinies, without robbing God of his glory. But he "thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

The Holy Spirit was sent into the world by Christ. The importance of this doctrine is at once seen by considering how important is the Holy Spirit to the benefit of the world.

1. The Saviour was begotten by the Holy Ghost.
2. The Saviour deemed the presence of the Holy Ghost more important than his own personal presence with his disciples.
3. Those who are regenerated are said to be born of the Spirit, and sealed by the Spirit.
4. Those who should blaspheme against the Holy Spirit should never have forgiveness, though blasphemy against the Father and the Son should be forgiven and Ananias and Sapphira were struck dead for lying to him.

\* John 14 : 3.

† Rev. 3 : 21.

‡ Rev. 21 : 27.

5. So important was the Holy Spirit to the success of the apostles that they were required to remain at Jerusalem till he should come upon them which they did. Yet in John 15 : 26, and in 16 : 7, Christ says he will send him if he shall go away, and Peter in Acts 2 : 33 says that Christ did send him. And in a few instances the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ. How Christ if any other than a being of infinite power could send the Holy Spirit is a marvel not easy to understand.

Christ's name is used in the formula of baptism. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to obey all things whatsoever I command you. And lo, I am with you always even to the end of the world."\*

These were among the last words if not the very last spoken by the Saviour to his disciples. By these we learn that the work of the apostles was to be to make disciples to Christ and to induce men to obey his word. And the seal of discipleship to be put on them was their baptism in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit as though these three names were of equal authority and importance. That the disciples did make converts to Christ and not to themselves and did teach the duty of obeying Christ has already been made evident. That they baptized in the name of Christ may be seen in numerous passages. Three thousand were baptized in his name on the day of Pentecost at Jerusalem; the converts at Samaria were baptized in his name; the Ethiopian Eunuch; the household of Cornelius; the converts whom Paul baptized at Ephesus and at Corinth,† &c., &c. Besides those mentioned in the New Testament, we may mention all who have received Christian baptism from the days of the apostles until now, administered ever in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. But how do those Unitarians who deny the divinity of Christ and even his pre-existence and superhumanity justify themselves in using such a formula? And what possible excuse have they for so great an inconsistency, except that they cannot justify

\* Matt. 28 : 19, 20.

† Acts 2 : 38—47; 8 : 16; 10 : 48; 19 : 5; 1Cor. 1 : 13—15.

so glaring a departure from the Scriptures, and yet claim to be Christians? This very practice is a swift witness against their doctrines.

We have just turned from the examination of some thirty-eight passages in the New Testament, which contain benedictions or doxologies or both. We have not been careful to examine all which the writings of the apostles contain, but think we have no doubt a fair sample of the whole. One of them is a benediction in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.\* In fifteen instances the names of Father and Son are so associated as that no sign of pre-eminence is given, unless it be claimed that the mention of the Father before the Son is such a sign, which we are not disposed to admit. In eight instances the name of the Father alone occurs; and in fourteen cases, that of the Son alone. In short, if benedictions and doxologies prove anything on this subject, it is that as much praise is due the Son as the Father, and that the blessing of Christ is as essential as that of the Father. All needful blessings for time and eternity are represented as flowing from Christ. All thanks and praises, all power and dominion and glory, for all time and world without end, are ascribed to Christ, sometimes in common with God the Father, sometimes with God and the Father, sometimes without the mention of the Father at all, and sometimes, though with less frequency, to the Father or to God without the mention of the Son. These passages are found in Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews, Peter, John, Jude and Revelation.

Will Dr. P., with all his candor and ingenuousness, meet the argument at this point, and inform us whether these benedictions and doxologies mean any thing; and if so, what they mean? Would any Unitarian writer have used such language? Was it proper that all praise, all dominion, all power, for all eternity, should be offered and ascribed to the son of Joseph and Mary, or even to any being inferior to God? Did these writers know whereof they affirmed? If not, are they not wholly unsafe as religious guides? If they did know that Christ was a human and finite being, were they not sacrilegious and blasphemous?

\* 2Cor. 13: 14.

Besides these forms of blessings and praise, there are several other passages which are of similar import, so that not less than about fifty must be explained away, as we understand them, in order to avoid the conclusion that Christ is equal with the Father. How do these passages compare with the following remark of Dr. P.? "I next remark that the whole phraseology of the New Testament with regard to our Saviour, implies his created existence and subordinate rank."

Our next position is that Christ is God. Not that his body, intellect or soul was God, but that his human nature and divine, were so blended that he was properly God incarnated.

1. We think this is substantiated from the fact that Christ possesses all the attributes of deity. He is immutable, or "The same yesterday to-day and forever."\* We have shown from plain Scriptures that he is omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, and eternal. Can there be in the universe two beings, separate and distinct, who possess all these attributes? They constitute their possessor infinite, and it may be laid down as an axiom that two infinite beings, exercising all the prerogatives of infinity, cannot exist. We think too, that it may be regarded as an axiom that neither infinity itself nor the attributes which constitute infinity can be delegated. Infinity implies omnipotence and self-existence, neither of which can be derived. According to our previous showing, Christ possessed these and is therefore God.

2. The same works and offices as are in some instances ascribed to God, are in others ascribed to Christ. We have shown by abundant proofs that Christ made the worlds, or is the Creator, and that he made the worlds not for another but for himself.† So also did God.

"Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth : and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure : yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment ; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed : But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no

\* Heb. 13 : 8.

† Col. 1 : 16.



end.”\* This strong language, which is manifestly addressed to God, by the Psalmist, is by Paul in Heb. 1, applied to Christ. This one passage, in absence of all others, would seem to render it evident that Paul regarded Christ as God. “When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers; the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained, &c.” “Thus saith the Lord that created the heavens, God himself that formed the earth, and made it, he hath established it . . . I am the Lord and there is none else.” “Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb: I am the Lord that maketh all things; that stretcheth out the heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself.”† The texts we have already quoted by which it is proved that Christ created heaven and earth and all that is in them, are too plain to admit of any other interpretation. Unitarians therefore usually suggest that Christ was employed by God to manufacture the worlds. The texts quoted above effectually dispose of that conjecture, by declaring that God made the worlds by himself alone, and with his own fingers. Besides it is a very sorry shift for a people who deny that Christ was any thing more or less than a man, to admit, for the purpose of avoiding disastrous conclusions, that he created all the thrones, powers, dominions and beings in heaven and earth, and made heaven and earth besides, and upholds them all—even though it were by a delegated power, and we hope the Dr. will pardon us for asking what, according to the Unitarian theory, there is left for God to do, if a “created and subordinate being” performs all that is attributed to Christ. The foregoing texts are only mere samples of the many that might be quoted.

God is often represented as the Saviour, and even declared to be the only Saviour. “I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour. . . I, even I, am the Lord, and beside me there is no Saviour.” “Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ who is our hope.” “To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory

\* Psal. 102: 25—27.

† Psal. 8: 3. Isa. 44: 24; 45: 18.

and majesty, and dominion and power, both now and forever.”\* If our Unitarian friends admit that these and many similar passages apply to Christ, then their argument is ended, because then Christ is God by their own admission. If they apply such passages to God, then they must confess that it is said of God that there is no Saviour besides himself, and still that Christ is the Saviour of the world, and that his is the only name whereby men can be saved. Then to what other conclusion can we come than that Christ is God? As a further confirmation of the idea that God and Christ are each and both the Saviour, compare the following passages: “And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered.”† We admit that this passage unmistakably applies to God, and cannot be otherwise applied in this place. But Paul quotes this language and applies it to Christ. “But what saith it, [the Scripture?]‡ The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart: that is the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved; For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.§ For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed.”|| &c. Here the apostle, without any perceptible sense of an inconsistency, quotes the Old Testament Scriptures, which enjoin a belief in God and prayer to him, and applies them, without scruple, apology or explanation, to the Lord Jesus.

\* Isa. 43: 3, 11; 1Tim. 1: 1; Jude 2: 5.

† Joel 2: 23.

‡ Deut. 30: 14.

§ Isa. 28: 16.

|| Rom. 10: 1Cor. 1: 2. Acts 22: 15.

## ART. VI.—ROBERTSON AND HIS SERMONS.\*

It may seem a late day in which to speak in any formal manner of Robertson or of his published Discourses. It is now nearly fifteen years since his earthly life ended,—more than ten years since the first volume of his sermons was reprinted in this country, and almost two years ago Mr. Brooke gave us the long-promised and eagerly-expected Memoir and Letters. Edition after edition of his Sermons has been called for, and they are not only taking a prominent and permanent place among the highest literature of the class to which they belong, but are doing not a little to vitalize and modify the public instruction of many thinking and influential occupants of the pulpit. They are remarkable Sermons. They follow no model and furnish none. They are often incomplete, sometimes fragmentary; and now and then they offer us not much besides the mere outline of the course of thought which was so carefully elaborated in the author's mind, so filled with intense life as it passed through the preacher's soul on its way to his audience, and rendered so effective through his magnetic utterance. They were not written out before their delivery. Some of them were reported by hearers not much accustomed to the service, others were reproduced by Mr. Robertson himself at the urgent request of parishioners and friends, so far as he was able to reproduce them when the special stimulus supplied by the audience had been followed by exhaustion, and he could be induced to enter upon what was to him an unwelcome service; while others still are imperfectly constructed from the brief notes left at his decease. But in spite of all these drawbacks the discourses have made an extraordinary impression wherever they have been read and studied, and awakened an intense desire to know as much as possible of a man who was only beginning to be known abroad

\* LIFE AND LETTERS OF FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON, M. A. Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, 1847—'53. Edited by Stopford A. Brooke, M. A. Late Chaplain to the Embassy at Berlin. In two volumes. Boston: Ticknor and Fields. 12mo. pp. 352, 359.

SERMONS, preached at Trinity Chapel, Brighton, by the late F. W. Robertson, M. A., the Incumbent. In five volumes. Same publishers.

while he lived, but whose fame seemed to spring so suddenly out of his grave and command the homage of men throughout the whole broad field of letters. Mr. Brooke has sought to meet this desire in the very interesting and well executed piece of biography before us ; and in the numerous letters of Mr. Robertson here presented in whole or in part, he has afforded a view of the preacher's personality and special traits which interpret and emphasize more or less of what appears in the Sermons themselves. Partly because of the intrinsic interest attaching to the man and his utterances, and partly because of our conviction that the clerical readers of the *Quarterly* especially may be greatly benefited by a study of these volumes, we give them the prominence which a brief notice will afford. Having recently read the "Life and Letters" with an interest little less than absorbing, and re-read many of the Sermons with a heightened conviction of their suggestiveness and power, we could not feel satisfied without calling special attention to the volumes which have so much to offer of just what many a man stands in sore and vital need. We can present nothing more than a mere outline sketch of the man, draw out here and there a somewhat salient fact from his unexciting life-story, and afford a few fragmentary specimens of his thought and his style of expressing it. If we succeed in inducing an interest that leads to the careful study of these seven volumes, we shall have reached our object and opened a source of instruction and profit such as does not every day offer itself.

Frederick W. Robertson was born in London, in 1816, and died in Brighton, in 1853, at the early age of 37. His father was a captain in the Royal Artillery, and the son never wholly outgrew the fondness for military life which was early developed in him. He looked upon the heroic and poetical side of the profession of arms, and even after he had been long in the ministry the old love and ambition would every now and then return upon him and make him almost long to actualize his noble and extravagant ideal of the soldier. He had really applied for a military commission, and had been sometime waiting for it, when he finally yielded to the judgment and solicitation of his family and others, and accepted the ministry from which he suf-

ferred a sort of instinctive shrinking. His first prompt and decisive answer, when the sacred profession was first urged upon his attention, indicated his reluctance to accept it. "Anything but that," said he, in his crisp and incisive way; "I am not fit for it." All his life long he was a true soldier at heart, though not such as to interfere with his duties as a clergyman; but it rendered both his experiences and his work in the clerical sphere marked and peculiar. He described himself truly when he said:

"There is something of combativeness in me which prevents the whole vigor being drawn out, except when I have an antagonist to deal with, a falsehood to quell or a wrong to avenge. Never till then does my mind feel quite alive. Could I have chosen my own period of the world to live in, and my own type of life, it should be the feudal ages, and the life of a Cid, the redresser of wrongs."

And yet when, only four days after he had matriculated at Brazenose College, Oxford, as a student for the ministry, the opening to a military career was presented, it was a fair illustration of his resolute and positive nature that he would not now regard the question of going into the army an open one. He had put his hand to the plough and it was not in him to look back. He had taken his vow, and in something of the spirit of a mediæval knight or a true disciple of Loyola, he would keep it at all hazards. If he sometimes groaned over the bitterness of the cup or staggered under the weight of the burden, he drained the one to the dregs without hesitation, and took up the other without a protest when he heard the call of the Master.

In this spirit he went to Oxford to fit himself for his duties as a clergyman in the Established Church of England. He was a close and successful student, though as yet he gave no very clear proof of the remarkable powers which were developed during his later years. Immediately on leaving college he was ordained and accepted a curacy at Winchester. A year of hard and anxious service so wore upon his energies that he was forced to undertake a tour over the Continent for the sake of recuperation. He was married in Geneva during this trip, and soon afterward found a sphere of labor at Cheltenham. Four years of service in this sphere developed somewhat the latent element

of strength in his mind and character, but brought such frictions in his work and so multiplied discomforts in his experience that he decided to remove. Two months of service at Oxfordshire sufficed to arrest the attention of the students and others, and make his pulpit an attraction and a power. A vacancy occurring in the incumbency of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, at this time, he yielded to the suggestion of his Bishop and the wishes of the congregation, and, in Aug., 1847, entered upon that remarkable six years' ministry, the character, significance and fruitfulness of which are still the study and the wonder of men.

Brighton is the Newport of England; but the transatlantic Newport boasts a far more self-complacent and perhaps a more intellectual aristocracy than its copyist at the mouth of Narragansett Bay. Fashion, wealth, fast-living and free-thinking are thoroughly represented in that noted seaport, as also are conformity and intellectual routine. It has its full share of gossip as well as gluttony, and both assume airs and play off their dignity. There are many in such a town who are perpetually on the lookout for a fresh sensation, and every new phenomenon is promptly reported and vigorously discussed. Mr. Robertson was such a phenomenon. His first public word broke like a prophet's voice; his Sabbath services were generally sufficient to stir the currents of thought, and nearly every sermon sent the blood leaping through the veins of his crowded congregation and furnished material for not a little criticism and discussion.

The six years spent here were eminently laborious. He devoted himself earnestly to every department of the work connected with his sphere as a clergyman, and took a deep and active interest in whatever had to do with the more general welfare of the community at large. He was the counsellor of the working men and most heartily entered into their plans and efforts for self-improvement. Literature and science were by no means overlooked by him, and there was scarcely one of the great practical questions that came up in social or political life that he did not effectually grapple with and on which he failed to have something of real significance to say. His powers seemed to burst at once into full blossom in this Brighton air. His sermons were weighty with thought, fresh in style and method, and

toughest and most elastic constitution. There was almost an inward fierceness connected with his work, and his attempt to repress its outward manifestations only added to the wear. His Mondays brought a reaction that sometimes ran into heavy melancholy or keen torture. He writes in one of these moods; "I am not fit for ministerial work. I want years and years to calm me. My heart is too feverish, quivers and throbs too much as flesh recently cut by the surgeon's knife." Such an intense service could not be a protracted one, and such a nature could not wholly escape the eagerness that is sure to overstrain the system, and the agony that wears out the life before its time.

Like many other marked characters, he seemed made up of obvious and active antagonisms. His real tastes were often at war with his settled principles. His sympathies gravitated strongly toward the aristocratic elements in society, while his deepest convictions allied him to the interests of the masses. The chivalry and culture and prestige of Toryism drew him in that direction with a powerful magnetism, but he so hated oppression and honored the rights that were being sacrificed in the persons of the ignorant and crushed poor, that his whole moral nature bound him to their side and made him a most valiant soldier in their defence. He discerned this discord in himself and bewailed it as a calamity and a weakness—not distinctly recognizing the fact that while it brought him disquiet and pain, it enabled him the better to understand both parts of the great social problem, and saved in a measure his vehement nature from excesses on either side. He states the case in his usual strong, nervous, epigrammatic way, when he writes to a friend:

"My tastes are with the aristocrat, my principles with the mob. I know how the recoil from vulgarity and mobocracy with thin skinned and over-fastidious sensitiveness, has stood in the way of doing the good I might do. . . I suspect that if the Crown were ever to tyrannize, and the people were to rise, I should be found fighting against the mob,—at least if, unfortunately, a queen were sovereign. . . Poor Balaam was in a similar antagonism, with tastes, love of poetry, &c., on the side of Balak, principles on the side of Israel: only gold inclined the scales to the wrong side, which happily is not my temptation."

There was also, partly arising from this keen sensibility and this interior conflict, a chronic and morbid and lonely sadness,—an experience that frequently attaches to deep and earnest natures. His experience was often such as finds expression in the *De Profundis*, though, as is usual in such cases, his exquisitely keen sensibility now and then brought him a zest and an overflowing joyousness of spirit to which a duller and shallower nature is a stranger. As he admirably says in a letter,—“The woof of life is dark, but it is shot with a warp of gold.” In the very beginning of his ministry this tendency was apparent. Dr. Malan, whom he met on the Continent, said to him in conversation—“My very dear brother, you will have a sad life and a sad ministry.” The prophecy was literally fulfilled, notwithstanding the occasional sunbursts that lighted his path and the occasional thanksgivings that burst up from his heart. The discords of life jarred painfully on his spiritual ear. The fierce struggles in which others were wounded, brought a sharp pang to his sympathetic nature. When so many were lying wounded and defeated where they had bravely battled or gone down with a coward’s dishonor, he could not turn away his attention to hear the victor’s shouting. Thus he expresses his idea of life:

“The deep undertone of this world is sadness,—a solemn bass occurring at measured intervals, and heard through all other tones. Ultimately all the strains of this world’s music resolve themselves into that tone; and I believe that, rightly felt, the Cross, and the Cross alone, interprets the mournful mystery of life,—the sorrow of the Highest, the Lord of Life; the result of error and sin, but ultimately remedial, purifying, and exalting.”

Not a little of this sadness was the result of physical debility, and of a nervous system, sensitive, irritated and revenging itself for the burdens wherewith it was so often and so fearfully weighed down. He found, too, more or less of distrust and opposition where he looked for sympathy and encouragement. His theological views did not satisfy his associates. He was not unjustly accused of being “liberal,” and of treading on questionable ground. His views of the atonement, of the Sabbath, of



Baptism, &c., were pronounced lax and heterodox. He had doubtless met not a little that seemed and that really was heartless and Pharisaic in the so-called evangelical party that appeared in the Establishment, and it was in his very nature to scorn and defy whatever savored of the spirit of the Priest and the Levite. And so his words grew sharp and severe as he gave expression to his dislike of the men, and his criticisms became less guarded when he dealt with their forms of stating the doctrines of the gospel. He could not sympathize with the Tractarians, he quarrelled with the Evangelicals, he refused to go with the Broad Church party to the goal which they had reached or were approaching, and he still kept up a strong and vital attachment to the Church of England; and so, as he says, he became a sort of "theological Ishmaelite." He believed Dr. Pusey's doctrine of the Eucharist "just as dangerous, but much more incredible than transubstantiation." And of the rigid Evangelicals he allowed himself to say: "I see sentiment instead of principle, and a miserable, mawkish religion superseding a state which was once healthy . . . They tell lies in the name of God; others tell them in the name of the Devil; that is the only difference." There is bitterness as well as grief underlying such testimony—bad blood is joined with a good conscience.

He seemed not at all elated but rather depressed by his growing popularity. His crowded congregations often wrung from him a cry of pain or provoked a burst of cynicism. There was something unhealthy in his occasional outcries against the evidences that his pulpit utterance was arresting and holding the public attention. The admiration felt for him was doubtless sometimes too voluble and short-lived to be worth much;—he felt at times the praises that came to his ear as though they were the meanest insults, inflicting upon him a serious degradation. He writes thus near the close of his ministry,—though it may have been done on one of his wretched Mondays:

"If you knew how sick at heart I am with the whole work of parlement, talkee, palaver, or whatever else it is called; how lightly I hold 'the gift of the gab;' how grand and divine the realm of silence appears to me in comparison; how humiliated and degraded to the dust I have felt in finding myself quietly taken

by gods and men for the popular preacher of a fashionable watering-place; how slight the power seems to me given by it of winning souls; and how sternly I have kept my tongue from saying a syllable or a sentence, in pulpit or on platform, *because* it would be popular!—I see what rhetoric does, and what it seems to do, and I thoroughly despise it. I think it makes people worse instead of better.”

But these were the less happy traits in Mr. Robertson's character, though they really constituted no small part of his power. And that power was of a rare sort, and it reached no merely ordinary height. His mental and moral traits were such, in themselves and in their combinations, as were sure to make him a marked man and to make his discourses sources of power. He was the very soul of honor. Meanness of every kind and degree was his thorough scorn. His sense of justice had a woman's delicacy and a judge's firmness. He could not practise double-dealing. He must speak out his full thought whether it met a welcome or a protest. He found nobility only in doing and daring for the truth. And while he stood for it at all risks, he recognized the danger of saying his resolute words in a defiant tone instead of a loving and sympathetic spirit. But he who can sit calmly in his study and write such paragraphs as the following, will never be a cipher in society, nor be likely to waste his courage on dead issues or men of straw. He says:

“I would rather live solitary on the most desolate crag,—shivering, with all the warm wraps of falsehoods stripped off, gazing after unfound truth,—where bird doth not find bush, nor insect wing flit over the herbless granite, than sit comfortably on more inhabited spots, where others are warm in a faith which is true to them, but which is false to me. . . I am alone now, and shall be till I die, and I am not afraid to be alone in the majesty of darkness which His presence peoples with a crowd. I ask now no sympathy but His. If He should vouchsafe to give me more I shall accept it gratefully; but I am content to do without it as many of His best and bravest must do now.”

After reading such a statement, one finds the key to that remarkable sermon on “The Loneliness of Christ.” It is more, than half the portraiture of his own deeper and unshared expe-

rience. The sympathy which he felt with Christ was peculiar and significant. He had studied the character of his Master as few men have studied it, and his fellowship both with his aims and plans, as well as with his sufferings, was one of the most marked features in his experience and one of the leading elements of his power as a preacher. His habitual feeling toward Christ was one of mingled tenderness, trust and adoration. He seemed to possess much of John's insight and naturally to find his place on the sacred bosom; while his sensibility to the wounds which human transgression was inflicting upon the Redeemer's heart prompted him to volunteer a defence that reminds one of Peter's vehement attack upon the armed company on the night of the betrayal. His soul bowed itself before the spiritual majesty of the Messiah, and his highest enthusiasm was roused and sustained by what was magnanimous and heroic in his great model. And when his own heart was bleeding from the wounds that were suffered as he wrestled with his inward foes and grappled with the sins and sorrows of the world, he turned instinctively for relief, and patience, and courage, and quickening, to the wondrous character revealed by the evangelist and made operative by the power of the Spirit. His language, when he speaks on this subject, is remarkable for its strength and clearness. He is both bold and tender,—self-assured and yet always reverent. He says:

“Of one thing I have become distinctly conscious,—that my motto for life, my whole heart's expression, is, ‘None but Christ;’ . . . to feel as He felt; to judge the world, and to estimate the world's maxims, as He judged and estimated. . . But then in proportion as a man does that, he is stripping himself of garment after garment, till his soul becomes naked of that which once seemed part of himself; he is not only giving up prejudice, but also renouncing sympathy after sympathy with friends whose sympathy and approbation were once his life, till he begins to suspect that he will very soon be alone with Christ. More awful than I can express. To believe that, and still press on, is what I mean by the sentence, ‘None but Christ.’ I do not know that I can express all that I mean, but sometimes it is to me a sense almost insupportable of silence and stillness

and solitariness. . . I read the life of Christ, to understand, love and adore Him; and my experience is closing into this, that I turn with disgust from everything else to Christ. I think I get glimpses into His mind, and I am sure that I love Him more and more. . . A sublime feeling of a Presence comes upon me at times which makes inward solitariness a trifle to talk about."

It is not difficult to perceive in these brief extracts the traits of a profoundly earnest, sincere and magnetic nature, and find ample reasons for believing that his preaching would be attended with obvious and decisive results. He was thoroughly independent, and yet delicately appreciative; stern and uncompromising as an old Hebrew prophet when sin was to be rebuked or a principle contended for, and yet as tender and pitiful as the father of the prodigal son when a wayward and straying heart was seeking its real home, though clad in rags and torn with passions. The gospel was far less a system of doctrine or a list of precepts to him than it was an inward force coming to harmonize and interpret a warring experience and fashion character into a heavenly likeness. He had a broad inward life which enabled him to understand the struggles of many classes of men, and so they trusted him and sought relief through his aid. He had felt so much of the power of Christian truth that he charged it with life when he proclaimed it to others, and so it quickened the hearts on which it fell. He lived it before he preached it, and so it came home to his hearers not as recited dogma but as translated experience. He never contented himself with copying other men's thoughts or reproducing their methods. He kept clear of accredited commonplace, and he thrust away platitudes that he might fill their place with intense and throbbing convictions. He spoke always with a definite end in view, and every sermon seems charged with the forces of both brain and heart. His insight into Scripture is often marvellous, and his skill in unfolding the deeper and fresher meaning of a passage, long since grown trite and familiar, is almost unequalled. While his sermons are crowded with instruction, and the thought is developed in such an order that shows the well-trained logician, he often suggests even more than he states,—stimulating the mind instead of overburdening it with material.

The results were natural enough. Men listened to him as to one who knew their mental conflicts from having fought through similar ones in his own soul, and were at first startled by his revelations and afterward won by his ready and practical wisdom. And the multiplying thousands of readers who pore over these volumes, even when least satisfied with his statement of some special points in theology, can do no less than acknowledge their deep obligations to him as one of the most fruitful and quickening of preachers, and admire the depth of a character and the nobleness of a life that cannot be studied without admiration and gratitude. These seven volumes may well be commended with a special emphasis to the attention and study of every man who is in earnest to make the most of his ministry, who is capable of receiving stimulus and suggestions without attempting to turn copyist, and who can separate the abundant gold of precious and saving truth from the alloy of an occasional theological dogma that will not satisfy an orthodox critic. He is surely to be pitied who could read this life-story without being powerfully stirred to a nobler Christian life, and that must be a dull and shallow preacher indeed to whose ministry the diligent study of these books fails to bring an elevation and a gain. Preaching will appear a higher art and become a sublimer function in proportion as the work of Robertson is studied and understood; and so far as it is repeated and perpetuated there is no danger that the pulpit will cease to be a recognized force in society or fail to be the power of God unto salvation.

---

As specimens of his direct, terse and vigorous style of speech, which often sets his suggestive thoughts aflame, and of the athletic wholesomeness of his mental tone, we add the following paragraphs from his letters. We do not quote from his Sermons, strong as the temptation is to do so, for justice could be done him only by giving him space enough to develop his connected course of thought. But the rare grasp of his intel-

lect, the intensity of his feeling, and the magnetic quality of his composition, are fairly indicated even by these brief excerpts :

“Trust me, a noble woman laying on herself the duties of her sex, while fit for higher things,—the world has nothing to show more like the Son of Man than that. Do you remember Wordsworth’s beautiful lines to Milton?—

Thy soul was as a star, and dwelt apart ;  
 Thou hadst a voice whose sound was like the sea :  
 Pure as the naked heavens, majestic, free,  
 So didst thou travel on life’s common way,  
 In cheerful godliness : *and yet thy heart*  
*The lowliest duties on itself did lay.*

I do not know anything of Alfieri’s ‘Life.’ By whom is it written? The misfortunes of genius, its false direction, its misery, I suppose rise partly from the fact of the life of genius being that which is chiefly given to the world. Many a soldier died as bravely and with as much suffering as Sir John Moore at Corunna ; but every soldier had not a Wolfe to write his death-song. Many an innocent victim perished,—yes, by hundreds of thousands,—on the scaffolds of France, and in the dungeons of the robber barons, but they died silently. A few aristocrats whose shriek was loud have filled the world with pity at the tale of their suffering. Many a mediocre boy have I seen spoilt at school,—many a commonplace destiny has been marred in life : only these things are not matters of history. Peasants grow savage with domestic troubles, and washerwomen pine under brutal treatment : but the former are locked up for burying their misery in drunkenness,—the latter die of a broken heart, with plenty of unwritten poetry lost among the soapsuds. I fancy the *inarticulate* sorrows are far more pitiable than those of an Alfieri, who has a tongue to utter them. Carlyle in this respect seems to me to hold a tone utterly diverse from that of the Gospel. The worship of the hero, that is his religion : condescension to the small and unknown, that was His !”

---

“What I admire in Shakespeare, however, is that his loves are all human,—no earthliness hiding itself from itself in sentiment-

alism,—no loves of the angels, which are the least angelic things, I believe, that float in the clouds, though they do look down upon mortal feelings with contempt, just as the black volumes of smoke which issue from the long chimney of a manufactory might brood very sublimely over the town which they blacken, and fancy themselves far more ethereal than those vapors which steam up from the earth by day and night. Yet these are pure water, and those are destined to condense in black soot. So are the transcendentalisms of affection. Shakespeare is healthy, true to Humanity in this; and for that reason I pardon him even his earthly coarseness. You always know that you are on an earth which has to be refined, instead of floating in the empyrean with wings of wax. Therein he is immeasurably greater than Shelley. Shelleyism is very sublime, sublimer a good deal than God, for God's world is all wrong, and Shelley is all right,—much purer than Christ, for Shelley can criticise Christ's heart and life,—nevertheless, Shelleyism is only atmospheric profligacy, to coin a Montgomeryism. I believe this to be one of Shakespeare's most wondrous qualities,—the humanity of his nature and heart. There is a spirit of sunny endeavor about him, and an acquiescence in things as they are,—not incompatible with a cheerful resolve to make them better, which I trust will be good for your mind. Mine wants it much. I speak bitterly of transcendentalism, for it is the rock on which I split; and I do not believe either in its usefulness or its heavenliness.

For man is not as God,  
But then most God-like being most a man.

A sunny, cheerful view of life,—resting on truth and fact, co-existing with practical aspiration ever to make things, men, and self, better than they are,—that, I believe, is the true healthful poetry of existence. All other poetry of feeling, however delicate and beautiful, is only sickly; the mawkish feeling, which sees more beauty in unnatural Consumption than in the ruddy glow of exercise.”

“What was the temptation? To use Divine power to procure comfort; to choose abundance instead of stones; a life of ease instead of the hard rock on which the highest must repose ever in this world. How many houses would have been open to Him like that of Bethany, had He chosen! Instead of executing His mission, might He not have turned aside to live in abundance? You must remember His soul was preparing for its work; He was forecasting the trials of His life; His spirit was silently acquiescing in and recognizing His destiny, and, one by one, dismissing the alternatives which suggested themselves,—a life of ease instead of hardness; rashness and distrustful impetuosity instead of the slow, patient toil of years, and after that of centuries; homage to the ‘splendid majesty of Wrong;’ expediency, in some form or other; to make the kingdoms of the world His own, instead of uncompromising worship of the good,—unless you keep all this in mind, of course it is ridiculous to talk of any thing very divine in fasting. Have you thought what it was for a real man to excogitate a course of action which was new in the world’s history, and steadily keep to it, in spite of treachery and desertion, the apparent worthlessness of human nature, the ripe rottenness at the core of the nation whose blessing He was bent on accomplishing? Have you reflected how He might have purchased life by silence and a very little prudent time-serving; what it is to be alone, misunderstood, and in dreadful sense of forsakenness at last to feel that all was failure; to hope for human nature in its lowest degradation; to believe that man is kindred with Deity, even in Jerusalem; to see a spark in the worst outcast which might become a bright and blessed flame; to despair of none; to hope for human nature even with His last breath on the cross, and with the laughter of His devil-like foes rising to His dying ear?”

---

“Crime is less severely treated than error. A weakness of the heart produces more misery, more both to self and others, and is more severely chastised than a deliberate wickedness. It has often made me ponder. Look at weak Eli, only a little too indulgent. The result,—a country’s dishonor and defeat,



two profligates, a death-bed of a widow and mother on which despair sits, and the death of a wretched old man, for whom it would have been a mercy if his neck had been broken before his heart. Then, again, Pilate, only irresolution,—the result, the ruin of the Holiest. My only solution of the mystery is this. The hardening effects of sin, which save from pain, are worse judgments than the sharpest suffering. Anguish is, I am more and more sure, corrective; hardness has in it no Hope. Which would you choose if you were compelled to make a choice?—the torture of a dividing limb granulating again, and by the very torture giving indications of life, or the painlessness of mortification; the worst throb from the surgeon's knife, or ossification of the heart? In the spiritual world the pangs of the most exquisite sensitiveness cut to the quick by the sense of fault and aching almost hopelessly, but leaving conscience still alive, and aspiration still uncrushed, or the death of every remnant of what is good, the ossification of the soul, the painless extinction of the moral being, its very self? This is my reply to myself. The whole mystery of pain has been unravelling itself to my heart gradually, and now that I have got a clew, the worse than Cretan labyrinth turns out to be a harmonious and beautiful arrangement, so that the paths which are still unexplored, I can now believe a part of the same plan. Pain has long ceased to be an unintelligible mystery to me. Agony and anguish,—O, in these, far more than in sunshine, I can read a meaning and believe in infinite Love! Goodness is better than happiness; and if pain be the minister of goodness, I can see that it is a proof of Love."

## ART. VII.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

BACON'S ESSAYS. With Annotations by Richard Whately, D. D., and Notes and a Glossarial Index by Franklin Fiske Heard. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1868. Octavo. pp. 641.

Of Bacon and of his Essays a critic may well speak with something of the feeling with which he would speak of Shakspeare and his Dramas, or of Milton and his *Paradise Lost*. His is one of the few royal names in literature, and he marks and largely constitutes one of the great epochs in the development and history of human thought. He almost revolutionized the methods of study by unfolding and vindicating the inductive system; while his multifarious knowledge, his rare insight, his comprehensive views, his calm and judicial style of discussion, his aphoristic wisdom, and the gravity and strength with which he approaches all classes of topics, have made him the study of thinking men in every civilized land. It is true that he very imperfectly applied the high moral principles in his personal conduct which he so clearly and forcibly states in his writings. It would not be easy for an instructed Christian to find fault with his theories,—it would argue great dullness of conscience not to find fault with his life. Pope's brilliant line was something more than a piece of clever satire when he wrote Bacon down as

“The wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind;”

and every attempt to gain a favorable verdict over the personal character and official conduct of the man has tended to sink the standard of moral judgment to a lower level.

But the published works of Bacon are of high and substantial value. He stands as an author upon a lofty plane, speaks out of a profound wisdom, and his simplest paragraphs are crowded with the very seeds of thought. Of all his writings his Essays speak most directly and forcibly to the average mind and heart. Elsewhere he speaks to philosophers and scholars alone; here he talks familiarly with ordinary mortals, and on the very themes which belong to our average life. And of all the editions which we have met, this of Messrs. Lee & Shepard is among the very best. The book is as solid, substantial and unostentatiously elegant in appearance as the contents would suggest and require; while the extended and carefully edited annotations of Archbishop Whately, and the numerous illustrative notes of Mr. Heard, double the original value of these sixty suggestive though fragmentary discussions. To read one of these Essays braces up the mind for vigorous and healthy work like an exercise in Euclid's *Elements* or a chapter in Butler's *Analogy*. They furnish the materials for thought, put inquiry upon a plain path and animate it with a high purpose. He whose library lacks Bacon's Essays should make haste to fill the vacancy, and he who wishes an edition that will satisfy every reasonable desire and include all the

highest excellences, need look no farther after finding the imprint of Messrs. Lee & Shepard upon the title-page.

**SHORT STUDIES ON GREAT SUBJECTS.** By James Anthony Froude, M. A., Late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1868. 12mo. pp. 584.

Mr. Froude's eminence as a fresh thinker and a forcible writer does not mainly rest upon what this volume contains. His History exhibits the ripest and richest fruitage of his powers. There he is more even, calm, and sustained; and the ample undertaking furnished a field for the freest and fullest exercise of his abilities and skill. Both were displayed to good advantage, and while his work will not please all parties nor satisfy every critic, yet no honest and competent judge will deny him a high place among the standard writers of History.

In this volume he exhibits himself in his varied moods some of which do him great credit, while others disappoint the reader. He has his pet theories which every now and then crop out. His philosophy is not wholly free from the taint of materialism. His reverence is never excessive. He has no patience with pretension, and his real heroes are made up in peculiar ways. Few thoughtful readers will be able to endorse all his statements, and his conclusions will be frequently quarrelled with. He writes on divers topics in these "Studies," and with different degrees of success. "The Times of Erasmus and Luther" are painted with deep colors, some portions of the picture suggest Titian's portraits, and the three Lectures devoted to that period and to the chief actors who figured in it, are fresh, interesting and instructive. Though succeeding so many explorers he does not at all follow in the track or echo the opinions of any predecessor. His presentation of Catholicism and the Monasteries will awaken no little attention, and repay a thoughtful reading. Homer is analyzed in a masterly way. His discussions of topics belonging to sacred literature and criticism are valuable, not so much in view of anything new which they offer as for the indications which they afford of the direction in which the literary and scientific mind of the age is drifting. The style of the book is admirable—full of pith and vigor. It drives straight at its mark like a minie bullet. The Greek flexibility and the Saxon incisiveness unite in it. One sees through it to the thought, however deep it lies, as through the water in the bay of Naples, or as through the clear air of Italy when gazing upon the distant Alps outlined against the sky.

**HUMAN LIFE IN SHAKESPEARE.** By Henry Giles, author of "Illustrations of Genius," etc. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1868. 12mo. pp. 286.

This volume ought to find readers, as we cannot doubt it will. Scarcely a person making a part of the cultivated, enthusiastic and delighted audiences who listened to these Lectures as they were delivered some years since before the Lowell Institute in Boston, will forget the rare

treat which was then afforded. Mr. Giles's fresh, peculiar and brilliant utterances gave him a power over his hearers, such as only a few men of genius have wielded. His study of Shakspeare is thoroughly sympathetic, and so he interprets his characters and draws out the lessons which they offer with remarkable clearness and effect. Genius only understands genius. Mr. Giles has the "open sesame" when he knocks at the dwelling of the great dramatist, and so he is never sent away baffled into silence. With a keen insight, a fine power of analysis, a strong imagination and an active fancy, a command of the treasures of the English tongue and a power to transfuse his utterances with his own intense vitality, he is sure to hold every susceptible auditor captive, and almost chain every appreciative reader to his page. And he uses his power to some purpose. He rewards the attention which he gains and kindles the souls which he puts under the spell. Not less but more excellent than when they were listened to in the glow of the assembly will these lectures appear as they are read and meditated by the evening fire. They are seven in number, and they bring out and illustrate the chief characteristics of Shakspeare, so that his marvelous and growing power is less an enigma, and his personages become clearer revelations of character and life. Mr. Giles is now a confirmed invalid, and his pecuniary circumstances are such that whatever income may be derived from the sale of his volume will meet real necessities and aid in keeping away positive discomfort. It ought to be gold, and abundance of it, into which so much fine brain is coined as this book embodies. Choice in its contents, it is a thing of beauty in its outward material and appearance.

**THE GROUND AND OBJECT OF HOPE FOR MANKIND.** Four sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, in November, 1867, by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, M. A. Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge. Boston: William V. Spencer. 1868. 16mo. pp. 84.

Prof. Maurice has a deserved reputation as a ripe scholar, an independent thinker and a catholic spirited Churchman. He has been somewhat notable as an adherent of Broad Church views, and has quite as fully as any other man whose orthodoxy is not seriously called in question, stood out as the representative of that school of theologians. He has a penetrative mind, a philosophical habit of thought and a cultivated style. Still he is not remarkably impressive as a preacher or writer. He lacks point, pith, directness, emphasis and unction. He does not stir and kindle and impel. His teaching settles into the reader quietly if at all, working its way through the intellect not without some difficulty, and spending a great part of its force in the brain so that it does not strongly magnetize the heart. He speaks chiefly to the select and narrow circle of reflective thinkers rather than to the impressible masses of the people. Both his books and his sermons, therefore, will reach and influence the general public only by being translated into more effective and popular forms of speech by men who come into closer contact with that general public on the one side while touching Mr. Maurice on the other.

These four Sermons well represent the qualities and the method of the author. He takes his texts from the epistles of Paul, and shows the bearing of the gospel upon the interests of men,—first upon that larger circle in which they move, then gradually narrowing down the view, deals at length with the necessities of the individual soul. His sermons stand in the following order: 1. The Hope of the Missionary; 2. The Hope of the Patriot; 3. The Hope of the Churchman; 4. The Hope of the Man. The bearing of the Gospel of Christ upon these several spheres of life is well and often forcibly presented, and it would be difficult to get up a quarrel with the theology that here finds expression. The book is issued in the plainly elegant style which marks most of Mr. Spencer's publications.

**THE WORSHIP OF JESUS**, in its past and present aspects. By Samuel Johnson, Minister of the Free Church at Lynn. Boston: Wm. V. Spencer. 1868. 16mo. pp. 92.

The extreme results of "free thought" in the sphere of religion, of which we hear so much glorification, are quite fully and fairly developed in this small book. There is very little here that has not been more forcibly said elsewhere and by others. It is an American dilution of German skepticism. The basis of Mr. Johnson's theory of Christ is found in the *Leben Jesu* of Strauss; but the Lynn expounder has put his own individuality and cool extravagance into both his unsupported assertions and his rash denials. He undertakes to explain the method in which "was gradually formed the mythology of the synoptical gospels, whose authors are unknown;" says that "of the real Jesus we know but little with any certainty, and most of what we may infer from the data must be spoken provisionally;" announces that "historical criticism, emboldened by the consciousness of a high moral standard, takes courage to ask the proofs that he was perfect, and fails to find them,"—and adds that there is "much that seems other than great and wise." This is a characteristic proceeding, and it reaches the goal by a very short cut. The narrative in the New Testament is first declared to be untrustworthy, made up of myths, and legends, and wishes of the heart put into the form of historic statements, that cannot bear criticism; and then the character of Christ is pronounced really defective. It was at first set forth as complete only after it was idealized according to the tastes of the age in which it originated. The Jesus of all these centuries is thus made the product of imagination; but even as a work of art the ideal picture will not endure the close inspection to which this "emboldened" nineteenth century is subjecting it.

And when Mr. Johnson is asked how such an ideal character came to be formed, and pictured, and accepted as real, in such an age and country,—when criticism was active and the new religion provoked opposition on all sides,—he returns this remarkable answer: "The soul believes what it wishes and needs to believe, where the facts do not stand forth too conspicuously in refutation of its dream. And here the facts

lay hid from every writer and observer of the age." And he adds, else where, that "the large tolerance of Heathenism protected Christianity in its infancy by the police regulations of the empire." Mr. Johnson in this reply certainly illustrates his dictum, that "the soul believes what it wishes." He openly contradicts, in the above statement, the positive declaration of Christ before the Sanhedrim, when he said (John 18: 20, 21), "I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing. Why askest thou me? ask them which heard me, what I have said unto them. Behold, they know what I said." And he equally contradicts the whole record of Luke in the Acts, and the whole tenor of secular history, when he represents that "Heathenism protected Christianity," and he virtually disputes Paul when he recounts his own sufferings for the gospel's sake.—"The soul believes what it wishes to believe"!—"The ideal itself was sent in the soul of the age!" And yet the Jews crucified the man who embodied their ideal, and the Gentiles undertook to root out by violence the system of faith which they wished to believe! Surely Mr. Johnson is an "emboldened" critic and a modernized logician, as well as a free reviser of history. And after having thus sought to throw discredit upon the New Testament and to reduce Christ to a mere imperfect ideal which the mind of this age has quite outgrown, he thus brings forward his substitute for Christianity and its Author as the redeeming force and hope of mankind. Behold the new Messiah which Radicalism introduces!

Our trust is not in any new meaning of this name, any more than in the old official authority it has hitherto given to Jesus. . . Our trust is *not in a personal name at all*. It is in the tides and currents of a larger attraction; in the laws of our life; in the facts of the common lot; in powers and needs that cannot be escaped; in the constant forces on which all depend, and which all must use for mutual help; in the great rivers of a common inspiration, to which all finer thought and swifter insight must appeal; in the warm, full outcries of our natural brotherhood, that know not many souls, but one human soul, and course beneath the surface-play of creeds and names, a native compulsion to all that religions promise, or the largest faith in our destiny demands. These are our word of God. Is not that clear as mud, luminous as midnight, tangible as dreams, philosophic as bathos, eloquent as the communication of a speaking medium, and unequivocal as the prophecy of a Delphic Pythoness! Can the gospels expect to survive such an assault, and must not the Christ of the churches fade into insignificance before the splendor of this new Regenerator that is lifted up by the preacher at Lynn!

Such attacks and schemes as this book shows us are sad and discreditable enough, but they are so extravagant as to do little mischief. These sonorous but empty sentences are not likely to supplant the calm and sacred words which have brought hope and peace to so many generations of smitten souls; and they who find life a fearful battle and experience a heavy burden will hardly turn away from Him of the marred

face and the many sorrows who offers to take us through conflict to victory, for the sake of what is offered them in the metaphysics and rhetoric of this later Radicalism.

PORTRAITS OF CELEBRATED WOMEN. By C. A. Sainte-Beuve. Translated from the French by H. W. Preston. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1868. 12mo. pp. 384.

Among the eminent critics who embody the learning and literary art of the most æsthetic of modern peoples, Sainte-Beuve occupies a leading position. His tastes and his philosophy ally him to M. Renan, and he would not be accepted as an authority on religious questions any sooner than the poetical author of the *Vie de Jesus*. But however a serious man may quarrel with the general drift and frivolity of Paris, there is no question respecting the beauty of the *Bois de Boulogne*, the splendor of the *Louvre* or the value of the *Bibliothèque Imperiale*. And there is little room for a second opinion touching the rare literary merit of such a work as the celebrated *Portraits de Femmes*. Nine of those celebrated essays are fair specimens of the author's skill in the analysis and portraiture of female character, and the personages afford us a pleasant variety in subject, surroundings and methods of treatment; while at the same time the prominent positions occupied by several of these women, and their large influence upon public affairs, will invest these essays with an interest deeper and wider than any single character or isolated life could awaken. Madame Roland was scarcely less than Minister of State during a short time while the terrible Revolution was going forward, and her execution was one of the most marked events of that period when every day had its startling phenomenon and its awful horror. Madame De Stael was deemed a personage of so much social and political consequence that the great Napoleon dared not trust his crown in the hands of the French people so long as she was left at liberty to criticise him and his policy; and he declared that though a man were seated on a rainbow he was not safe from De Stael's arrows. And Madame de Lafayette and Madame Guizot were also women to know whom thoroughly is to be familiar with not a little of the political policy and the social experiences of the French Empire. These women, together with others who are widely and justly celebrated, are among those whose portraits hang in this noticeable gallery.

M. Sainte-Beuve has rare insight into the female character which is partly intellectual and partly sympathetic. His appreciation of what is truly feminine is very hearty, and his sensibility is stirred whenever he stands face to face with a true and noble womanhood; and yet he never loses his critical self-poise through admiration, nor fails to recognize and esteem the strength and active heroism which he deems the proper masculine qualities. He has his strong likes and dislikes, but he sees clearly even when his heart is throbbing with strong emotion, and his sense of justice keeps all his impulses under control when he is at work upon his canvas. With an ability that is rarely equalled, with a taste that in-

instinctively seizes what is fit and rejects all that is inappropriate, and with a style that combines accuracy, vigor and an affluent richness, he gives us in these biographical essays a volume that deserves a wide circulation, and which will be turned to again and again by thoughtful and cultivated readers. The translator has done her work well, and the publishers have withheld nothing which they could contribute to make an attractive book.

**THE GOSPEL IN THE TREES: with Pulpit Opinions on Common Things.** By Alexander Clark. Philadelphia: J. W. Daughaday & Co. 1868. 12mo. pp. 305.

The Psalms suggest, beyond anything else in literature, the religious uses to which the objects that surround us in the natural world may be made to serve. The author of this volume, in imitation of the *devout singers* of the past, has found texts from which to discourse on some of the highest Christian themes and spiritual experiences and sacred duties, in the well known trees of the field and the every-day phenomena of nature. He deals with the Apple tree, the Cedar, the Olive, the Myrtle, the Willow and the Palm, setting forth their characteristics and making them illustrate the great truths which the pulpit is set to unfold and impress. And then the Rain, the Snow, the Hail, &c., are summoned into service and made to vocalize the thoughts that breathe in the word of the gospels. There is much that is suggestive and valuable in these somewhat unique pulpit addresses, and the preacher has manifestly a keen eye with which to survey the world and inspect life, and a thoroughly receptive and sympathetic spirit which makes his contact with nature and with men a vital experience. It must be added that the style of these discourses is much better employed when the speaker is earnestly addressing a roused audience than when the writer is unfolding his thoughts to a cool and critical reader. It is bold, figurative, intense, vehement and not unfrequently hyperbolic. There is some truly poetic imagery, not unfrequently a burst of enthusiasm that is truly magnetic, occasionally a touch of pathos that must have been answered with moist eyes, and now and then a startling metaphor such as transfigures a common truth and makes it seem a new revelation from heaven: but as a whole we think a lower rhetorical level would have been preferable, and it would have been a gain had careful instruction in part supplanted the abounding stimulus.

**SABBATH CHIMES: or Meditations in verse for the Sundays of a Year.** By W. Morley Punshon, M. A. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1868. 12mo. pp. 223.

**THE PRODIGAL SON.** Four Discourses by the Rev. W. Morley Punshon, M. A. Same Publishers. 1868. 12mo. Pamphlet. pp. 87.

The first of the volumes whose titles are given above is made up of poems by the eminent English orator and preacher whose name it bears. The second presents us with characteristic specimens of his style of speech in the pulpit. Mr. Punshon is a marked man, and would anywhere be recognized as such. His traits are positive, his individuality would



be noticeable in any company, and his force of thought and freshness and a originality of style would insure him both hearers and readers whenever he should address his fellows through the lips and pen. He has an ample vocabulary, an accurate discrimination in the employment of words, a style that lacks neither vigor nor unction, and a fervid spirit that surely wins its way by its influence upon the sympathies of mankind. He is not a poet of the first or second class, though many stanzas in these religious poems or hymns are truly musical in their rhythm and effective in their presentation of poetic forms of thought. They indicate a keen sensibility, a profound and varied experience that interprets the deeper life of men, and a decided ability to invest the higher truths of the gospel with a rare power over the heart. In his sermons he is more at home. His range of thinking does not appear to be eminently broad, and his mind is not remarkable for calibre. He is diffuse in style, sometimes almost to weariness, running into details in his description, giving a loose rein to his fancy, and keeping his pictures a long time before his hearers,—evidently aiming to reach his result by prolonged pressure rather than by a single skillful blow. He reminds a reader of Guthrie, and it is obvious that his personal presence and the magnetism of a congregation are needful to the highest and fullest expression and operation of his power. He comes much nearer to being an orator than to being a *litterateur* or a poet. It is not difficult to believe that he could readily master an audience,—master it indeed by means of the very qualities that are somewhat objectionable when we meet them in critical coolness on the printed page,—though it must be said that, while the reader's objections are assuming definite shape, there is a grateful acknowledgment of a valuable ministry.

The lessons drawn from the Parable of the Prodigal Son are abundant, valuable, profound and comprehensive; the narrative is made wondrously fruitful, and the impression left testifies to the power of the expositor. The poems run on lines very similar to those of the sermons;—the preacher is at work in both cases and with precisely the same end in view. Few books have appeared whose mechanical excellences are higher than those which combine in Sabbath Chimes. The Discourses are issued in cheaper form. A rival edition has also appeared from the press of Messrs. Roberts Brothers, Boston, to which Rev. Gilbert Haven furnishes a characteristic Preface.

**PROBLEMS OF THE AGE; with Studies in St. Augustine on kindred Topics.** By the Rev. Augustine F. Hewit, of the congregation of St. Paul. New York: Catholic Publication House. 1868. 12mo. pp. 287, 156.

The Catholic Publication Society is busily at work, issuing the popular and tract literature by means of which Romanism is sought to be made palatable to the masses of the people, and now and then a thoughtful treatise appears that is meant to justify the Catholic dogmas to the logical intellect of thinking men. This volume is not without ability and merit, but it is hardly likely to produce any very decided results upon

men outside the Catholic circle. It may lessen for a little time the mental disquiet which thoughtful Romanists are suffering as they begin to think over the relation of Catholic theology to philosophic inquiry, but the success of the attempt to solve the great problems of the nineteenth century by means of the theological dogmas which the schoolmen of the Middle Ages elaborated, is so obviously doubtful or so manifest a failure, that the book before us will not be likely to win any marked attention or greatly affect the course of thought. The assumptions are often amusing. The introductory chapter opens with the statement that "those who are destitute of Catholic faith evidently possess no solution of these problems which satisfies themselves; wherefore they are always in a state of intellectual unrest, ever seeking and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth," Catholics are then declared to have the means of solving these problems, and so of getting rid of disquietude. This is characteristic. Non-Catholics are to be here taught how to solve the problems of the age in such a way that they shall be found consistent with Romish theology; and the first thing which they are told is that the acceptance of this theology is essential as a key to the solution. In other words, the philosophy is brought forward to justify the faith, and then the faith is declared to be indispensable to a comprehension of the philosophy. And then farther on (page 65) we are told that "the act of faith is above the natural power of the human mind. It is strictly supernatural, and possible only by the aid of supernatural grace." How converts are to be made from non-Catholic circles in view of all this does not very clearly appear, and the faith which anticipates it must have a sort of desperate bravery.

The second treatise in the volume is not very satisfactory. It is very doubtful whether the author has any adequate comprehension of the great man whom he claims to be studying, and the motive animating the study seems too thoroughly partisan to promise any real success. Augustine has usually been regarded as in some sense the father of the Calvinistic theology, and he is the last man who would be quoted in support of the pretensions of Popery. But Father Hewit undertakes to prove that "neither the saint himself nor the church of his period held the Calvinistic or Evangelical system," but, instead, that both he and the church "held the system of Catholic doctrine prescribed by the See of Rome at the present day." That would be sufficiently ingenuous to provoke a charitable smile, if it were not so audacious as to excite astonishment. The Paulist Fathers must do better than this, if they are to capture the intellect of America and bear it as a trophy to the Vatican.

THE  
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

---

No. LXIV. OCTOBER, 1868.

---

ART. 1.—CHRIST'S VITAL RELATIONS TO MEN.

In the early summer, especially, Nature every where gives emphasis to the illustration of the conditions of spiritual life, which is found in the fifteenth chapter of John's gospel, where Christ sets himself forth as the Vine and his disciples as the branches. The illustration is equally forcible and beautiful. The branches that maintain their vital connection with the parent stalk are full of vigor. The boughs are green with foliage, each twig is bursting into buds, and all the buds are flashing into blossoms. The limbs of old trees, stiff with the toughness of their fibers or with the hardening influence of their many years, grow flexible and sway to the music which is poured all the day along the aisles of the forest. Roses are blushing as if at their own beauty; honeysuckles clamber up the lattices and breathe fragrance in at every open window; the clover nods in every field to the daisy; the lily puts on the robes which no attire of eastern monarchs can rival; every bush by the road-side is hanging out its bannerets; the fruit-trees already bend beneath the weight of promises that are hastening into fulfillment, and the most barren mountains are carrying verdure far up their sides toward the crest, or bursting out into miniature oases wherever

a little tuft of grass can push its way up through the crevices of the rock. The brownest heaths grow beautiful, the mosses upon the stone gather new greenness, and the desert blossoms without the help of metaphors. And all these struggles and swellings and triumphs of life owe themselves to the organic unity of vegetation;—the stem keeps its hold upon the root, the branch abides in the vine, the loftiest twig preserves its vital connection with the deepest and minutest radicle.

Sever the thriftiest branch, and death hastens its work to completion. The sap stagnates in the channels, the chemical processes that went on without interruption are suspended, the twigs lose their flexibility and then stiffen into brittleness, the foliage wilts and then grows crispy, and decay and decomposition come in to end the process. No artificial appliances avail. Cement or string may keep the member in its old position, but they cannot restore nor preserve the vitality. The stream of life has been cut off from the fountain, and so the channels must run dry.

How different, too, is this life of nature from the best and highest imitations of it in the spheres of art! The best painting on the canvas is a poor thing compared with the landscape which it seeks to reproduce. The grass in the picture has no motion; the clouds keep their old shapes day after day; the brook neither sparkles nor sings; there is no murmur through the forest; the shadows cast by the sun neither lengthen nor change; the night dims the scene with no unusual suggestiveness, and the morning floods it with no new splendor. An oak in a pasture elaborated by the chemistry of a hundred seasons, is a thousand times nobler than a cedar of Lebanon in a picture-gallery, built up of painters' pigments. A rose of wax, however skilfully fashioned, is a contemptible thing when compared with the queen of the parterre swinging in the breezes of June. The painted cluster of cherries which tempted the bird to the window where it hung, how vastly inferior was it to the product of the fruit-tree, which would have fed instead of cheating, and called out a new hymn of thanksgiving from the throat of the warbler. By so much as substance is better than show, as realities are superior to shams, as great deeds are above skilful jugglery, as spontaneous movement is to be preferred to automatic

impulse, as a leap of life signifies more than a galvanic contortion, by so much are vital products to be chosen rather than mechanical, and God's inspiration before man's philosophy.

In these words of Christ, that show his vital relation to the true life of the human soul, are stated both the highest fact and the deepest philosophy of the gospel. All genuine spiritual life is the result of that vital influence which is poured from the divine heart into the currents of the human spirit. The amount of this influence received and appropriated measures the strength of the religious character and the fruitfulness of the religious life. Without this the soul is weak and effort ineffectual; with it, even frail natures become strong, and exertion that seemed to promise little, issues in achievements which wake the wonder of men and win the smile of God.

Vitality is the test of every thing. Whatever helps us does so by adding to our life. All true teachers quicken;—they are not set simply to sooth and subdue. We do not want powers crushed out, but rendered normal and consecrated to vigorous work. The difficulty with men now is, that only half the faculties are awake, and those that sleep are the noblest. The intense and exhausting action that is complained of is usually partial action, which throws the soul out of tune;—as the tyro musician injures his instrument and wearies out the patience of himself and his auditors by always playing music in the key of D. The test of a system or a sermon is its power to quicken the recipient and hearer. Anything that sets fettered powers free, that expands the sphere of thought, that opens new channels of enterprise, that exalts aim, that solidifies purpose, that enlarges the play of imagination, that makes the movements of the will resolute, and thus increases the dynamic forces of men, is set down as a blessing and a condition of real gain. The whole plan of the world is such that it is meant evidently to stimulate and normalize the human powers. The hiding of resources that they may be sought for; the curse and dishonor put upon selfishness and indolence; the reward held out to a wise industry; the victories promised to persevering toil; the joys that blossom in the pathway of learning and discovery; the honors that wait as a crown of heroism; the monuments which men build in their

hearts to philanthropy; the benedictions wherewith all good men hallow a human saintship;—all this shows that souls were meant to find stimulants rather than anodynes in the experience of life. And it is Christ himself who says, “I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.” “Go, work,” is the Master’s commission whenever he finds a teachable and loyal heart, not, “Lie down and dream.” “Take up thy bed and walk,” is his cry to the palsied cripple; and the mandate was aimed more at the torpid soul than at the droning nerves or the flaccid muscles. And he vitalized common natures till they became historic and wonderful. Peter had scarcely been known, save about the shores of Gennesaret, till Jesus commissioned him;—after that, he filled all Jerusalem and Judea with wonder and alarm by his bold and magnetic speech. Paul had set as a student at the feet of Gamaliel till the gospel stung him into frenzy; and then, having accepted its ministry, he makes all Asia Minor ring with his name and become reverent before the messages which go out from his prison. Not more surely does morning dawn to wake the earth from its slumbers, than Christ comes to quicken humanity and vitalize stagnant souls. Not more surely do the monotonous forests change into fruitful gardens along the highways of civilization, than does the desert of human experience blossom out into beauty when the life-giving spirit of God finds a channel along which it may flow through the torpid heart.

It is this perpetual presence of Christ that constitutes the glory of his gospel, and gives it the chief promise of success. That pledge,—“Lo I am with you always,” rightly interpreted, is the highest guaranty that his word shall not return void, nor his servants speak it in feebleness. It gives the speaker new authority and fervor, and it makes the hearer realize that he is listening to no common message. Christ’s ministry was not simply the proclamation of a system, or the founding of a new religious party; it was chiefly meant to bring a new vitality to the world. He did more than to make our planet a visit, to show his own condescension and assert the forgotten dignity of men. He comes to dwell in humanity, and build up successive generations of souls into heavenly majesty and beauty.

The manifestations of God which marked the earlier history of the world are not to be set down as exceptional developments and expressions of his interest in the human race. The old miracles are not the only symbols of the Father's heart. All the centuries are his children; each generation draws largely and freshly on his sympathy. If he brooded over the cradle of the race, he does not forget its youth nor leave its manhood unattended. The interests of our world grow constantly more numerous and more valuable. As its forces increase and become more operative, so must he follow them in their work with a deepening interest. The world's life of to-day stands related to its earlier life as the oak is related to the acorn, as the flower to the bud, as the fruit to the germ. The human race is a constantly growing element in the sum of being, and God's interest is always measured by the moral power of any existence.

Men, calling themselves philosophers, often object to the idea that God is operating in the world in any effective way, on the ground that he is restrained by law. As though methods must exist at the expense of souls! As though God would frame statutes that shut him away from the home, and cut off his most needed ministries from the hearts of his children! As though laws were not instituted with a full knowledge of all the ends to which they stand related! As though they were fashioned for any other purpose than to be channels through which his grace might be poured, in the largest streams and with the highest certainty, into the heart! As though any law of God were any thing else than a guaranty to faith that the gift of to-day should be repeated to-morrow. As though it were any thing else than a picture of his beneficence, all written over with the sentence,—“The same yesterday, and to-day, and forever!”

The withdrawal of Christ's humanity from the earth is no index of loss. It does not denote the perishing of divine sympathy,—it rather suggests its enlargement and diffusion. The human channel could no longer hold the broad stream, as the banks of the Nile cannot enclose nor restrain the liquid fruitfulness which comes pouring down when the spring rains have given their baptism to the mountains. It was expedient that he go away; for only thus could the great Comforter and In-

spirer find his way to all hearts without hindrance. Allied with a human body, God's grace must be largely limited in its operations by human conditions. If Christ's human lips must distil wisdom, it could fall only when his lips were opening. If the touch of his finger or the glance of his eye must give healing vigor or communicate hope, the distant sufferers must pine on without relief from weakness or despair. While Capernaum brings out her diseased ones, and Gadara is cured of possessions, and Nain and Bethany welcome life back from the sepulchre, Jerusalem finds no cure for her leprosy, Hebron sits solitary, and Bethlehem stretches forth her arms in vain. While the lost sheep of the house of Israel are sought out and brought home with rejoicing on the shoulders of the Great Shepherd, wolves are devouring the flocks now broken loose from the folds of the Gentiles. Christ's bodily life is the alabaster box which holds the sacred ointment;—it must be broken before its odor fills the house of humanity. The incense must find egress from the censer before the fragrance can diffuse itself at once through all the temple of life. The flood of glory which came at the Pentecost would have been only another shower, such as fell at Nazareth and Sychor, had not the cloud found room for expansion till it filled the whole heaven. The light set now in the firmament, and "lighting every man that cometh into the world," would have been only a changing star, like that which guided the Magi, had not the obscured splendor culminated and formed the Sun of Righteousness. The human Jesus walked among men to show how thoroughly God may come in contact with the soul and with common life; having done this, he threw off the finite limitations that the Infinite Presence might brood at once and forever over all the world of spirit.

Jesus, then, is the giver of a new and divine life to men. All real spiritual vitality comes of his influence and quickening. It commences with an infusion of energy from him. It continues only while he feeds it from his own exhaustless fountain. The original impulse from him does not suffice to keep us forever in the sacred orbit. He gives as we receive and apply; he feeds only as we consume. We never get beyond the necessity or his ministries. We never acquire a momentum that enables



us to dispense with his fresh impulses. Daily we must have the daily bread. The manna gathered yesterday does not answer to-day. We maintain no independent spiritual existence, by virtue of any acquired vigor, or enlarged knowledge, or completer self mastery, or growing skill. However green the foliage, or beautiful the blossoms, or luxuriant the fruit, which may appear in our life, while preserving our vital connection with the living Vine, we sever ourselves only to find the flowing currents stagnate, the foliage wither, the blossoms perish, the half matured fruit become acid and fall. Keeping up this union with him, the sphere of life enlarges, the play of its forces is freer, the experience is enriched, the vitality becomes intenser, the working energy multiplies, the interior friction grows less, the powers combine harmoniously and work with new singleness, and the results of this intensified and normal life are larger as well as better. Out of this statement of the truth contained in the figure of the Vine there spring many thoughts which show the significant bearings of the lesson, exhibit it as a practical sentiment, and enforce its applications. Of these let us consider a few.

1. It exalts Christ to a divine rank and assigns him a divine ministry.

It can be no finite teacher, no delegated personage, no dependent being, who is authorized to speak such words as these. "Abide in me for so only can you have life. I alone can vitalize your spirit, can keep your souls from stagnation, can fill you with energy and crown your work with success. I am the fountain; drink and live. I yield nutriment; feed on it and grow. I supply energy; receive it and be strong. Cut off from me you perish, let whoever will bring guardianship or apply culture. Without me ye can do nothing. With my inspiration no human task shall be undertaken in vain. Prompted by my impulses, ye shall ask what ye will and the petition shall have its answer,—struggle for any goal and it shall be within reach." Make now all proper allowance for eastern metaphor, there still remains in these words a fulness of meaning, and they denote the calm, quiet consciousness of resource, authority and power, that makes them the outburst of an insufferable egotism, or bold with terrific blasphemy if they are not from Him who is all in all.

2. These words set aside all theories of human redemption based on self culture, or the education of society.

The philosophy of development is utterly ignored in this statement of the source and the quality of all real spiritual life and Christian character, and which explains every thing by reference to a new and higher agency. These two theories of the Christian life divide the world. One set of teachers tell us that true religion is proper self regulation; that repentance is breaking off bad habits; that forgiveness of sin is the overcoming of passion and a growth out of the reach of evil forces; that faith is adherence to principle; that prayer is a stimulus applied to the sensibility in the form of devout words; that the peace of God is the harmony of a well-balanced soul; that true worship is a wise industry; that God's gift of strength is a will grown resolute by exercise; that succor in temptation is the repulsion felt by an improved moral taste; that the "well-done" of heaven is the reasonable self-satisfaction which our heroic work has brought us; and that salvation comes only from an out-growing of our inherited weaknesses.

There is indeed a partial truth wrapped up in these methods of representation. They imply a fact;—they show that there is a human side to Christian experience; that a passive and indolent soul fails of the highest good; that a Christian life is more intense in its activity than any other. But these words of Christ give another account of the change wrought by religion in the human soul;—they make these high activities chiefly the expression and result of his ministry within us. They show that the heart is quick because life has been poured into it from above. It is penitent because its sin is shown it as a defiance of God's law and a blow at Christ's love. It has peace because the broken law's sentence of condemnation is withdrawn. It hopes through its clinging to the divine promise. It is strong through the incoming of heavenly power. It loves because the Redeemer stands before it transfigured into the beauty of excellence. Its gratitude is kept active by the perpetual coming of great and undeserved gifts. It looks for victories only under the leadership of him who in conquering all foes for himself, comes to conquer them again in and through each of his children.

Not by mechanical processes but by vital, does Christ propose to make human nature a divine temple and the earthly life a type of heavenly experience. Not by curtailing this power and enlarging that; not by pruning here and stimulating there; not by perpetually crowding the nature into some ideal mould, to bring and keep it into comeliness and harmony of parts, would Christ teach us to fashion the soul for him. Rather, he instructs us that we must take from him the living force that works in the centre of our nature, elaborating the elements of spiritual nutrition, and distributing them with superhuman skill to the very extremities of our being. He must pour light into the understanding, make conscience quick to see and prompt to impel, arouse sluggish affections, ennoble aim, fortify purpose, sustain faith, preserve patience, keep effort consecrated and vigorous. Into the arctic winter of the soul he must breathe summer airs; and on the barren soil of the heart he must pour enriching influences, as the annual floods of the Nile change desert Egypt into gardens. Thus and thus only, according to Christ, does the soul truly live; thus only does experience rise up to its great heights of privilege; thus only does effort bear the weighty sheaves on its shoulders at whose approach heavenly voices join in shouting the "harvest home."

3. This view of Christian life, is reasonable and necessary;—that is, it is easily sustained by philosophy, illustrated by numerous analogies, called for by all profound experience, and exalted in its results.

Whenever life gets really ennobled, it is by the infusion of new forces from without. A soul that gravitates downward through its own weight, must rise, if it rise at all, because an upward impulse has overcome the nether attraction, or a superior magnetism is lifting it heavenward. All effort at self redemption, which excludes help from without, is like a struggle to raise one's self by lifting at his own feet. And the merely human helpers that stand on the same plane can only push the ambitious soul as high as their own shoulders. The truly ascending spirit must rise by the aid of stronger and diviner hands. The soul's life is in union with God; whatever aims at or reaches less than this, leaves the great work undone and the great want unmet.

In vegetable culture, from which Christ's simile is drawn, all radical changes depend on radical conditions. A richer soil and more thoughtful care, a more skilful training, may add thriftness, luxuriance and value; but they cannot radically change the products. A buckthorn will yield only diminutive and acid berries though it be taken from the roadside and put into the choicest spot in the nursery. Place it in the centre of the orchard, offer it precisely the same elements on which to feed, subject it to precisely the same culture as pertain to the surrounding fruit-trees; yet it will not yield cherry, apple, peach nor plum. Its proportions may be more regular, its foliage shade a broader area; but it bears only the fruit after its kind. Its own affinities determine what elements it shall take up, and the chemistry going on in every branch decides what fruits it shall yield. There is one way, and only one way, in which the products may be made wholly different; and that is by grafting a branch from another tree into the organism, and so setting new and controlling forces at work in the laboratory. Do that, and roses may bloom on one branch, purple plums and golden pears may hang on contiguous boughs, and apple and peach may blush side by side. And by similar processes must the human soul be made to yield the higher products of the gospel, if they ever hang from the boughs of its life. There is this difference, however; that, whereas each new and differing product must come of a specific graft in the nursery, the same infusion of the new and vital force into the soul flows out in all the branches,—maturing all forms of precious fruit,—“love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness and temperance;” warm affections, resolute purpose, generous deeds, reverence for the noble, pity for sufferers, prayer for the wayward, pardon for wrongs, enthusiasm for Christ.

The mingling of races, where the vitality of two differing nations is interchanged, marks always the birth of a new civilization, and one that might otherwise have been sought and waited for in vain. The sluggish blood of the east leaps when vitalized by contact with the life of a more ardent people; and the most stupid tribe from tropical Africa, unquickened by the forces of a strong and intense civilization acting from without,

springs into a new sphere and power when the Anglo Saxon blood is poured into its veins. The very process that bleaches the skin magnetizes the spirit. The external culture offered by our enterprise works feebly and slowly; whenever the old English life is imported, there is an energetic awakening as from a dream. And so Christ renews by vitalizing.

And in those deeper experiences of the heart, when its fountains are broken up, and the floods go careering over it,—sweeping away the monuments of its power and laying all its earthly hopes waste, nothing can content or relieve it but a real God at hand. When the plans of life succeed, when each new morning dawns upon a fresh joy, when heaven smiles in the look of the sun and drops benedictions from all the stars, when calamities are kept at bay, and lips distil compliments, and honors accumulate upon us,—then we talk perhaps of the beneficence of natural order, and glorify law, and praise human skill, and boast over our foresight, and feel we have no great need that God should come near us. But when great perils impend, and our wisest plans are thwarted, and our possessions drop away from us, and loving lips are dumb, and trusted hearts grow treacherous, and the order of nature is like a massive chariot with scythes hung at its axles cutting down our treasures as it rushes by;—when all surrounding forces are laying life desolate without apparent compunction or emotion,—blind to our tears and deaf to all our wailing,—then the blasted and quivering soul cries out for a heart, and yearns for a bosom on which the aching temples may find a soothing.

And especially when the heart reproaches itself for its sin; when the Law thunders condemnation; when the soul wakes to find itself guilty, desolate and astray; when it feels that retribution is on its track and the earth has no refuge for it; when the passions wake and ply all their enginery as if to take conscience by storm; when temptation comes every hour with a fresher and larger bribe; when the public virtue falls away and the integrity of trusted men fails them; when the retrospect of a wretched life sickens the dying transgressor, and a miserable legal obedience seems only a tattered garment falling away from a selfish soul;—then what but the prompt mercy of a personal

and Infinite Redeemer can avail? Will you talk to such a spirit of magnetizing itself, when its very limbs are torpid? Will you point its fears to Law when Law is only Mount Sinai quaking with thunders? Will you bid it submit like a stoical philosopher, when its deepest and strongest instincts are leaping to find deliverance? Will you offer it a subtle and icy philosophy when it pleads for a simple word of love and the uplifting strength of a Father's arm? None of these things can satisfy; they only mock at its necessities, and reproach while they profess to help. One word only can bring peace and impart satisfaction;—and that is the sentence of the last Jewish prophet,—“Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!” And then while the hearer looks and listens He himself draws near to say,—“Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.” “Lo I am with you alway.”

The character, too, which grows up under the tuition of faith, and matures in the sunshine of this conscious presence of Christ, is better as well as surer. The spirit of an amiable woman is beautiful; the integrity of a strong man is impressive; a mother, walking affectionate and queenly among her children, is a scene for an artist's skill; and the heroism of a great patriot is wrought into an epic whose grand music goes sounding down the ages. But if the amiable woman lack heavenly love, her grace may be only inherited taste or fashionable etiquette; and if the strong man's integrity wants the basis of religious conviction, it may go crashing down beneath the next fierce pressure. The mother's royal robes drop from her when we perceive that her home is prayerless, and her children are taught no trust in a Heavenly Parent; and the patriot keeps but half our reverence when we know that his death was no token of fidelity to God. A punctilious legality is far below an obedient love; a constrained propriety is not half so welcome as a tear that proclaims the thorough repentance of a prodigal. Tithes of mint and anise and cummin are less than one deep gush of affection, making the heart run over toward a personal Christ. The Magdalen's box of ointment was worth a thousand times more than the Pharisee's anxiety for the moral reputation of his house; and Thomas's “My Lord and my God,” mounts in its character far above all

his prudent questioning lest he should be persuaded too soon into the belief that his Master had fulfilled the prophecy of his resurrection. From the humility of a broken heart there springs up the highest nobility of goodness, as the *Gloria in Excelsis* is never so magnificent as when it bursts up from the orchestra just now wailing out the *miserere*. The virtue that comes of self-culture and the regulation of the passions may have symmetry and beauty;—that which flows out from the inspiration given to the soul by Christ has warmth and life and motion. One is like the statue of the *Venus de Medici*, standing century after century in the Florentine gallery to challenge admiration; the other is seen in such daily ministries as those of Florence Nightingale among the wounded soldiers of the Crimea, ambitious only to soothe suffering, and finding her highest reward in the smile of peace which answered her effort when she pointed the dimmed eyes of the dying to Calvary.

4. The practical acceptance of this sentiment is the highest guaranty of a sound theology.

Theology begins its method wrongly when this idea of God's direct and constant contact with the human soul is not laid at its basis. Religion has no vitality, and so no valuable truth, when this is denied or ignored. It is only a set of dry dogmas,—a skeleton system, without nerves or blood, and in which all the muscles are either shrunken or ossified. He who, on the other hand, commences his system of doctrine by putting this great thought into the centre as the nucleus around which all other truths are to be arranged in their order, is not likely to go widely astray. Such a man has one of the highest qualifications for the study of religious truth,—that is, a heart quick with affection, reverential with wondering gratitude, and teachable in its simple trust. Such a spirit as this wins its way where philosophy is bewildered, and sees the morning kindle while irreverent science is searching vainly for a star. Where speculation stumbles love interprets; and many a text of scripture or a hard sentence of Providence that defies investigation gives up its meaning to prayer. For God has "hid these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes."

Besides, he who accepts this perpetual presence and grace of

Christ, as the end and significance of all religious doctrine, we have a special reason for loving and longing for the truth. To him each truth will seem a cup with which this living water is to be dipped from the fountain and carried to the spirit's lips; and so the more clearly the truth is seen the more readily can it be used;—the more full our apprehension of it is the larger is the quantity which it holds. As souls seek the water of life, so will they prize the channels offered by truth along which the tide may pour. True doctrine is an unfailing aqueduct; false sentiment is a broken cistern; it is the thirsty spirit, coming often to drink, that will soonest distrust the shattered vessel.

And by this test the relative importance of errors is to be determined. The worst heresies,—those that most need hounding down and hounding out of the world,—are those that cut off the soul from the divine fountain, that paralyze its spiritual faculties, that make its higher life stagnate, that cheat its pulses of vigor, that take God away from its consciousness, that beget false independence, that drive the spirit out of its appointed orbit, and leave it to moral orphanage. Whether these errors be of those put under ban or of those that keep orthodox company, they work the chief disasters in the theology of the world. And that is the divinest sentiment that most abounds in nutritious juices;—that feeds the soul without killing its hunger, that allows God all majesty and yet brings him closest to the heart, that enables us to whisper our prayers into his very ear, to behold him putting his seal on every task, to realize that he touches the soul at every point, and so makes all life the outgrowth of his influence, and all work to be done as under our great Taskmaster's eye. That theology is the soundest which, year after year in many times and lands, on many classes of souls, brings such attestations, stimulates such forces, and matures such fruit. The heterodoxy that vitalizes is truer than the orthodoxy that benumbs.

5. The hearty reception of this sentiment will give to the soul courage and to effort effective power.

He who knows most of the world has usually least faith in its redemption; they who carry with them most of this sacred



vitality are most effectively pressing it on toward its true goal. Peter and John could promise nothing of themselves to the crippled beggar at the gate Beautiful; but, holding at their control the forces of Christ they could make him leap with a word. And he who goes abroad in the strength of the Lord God, may calmly look all dangers in the face and yet be full of resolution; may measure the barriers that oppose him and yet look for them to melt away like walls of mist when smitten by the wings of the morning. It matters not much how weak human things may be if God has really selected them to confound the mighty, nor how simple the instrument if it is Heaven's chosen weapon for the overthrow of men's wisdom. God in us is the adequate explanation of every achievement, and a sufficient justification of the highest prophecies of the sacred word.

There is hope of bad men, too, if God's quickening may be counted on when our most rousing words bring out no symptoms of life. The dead in trespasses and sins may live, if he will pour vital currents into their stagnant souls. The old man may give way to the forces of the new creature, if his warm breath may quicken into summer growth the seeds of grace till now buried and unawakened. It is no longer a marvel that the chief of sinners may be saved, and that possessed men may sit clothed in their right minds.

Here, too, is the proof of the human soul's nobility. Not all the history of Bethlehem had enriched that town so much as the brief sleep of the infant Messiah in the manger of one of its inns. The glory of Solomon's temple was not in its magnitude nor its splendor. The Shekinah above the mercy seat was its crowning characteristic. The glory of man is not his splendid intellect, nor his skill which puts even his weakness into the place of mastery, nor his great achievements of which history is the monument. The dwelling of divine forces in him is the strongest assertion of his greatness. The weakest and most defiled soul is a majestic thing when the Creator's spirit chooses it for a temple sooner than it chooses the Basilica of St. Peters. Carlyle voiced his sentimental pantheism when he said, "He touches divinity who lays his finger on a human body;" it is plain Christian truth which tells us that he who unlocks a human soul

to the gospel builds Jehovah another sanctuary on earth. No man is mean who carries such a nature; no effort wants dignity which would transfuse such a nature with the life of God.

So, too, this sentiment will help us rightly to interpret success. Our learning may astonish, our taste purchase compliments, our genius startle, our gifts win homage, our logic silence opposition, our eloquence magnetize, our pathos start tears, our imagination throw splendid hues over the homeliest things and thoughts, our fame attract crowds; and yet, if men are not made to feel the beating of God's heart in theirs, and their souls are not quickened with the consciousness of his inspiration, we have only displayed a skilful jugglery where we were set to distribute life. Pretending to inspire souls, we have only pampered taste and amused the fancy,—deepening all the while the guilty slumbers we should have broken.

6. There is special need of making this sentiment real and primary now.

Our general life is eminently outward and fearfully intense. The gains we chiefly prize are those that can be turned into cash without much discount or delay. We spend our chief force upon matter. Strength of muscle, the cunning of the brain, and the subdual of natural powers to the service of the body,—we hold these up as symbols of our civilization and indices to our boasted progress. Physical science is jostled by eager devotees everywhere, who tease her for commissions or boast of miracles in her name. The cry of the restless soul is answered by an offer of new luxuries to the palate, or the display of art that shall feed the taste and so turn off the eye from the inward barrenness. Men change the desert into fruitful fields, and so forget to ask Heaven for daily bread. They play with the lightnings, and so lose their sense of dependence on the divine protection. They balance one selfish interest against another, and call it peace. They play off counter passions upon each other in the game of life so skilfully that they forget that God only can preserve the whole mechanism of society from confusion. Charged with nervous power, men swing backward and forward without cessation, like electrical balls,—attracting and repelling, striking and rebounding,—and this they call life;

while the music which comes of the collisions is described as the "March of Progress." We work deep, but think on the surface; we stimulate invention, but mesmerize the heart; we plan much, but pray little; pet the body but plague the soul; multiply resources for this world, but lay up little treasure in the other; put new honors constantly upon men, but lay down small homage at the feet of God.

That is one vicious element, and defective feature of life. Another is our exaltation of human interests above God's authority. The sneers at the Higher Law, in which so many public men have heretofore allowed themselves to indulge, show us pride gone mad and self-worship which has become at length practical Atheism. It is perverting the public conscience, turning faith into mere sentiment, and robbing religion of all vigor; and, besides this, it is paving the way to the very worst civil anarchy, and converting legislation into a game of skill.

The cure for all this is obvious. The consciousness of God in the heart of society, the perpetual conviction that his Spirit is interpenetrating our life, and will let no injustice nor crime pass without notice or challenge or discipline,—this alone can call men back to reflection, teach them dependence and submission, and render life loyal or noble. We want more intelligence, without doubt; but still more we want that vitality of conscience which God imparts by his contact with souls. Our discoveries, our enterprise, our achievements, our increasing power over matter, and our developing national forces, may be welcomed with gratitude; but even these fail of their highest service till we have learned to use them all under the direction of Him whom we recognize as Lawgiver and Lord.

Nor does this vital union with Christ imply or promote a dreamy sentimentalism, which thrives in the cloister but wilts in the sun. It does not show itself chiefly in rhapsodies, and perish the moment hard work is to be done. It is not a mere stimulant of imagination, while it palsies muscle and takes the vigor from volition. Rather it is the opposite of this. Its legitimate and richest products are stalwart men,—keen of eye, prompt in duty, unflinching in courage, skilful in work. This spiritual force of God is specially wanted that it may fill the whole do-

main of life. 'This vital power, truly within us, comes out every where ;—there is no task, however humble, but it ennobles and hallows. On the high places of eminence and in the commonest walks ; in homes as well as in sanctuaries ; in places of merchandise as well as in closets,—this sacred influence works and appears. “To be spiritually minded is life. Every rising up of pure aspiration ; every clinging to principle in the hour when the tempter is nearest ; every choice of abstract right above politic selfishness ; every putting down of sensual passion with reverential prayer ; every preference of a truth which inherits a cross, over the lie that flatters with a promise of prosperity,—is a palpable motion of God's life within the soul.” Indeed, the highest developments of this divine force we have yet seen or shall see, appear in common life, when the daily work of men and women all about us is undertaken with prayer, continued with true and patient heroism, hallowed as though it were a holy sacrifice, and ended with a hymn of thanksgiving. And some of the grandest achievements which the gospel is set to reach, will be seen only when our secular pursuits shall be animated by a Christian temper, and our week-day work shall be holy like our Sabbath worship. No higher tokens of God's presence among men can be witnessed than will appear when labor and capital shall confide in each other, because both shall cultivate honor and cherish sympathy ; when trade shall be both just and generous ; when commerce shall be beneficent by intention ; when politics shall be animated by a conscience ; when law shall echo the divine statutes ; when statesmanship shall imply patriotism and philanthropy ; when schools shall produce manhood, and honors be ordered by a wise and efficient love. Over such a human state as that, the great voice would be heard again in heaven,—not as before ringing out a prophecy, but at length announcing a fact,—“Behold the tabernacle of God is with men.”

## ART. II.—WORK FOR WOMAN IN INDIA.

The saying has passed into a maxim that the prosperity of a state depends upon the moral and intellectual elevation of its women. The world's history is a standing proof of its truth and neither philanthropist nor philosopher has ever succeeded, who ran in the face of a law so universal and so binding as this. For many generations it has been a fundamental principle in all moral reforms that the lever to lift a community from degradation must first lift its women, and on this principle has every great enterprise proceeded, which has contemplated the amelioration of the race. The course of reasoning in the case has been simply this, that so long as the central and controlling influence of home remains corrupt, no efforts, be they never so earnest and untiring, for the good of society can be either thorough or permanent. The mother of the household must be reached, and only when her heart is converted and her mind enlightened is the way open for the proper training of the rising generation.

No class of men have felt the force of the foregoing facts so deeply as Christian missionaries among the heathen. They have had to see and to study humanity in its most terrible and appalling depravity and to calmly counsel for its welfare, and they occupy a broad field for observation and effort. Those whom God has called to work among the teeming populations of Asia and Africa have from the very first recognized the principle which has been laid down, and aimed to reach the heart of the family by bringing the women under the benign influences of the gospel. In some parts of the pagan world such an aim has been easily carried out, and work for woman has been prosecuted without serious difficulty. This is true of Africa, and of several countries of Asia such as Burmah and China. In other sections all work of this kind has been beset with the sorest and stubbornest obstacles. This has been pre-eminently the case in Hindostan, where woman has been so completely secluded from society by a curious and cruel custom that knows no self-interest and respects no benevolence.

The design of this paper is to briefly illustrate the condition

of woman in India, and to point out what is being done to instruct and educate her. And in speaking of her condition it will be necessary to make separate mention of the upper and lower classes. The first comprises all belonging to families of more or less social distinction on account of caste, wealth or position. The second takes in all the women of the common working classes. Besides these there is the large class of disreputable women, of whom no further note need be made here.

For convenience's sake, I will first treat of the second class or the women of the working people. These are divided of course into about as many castes as there are distinct employments, but as to social position they all are so nearly on a level that it is not worth while noticing the minor differences. These women have to work for a living, hence are obliged to move about. They cannot seclude themselves at home if they would. They must till the land, go to the jungles for wood, carry various kinds of produce to the bazars and markets, and frequently work out as day laborers. This woman of the common people is therefore necessarily active and much out-of-doors. It is easy to reach her for purposes of instruction provided you can hold her attention long enough from her daily toil. She will halt five minutes it may be at the preaching stand and then hurry along. She never knew a letter of the alphabet and never means to. Why, her husband would die, were she to learn to read! But she is a very religious person. If she be forty years old you will find denser and darker superstition in her mind, than in any other in the land. In fact this woman is full and running over with all sorts of silly stupid trash that has been handed down from parent to child for generations without number. In short this representative woman of the second class is an ignorant, rough, stirring creature, who is quite satisfied with her attainments and cares little about knowing more or becoming better.

The morals of this class are by no means above reproach. Virtue is a thing sadly rare in these homes of the common people. The marriage tie is lightly esteemed and easily broken. How could it be otherwise in a land where polygamy prevails? Concubinage is common and breeds untold misery. It furnishes

a very convenient method of violating the Hindu law about widows, that under no circumstances shall they be allowed to marry again. Vice of every form not merely lurks beneath the roof, but stalks abroad at mid-day. In some of the lower order of communities shame is a thing unknown in either speech or action, and loose rein is given to every corrupt passion. Long, loud quarrels by day and by night can be heard for half a mile, and there is nothing on earth that can enter the lists in point of low vile abuse with these Hindu women. This description might be carried out into its dark and dreadful details, but this is not my present purpose. A general view of the case is quite sufficient, and is surely dark and dreadful enough.

What now is the condition of woman in the upper class? To begin with, it must be said that she is strictly secluded from society. Some of these *Zenanas*, as they are called, i. e., the woman's department in a Babu's house, are as closely sealed against intrusion, and as secret as a nunnery. This custom is not a native one, but was derived from the Mahommedans. Before the great Mahommedan invasion nothing was known of this Zenana system. The name *Zenana* is of Arabic or Persian origin and belongs to the Mussulmans. It is singular to perceive how binding this custom of foreign introduction has come to be throughout India. Upon visiting the house of a respectable Hindu or Mussulman, you never get a sight of the women of the family, save possibly an aged widow or a domestic. All are imprisoned within the close inner apartments and know little or nothing of the outer world. So far is this privacy carried that even a physician cannot see his patient when summoned to one of these first class families. In these circumstances some friend of the invalid will state the case, which is usually the poorest way on earth of securing a correct diagnosis. In an extreme case by much urging and a final movement to leave the house, you may succeed to the bold extent of insinuating your masculine digits far enough through a slit in a heavy curtain to touch the wrist of the actual invalid, and under a burning or a brumal skin to feel the private pulsations of a poor Zenana prisoner's heart. Or, *more public still*, in a desperate case, the fair one may be constrained to protrude the tip of her tongue through a shaded

screen, thus affording the doctor such an admirable chance . . . determining both the trouble and the treatment! Her husband and her sons, her husband's younger brothers and her men-servants, these are all the persons of the opposite sex whom she can see. The inner court is her out-door world, where she can bask in the sun as her hair is being combed, or gaze at the stars while fondling her babe.

As to intelligence this woman of the Zenana is far superior to her sister of the lower class. She has more mind, is more of a lady, can converse much more agreeably, but her stock of actual knowledge of common things is of course much smaller than that of the other woman. All she knows she learns from her home friends. This may comprise a few words of English which her lord has deigned to teach her, and which she is very fond of parading before the few lady visitors who are admitted to her apartments. These Zenana women spend their time in sleeping, ornamenting themselves, chatting, eating, and playing with their children.

The morals of the Zenana though far above the standard of the class already described are by no means above reproach. Still in some of these homes there is to be seen that real affection of husband and wife, and of parents and children for one another, which is the surest guaranty of peace and happiness.

I have thus far sketched very briefly the present condition of women in India. So much might have been said of this that it has been difficult to compress the main facts into so small a compass. And now we proceed to mention what is being done to civilize and christianize these heathen women. The reader of the foregoing pages must perceive that the work I am about to describe is one beset with serious obstacles, and so far has been prosecuted under great and discouraging difficulties.

In the first place we shall inquire what is being done for the lower class of Hindu women, or those belonging to the ranks of the common people. It has been a cherished object with Missionary ladies, for many years past, to organize little village schools for these working women, but not one school of the kind that I am aware of has ever proved a success. It was impossible to get the pupils to come to the Missionary's house for instruc-



tion, so she went to the villages. Morning and evening did she try to carry out her benevolent wish, but nevertheless failed. In the morning every one was off to work in the field, the jungle or the bazar, and in the evening the tired creatures were busy about cooking their food. And besides this there was the original distaste for study which it would be hard to overcome under the most favorable circumstances. So far as I know therefore these regular village schools for the women of the common people have never succeeded. The next resort then on the part of the Missionary teachers has been frequent visits to the villages for religious conversation. Sometimes one or two and at other times eight or ten women can be called together under a tree or in an open verandah for a simple short talk on ordinary religious topics. These people are free to ask questions and appear interested in what is said to them about their sinful hearts and the Saviour's love. The next time the teacher goes there may be entirely a new company of listeners. This sort of work for woman is very common throughout India and has resulted in much good. By God's blessing numbers of these village women have learned of the way of life and salvation and some have embraced Christianity. In several missions native Christian women are regularly employed as Bible-readers, and they devote much time to such house-visitation. By their untiring efforts many of these pagan women have been taught to read the Holy Word. This agency of native Christian women we believe to be one of great importance and also of great promise. And this makes the work of educating the women for teachers one of peculiar responsibility on the part of all foreign missionaries. As our labor comes to be better understood and more thoroughly systematized I cannot doubt that much more will be done for these women of the common people. Thus far what has been done can be looked upon as hardly more than a series of experiments, out of which some settled method of procedure must surely come that will be practicable and successful.

Zenana work in India is of comparatively recent date. The Zenana has been barred and bolted against foreigners. Missionary ladies have despaired of ever carrying the light and life of the blessed Gospel into these sealed homes of superstition.

Such was the distrust of the husbands and such the absolute tyranny of the old mothers-in-law, that for many years this most interesting class of women has been excluded from all opportunities for acquiring knowledge. But the Word of Jehovah can drop the bars and draw the bolts of the mightiest barrier that opposes itself to His truth. It has been so here. To-day into hundreds of these dark households the grateful messengers of Christ are daily bearing the glad tidings of salvation. It is not easy to boldly begin this work as one of religious instruction ; at first the consent of the husband is obtained for just a short call. Soon upon getting a little acquainted attractive specimens of needle-work and some handsome worsted patterns are introduced. These never fail to amuse and interest the Zenana women, and these alone have by the Lord's blessing opened many a door to the Bible. A gay cap or slipper pattern has been shown the shy wife and she has shown it to her lord, who was so entirely led captive by it that he yielded ready consent to the regular visits of the Missionary lady. But regular visits this lady can make on the sole condition that she takes the Sacred Scriptures with her and teaches her pupils out of them the way of life and peace. Very rarely indeed have the Hindu babus been able to resist the fascination of the fancy work spoken of above and shut their doors in the face of Christian teachers. This fancy work has been the key to throw open as if by magic many a secluded Zenana to the healing beams of the great Sun of Righteousness. Let us thank God that so simple an instrumentality has proved so signally successful in the great work of India's evangelization.

It is in place here to present some statement in regard to the statistics and the success of this department of the work for woman in India. There has recently been placed in my hands a series of facts concerning Zenana work in Bengal and the north-west provinces, to which it is my good fortune to refer. At Delhi, Agra, Lucknow, Allahabad and Benares this work has been opened under auspicious circumstances. Needle work in great variety is taught, and at this the women are very expert, learning rapidly and with great relish. They say it is such a relief from the old way of spending their time, combing their

hair, coloring their nails, smoking, chewing pau and cutting betel-nut. But in the North West hardly more than a beginning has been made. In Bengal more has been done, and the prospect is more cheering. Midnapore is the only station of our own Mission where this work has been begun. Upwards of thirty homes have been entered, and the Bible carried into them all. In Calcutta and its immediate neighborhood the *English Baptists* visit 24 Zenanas, the *Church Mission* 30, in which about 100 women are taught, the *Free church of Scotland* 30, the *London Mission* 17, and the *American Ladies' Mission* 150, in which they teach about 450 women. This shows that in Calcutta 300 Zenanas are visited and about 1000 women are under instruction. In this sum total I have reckoned the figures of a zealous Christian lady who herself visits 50 Zenanas and has 150 pupils. Nearly all these women pay something for the instruction they receive, which money helps support the native assistants necessarily employed. All the women pay for their working materials.

Now let us hear of the success which has thus far attended this most interesting department of missionary labor. I need not attempt to prove that the very fact of having gained admission to these strangely secluded homes must be counted a marked success at the outset. I will let several of the happy workers speak for themselves. To have the picture a fair and truthful one both sides should be presented, that is, the dark as well as the bright. One European lady in Calcutta says about the Zenana woman,—“I have not seen any wish for either social or religious improvement. They seem quite content with the present state of things.” Another writes,—“In very many instances there is no desire for social or moral improvement. They do not seem to know anything of their privations.” A lady of Delhi says,—“So far as we know them, the higher classes are very indifferent to knowledge of any kind and the lower are chiefly desirous of making a pecuniary benefit of it.” These statements show what is true to a certain extent, but happily they do not show the whole truth. A lady at Dacca writes,—“In former years no one would allow a Missionary's wife to enter their female apartments, now there is free access everywhere.”

At Berhampore,—“The ladies learn fancy work, read in Bengali, and show more or less interest in subjects of a religious character.” At Midnapore,—“Some of the Zenana women, there is reason to believe, have a strong desire for improvement.” Calcutta and vicinity afford yet more cheering news. One writes,—“The native ladies are in general eager for instruction in needle-work, less so for book-learning. They are willing to pay large fees for competent teachers.” Another says,—“In all the houses where we visit, the ladies are most deeply anxious for social improvement, and in most for religious improvement also. Quite a large number of our Zenana ladies have been brought by their husbands to spend the evening with us.” Another says,—“I must tell you a little about a house to which I was truly grieved to be denied entrance, where I had one pupil only, but she was so intelligent, and seemed so glad of religious instruction, that it seemed like sowing seed in good ground.” Another says,—“From conversations that have been reported to me I should incline to the belief that some of them are feeling after the truth.” Another writes,—“I cannot mention any cases of baptism in the Zenanas, but I feel sure that there are two or three who have sought and found our precious Saviour.” Another says,—“In No. 1 English spelling book our Lord is represented in a picture bearing his Cross. One of the ladies asked me, Who was this? I explained. ‘Yes,’ she said, ‘I know all about him,’ and at my request she went on to speak of his birth, sufferings, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension. I asked her where she acquired this history. She replied, ‘From a Bengali Bible lent me by a lad who was studying in the Bhowanipore Institution, but he has taken it away from me.’”

Much more might be said, but this will suffice to show that a better day is dawning upon the benighted Zenana. The word of God is to-day taught in hundreds of Hindu and Mussalman homes, and will surely, though silently, overturn the works of darkness.

An important auxiliary in the work for the women of India is the schools for native girls, which are now steadily on the increase throughout the country. In this connection a very brief notice of these will suffice. I will at first mention statis-

tics. Mr. Monteith in his "Note on the state of Education in India" says, that—"In Bengal there are three Government schools, for the Education of native girls, with 153 pupils; and 217 private schools with 5559 pupils." And "in the North West Provinces there are 497 Government schools for girls with 9269 pupils, and 77 private schools with 1494 pupils." Besides this Missionary societies are doing an important work. Where Zenanas are visited girl's schools are almost invariably found, and in many places the latter exists without the former. At Delhi, Agra, Futtehgurh, Lucknow, Allahabad, Benares, Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and many smaller stations, are large, vigorous schools for native Christian, Hindu and Mussulman girls. The vast majority of these are day-schools. In these tuition fees are fast becoming the rule. The Mission boarding schools are of course supported mainly by foreign funds. I have no reliable statistics of these. But it is safe to calculate that there are at present no less than 2500 native Christian girls in these alone.

This shows that several thousand native girls are now under instruction in India. In all save the Government schools and the private Hindu schools, the Bible is a text-book and is faithfully taught by Christian men and women. The intelligent reader will at once perceive the power for good which these schools must exert in this pagan land. In them are being trained the teachers who shall carry on the noble work for woman in India. Already have many in the Mission schools become disciples of Christ, and some of these to-day hold positions of public responsibility in connection with the Missionary enterprise in their native land.

In the foregoing pages I have tried to give a view of what is being done for woman in India, and now it may be well to point out in conclusion a few cheering signs which greatly encourage the toiler in this interesting field.

The first cheering thing that should be noted, and for which every Christian will devoutly thank God, is the fact that the natives of India are beginning to perceive what is woman's proper place in society and to feel that she should be helped to reach it. Among the more enlightened Bengalis very few will be

found to uphold the ancestral system of keeping woman out of sight and in total ignorance. Those of this class who do speak in favor of the old way do it more to please the fathers than because they think so themselves. It is more the special pleading of an advocate than the passionate devotion of a believer.

Not long ago a babu called on me, whose views interested me much. He was upwards of fifty years of age and in the Bengal civil service. So completely has this Hindu changed his position on the woman question that he now openly advocates all that we could wish. He fairly grew eloquent over the topic as he pictured the good results of the Zenana and girls' schools. As he was a Brahmin I was the more surprised and pleased at this. "Why," said the old man "our wives will soon be returning the calls of your good ladies who are now regularly visiting them at our homes. I am doing all I can to bring this about. In my native village I have opened a girls' school and I do wish you would send me a native Christian teacher, I will cheerfully pay her good wages."

Here in Midnapore a small girls' school has been opened in the bazar and many of the babus patronize it. It is enough to make one thank God aloud to see the dear little heathen girls so happily walking home from school at evening, their books neatly tied up in a cloth, swinging their slates as they go merrily along. Many such schools are springing up all over India today. They will exert an untold influence over the generation to come by breaking up the strongholds of superstition and preparing the way for the Gospel.

Another very hopeful sign is the encouragement which the British Government affords this enterprise. Many of the Zenana schools and Mission Boarding schools for girls receive grants-in-aid from the state. And many schools, which I have cited above, are supported entirely by Government. Could our rulers be persuaded to place the Bible in all their schools, the prospect would be still more cheering. Normal schools for girls are now being organized in Calcutta and at other prominent centres. The administration of Sir John Lawrence will be gratefully remembered by all for its intelligent and liberal policy in regard to the education of the masses in India.

Still another token for good must be mentioned, and this will here suffice. It is the right hearty and faithful service which some of the native Christians are rendering this enterprise. I could cite many illustrations but select a single one. Last month (May, 1868), the *Weekly News*, a Bengali newspaper, issued its first sheet in Calcutta. The Editor is Babu Parbati Charan Bandopadhai, a native Christian and a man of scholarly ability and attainments. His paper has as yet but a small circulation, but this man is already dealing heavy and telling blows on Hindu sins and superstitions. Here is an extract or two from a recent leader on "*Woman's Education.*" "Life without learning is a desert. Every body admits that knowledge is priceless wealth. How supremely selfish are the people of Hindostan! They are diligent to acquire knowledge themselves in order that they may carry out life's chief end, but they allow the cruel custom to prevail that robs woman of all knowledge. Alas! is not the heart of the merciful moved with pity upon seeing her miserable state?" Then after comparing Hindu women with their European and American sisters, he says,—“O when will Hindus look in mercy upon their own wives? When will their folly cease? When will they strive for the welfare of the state by educating their daughters?"

These are some of the signs of the times that cheer us in India. This work of blessing woman and making her a blessing to society is the work of God, and just so far as His Holy Word prevails in this pagan land will the movement we have described prove successful. The greatest of Hindu lawgivers declared centuries ago that "*Women must be honored by their fathers, their husbands and their brethren, if they seek abundant prosperity. Where woman is honored there the deities are pleased, but where dishonored, there all religious acts become fruitless.*" Manu's words shall yet be heeded in his fatherland, and this picture realized in all its power and beauty, from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin.

### ART. III.—THE FIRST CHAPTER OF EPHESIANS, OR PERSONAL PREDESTINATION.

There has been considerable controversy about the destination of this epistle—whether it was sent to Ephesus, Laodicea, or to some other church. It is not necessary to enter into the discussion of this question as it does not materially affect our present purpose. There is no question of its genuineness. It is not at all improbable that a copy was sent both to Ephesus and Laodicea. Our attention will be confined particularly to the first chapter. For the sake of convenience this chapter may be divided into three parts, and each part be considered by itself. The first contains the apostle's salutation including the first two verses; the second refers to God's dealing with the first believers and the ground of their confidence, and extends from the third to the twelfth, inclusive; and the third is concerning those Christians whom Paul addressed, and comprehends the remainder of the chapter. Or what, perhaps, is better, it may be treated in three sentences: 1. the salutation, 2. the doctrine, and 3. the prayer.

We will commence with the first sentence. "Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus; Grace be to you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ." Here the author styles himself "an apostle of Christ," thereby giving the authority of his office to what he is about to utter; and he adds the authority of God, by saying that he is an apostle by the *will* or *command* of God. This is a common mode of salutation with Paul in his epistles.

Notice those addressed are styled saints (*holy*), a term synonymous with Christians and employed to designate the people of God before the latter term was introduced, and the faithful (or *believers*). Some suppose he means to address the church at Ephesus and other believers; but where is the proof? He does not say so. To say with Barnes that it is *evident*, does not prove it, neither does it follow because in his first epistle to the Cor. he includes all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus



Christ our Lord ; and in the second "all the saints which are in all Achaia," any more than the opposite follows because he says nothing about it in his other epistles. We are not inquiring what he has said elsewhere, but what he has said here. There is a similar form of expression in the introduction of his epistle to the Colossians, where both terms are applied to them, even tacitly by Mr. Barnes. In this case we consider that the latter term is used by way of emphasis as exegetical of the preceding, and may be construed to the Christians at Ephesus, even to the believers (i. e., *true believers*) in Christ Jesus. The rest of the sentence is simply a good wish.

The second sentence, from the third to the fourteenth inclusive, is more difficult of explanation. Its length, its complexity, and its doctrine, all contribute to this result. Peter says that in Paul's epistles "are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest (or *pervert*), as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction." This may be one of the sentences to which Peter refers. Be this as it may, I suppose it was designed to be understood that it has a practical meaning. Let us not pervert it.

Paul here praises God for the abundant spiritual blessings he had bestowed upon them who first believed in Christ. These blessings were not the result of chance, of caprice, or of fortuitous circumstances. But they came through the blood of Christ and the grace of God according to an original plan wherein he had elected them on the ground of holiness ; and had predestinated them to sonship through faith in Christ as was his pleasure. This permanent plan of salvation which God had devised, this "mystery of his will" which he had contrived or "purposed in himself," which contemplated eventually the union of all things in Christ, it had been his pleasure to reveal to them and they had obtained their portion, being predestinated, as he had before said, according to this original plan or purpose made known to them. He assures those whom he addressed that they come under the same plan or gospel of salvation which was revealed to them also ; for they had heard it, believed it, and were sealed with the spirit promised to themselves in this scheme as the pledge of their portion at the final consummation of all things.

The great difficulty in this passage arises from the various interpretations of the expressions "hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world," and "having predestinated us." The language is here, and it has a signification; and whatever that signification is, we should not be afraid to recognize and cordially endorse it. But too many form their opinions beforehand, and then take the word and try to make it conform to their preconceived notions, instead of going to the word first, impartially and critically examining it, and implicitly assenting to its truths. Some come to this passage, revering the opinions of the fathers, confiding in their authority, adhering to the doctrines of Calvinism, and they are ready to say, "Here we have it surely—unconditional election and predestination absolute." Others consider themselves committed against Calvinism, and they go as far beyond the truth in the opposite direction. They think they cannot be too strong against a doctrine they so much detest. They may entirely reject it and limit the foreknowledge of God to suit their convenience. When such men come to this passage they adopt an arbitrary mode of interpretation. They attempt to make out that the election and predestination here is national, and has reference to the privileges conferred on the Gentiles through Christ; and this is the only election "before the foundation of the world," or from eternity. To sustain this position they say with Macknight, Bloomfield, Clark and Whitby, that "us" in the third and fourth verses means *Gentiles*; but they do not carry out the same meaning of "us" and its corresponding term "we" through the sentence as the law of language requires. As they make "ye" in the thirteenth verse signify *Gentiles*, it would be too bare an absurdity to make "we" used just before it in the same sentence, and in opposition to it, arbitrarily mean the same thing, so they make "we" mean *Jews*. But why do "we" and "us" in one part of the sentence mean *Gentiles* and in another *Jews*? There is no reason given in the text or by the interpreter. Macknight says "us" in the third and fourth verses means *Gentiles*, in the fifth, *Jews and Gentiles*, "we" in the seventh, *Gentiles*, in the eleventh and twelfth, *Jews*, and "ye" in the thirteenth, *Gentiles*. Now by what *usus loquendi* does he do this?—He doubtless has a motive! There is not the least

intimation that the author has reference directly either to Jews or Gentiles. Nothing is said about nations at all! Indeed there is an absurdity in the idea.

Writers sometimes use the plural pronouns for singular *par excellence*, "or *pluralis excellentiae*," but generally they use them either to designate themselves with the parties addressed, or to designate themselves with parties in distinction from those addressed. Paul either meant by these pronouns to include himself with the Ephesian brethren, or else himself with others in distinction from them. We think he used them in the latter sense; 1. because before he closes the sentence he addresses them directly by "ye" in opposition to "we;" and 2. because he uses a clause in the sentence (v. 12) which informs us whom he does mean, "we—who first trusted in Christ." With this we ought to be satisfied.

But again; he could not say "us" Gentiles, because he was a Jew; and we are not sure that "ye" could mean Gentiles, because we do not know how many Jewish Christians there were among those whom he addressed. He evidently did not expect it to be so understood; for afterwards when he wishes to speak definitely of the Gentiles and the rich provisions of the gospel for them, he says (Chapter 3: 1,) "you Gentiles," as if the pronoun alone was not sufficient. Does not the law of language require that the same pronoun stand for the same person or thing throughout the same sentence, unless the construction or author signify in some way to the contrary? No such notice is here given. It seems to me entirely unnecessary for Arminians to resort to any such subterfuge. As Barnes says, they do not get rid of the difficulty. On the other hand, it does not prove that this passage sustains unconditional election and absolute predestination, to show that it has reference to persons. By no means. The conflict with the common sense and consciousness of men is not thereby decided. Men know that they are free. It is a settled point of personal conviction, not to be satisfied with simply saying that the discrepancy between free moral agency and absolute predestination is only *apparent*; and that while we cannot reconcile them, they are doubtless reconcilable in the mind of God. Neither does the attempt to show that the election and predestination here mentioned are personal, and not nation-

al, as Barnes endeavors to do, prove that they are unconditional and absolute. I believe in these doctrines as here expressed, because they are here revealed; and I believe that they harmonize with every other doctrine. No man has a right to draw, or can legitimately draw a tenet from the Bible which conflicts with any other firmly established tenet. If our explanation of a doctrine will not bear to be put by the side of human freedom, which is everywhere recognized in the Scriptures and is also an evident matter of consciousness, we may reasonably distrust it, and seek for a better.

The passage before us affirms the salvation of those "who first hoped in Christ," and of those whom Paul addressed upon the same ground. He commences the sentence by praising God for all spiritual blessings in heavenly places or things in Christ, "according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world," &c.; having predestinated us unto the adoption of children, &c.; hath chosen, i. e., selected or elected us—apostles—true Christians who first trusted in Christ, i. e.; through voluntary faith in him; to the end that we should be holy and unblamable before him; in love having predestinated—predetermined, foreordained, or predestined us, really Christians, to adoption or sonship by Jesus Christ to himself according to the good pleasure of his will. It is so arranged by God from eternity, that Christians by living faith in Christ stand in the relation of sons to God. All this is to the praise of his glorious favor wherewith he hath favored us in Christ the beloved; in whom we have redemption through his death, even the pardon of sins according to his rich favor which he hath made to superabound towards us with all wisdom and prudence.

In the next verse the apostle continues in substance,—God hath revealed, as he pleased, the whole scheme of salvation, hitherto a secret, which he in himself purposed; to the end that in due time he might bring all things belonging to heaven and earth, together in Christ; in whom we have received our portion or lot, being predestinated to sonship, as aforesaid, through faith, according to the benevolent purpose of him who doeth all he pleases, in his own way. That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first hoped in Christ, or who before *you* hoped in

Christ; in whom you also, true Ephesian Christians, having heard the word of truth—the gospel of your salvation; in whom also having believed ye were *sealed* with the promised Spirit, who of our portion is the pledge for the redemption of the final acquisition to the praise of his glory.

The object here seems to be to show the foundation on which the church rested. The first believers were saved through grace abundantly or freely supplied, by faith in the blood of Christ, according to the original design of God, who acted out his own pleasure in making provisions for their salvation, blessing them, and saving them. The Ephesians stood on the same foundation, dependent upon the same grace, and saved in accordance with the same design. They also heard the gospel of salvation, believed, and were sealed with the Holy Spirit. To seal is to make sure—to put a mark or seal upon anything to show its genuineness—that it is approved, confirmed, chosen. Thus Paul aimed to encourage those whom he addressed as approved of God, as predestinated.

The greatest controversies on Election and Predestination have arisen from this passage. They are announced with the conditions of holiness and blamelessness before God—of sonship by a life of faith. Paul wrote to “saints,” or true believers, in Christ Jesus, who were sealed for their final redemption. We remark,

1. *God must save.*—This point will generally be admitted. We cannot save ourselves. We cannot cancel or pardon a single sin, and God has repeatedly declared, “I am Jehovah thy Saviour”—“And beside me there is no Saviour.”

2. *If God saves, he determines or intends to save.*—If he does not, he must act without design and of course without wisdom. He must be governed not by a benevolent purpose, but by accident or chance. He could neither manifest goodness nor mercy. The moral quality depends on the intention. If I kill a man without any intention of injuring him, it would not be murder according to human or divine law. It makes an essential difference whether it be the result of “malice aforethought,” or of mere accident. If I do that which proves a great benefit to another, with the intention of injuring him, or without the design of doing him good, it cannot be considered a good deed on my

part. I must intend to do a good deed. So the moral character of God's acts must depend on his intention or purpose. As God is infinitely wise and good, if he saves he not only intends to save, but from the nature of the case he must determine how, or on what conditions, he will save and whom he will save. This he has done. In this determination are embraced certain principles of action revealed, by which he will always govern himself. He has offered the plan of salvation through Christ to the world on conditions of faith and obedience; and every person who will comply with the conditions, he has determined to save.

3. *If God determines to save he pre-determines to do it.*—God cannot determine his own acts afterwards. It would be inconsistent with his character, to suppose that he was so devoid of plan, as not to intend them until he acts. Man with all the contingencies to which he is exposed, exercises forethought in regard to the most ordinary affairs of life, and can it be supposed that God whose prescience is unlimited, will not exercise it, and lay his plans accordingly? If it cannot be supposed, then if God saves, he pre-determines to save, or predestinates to salvation.

4. *The predestination of the text is from eternity.*—Paul says he hath chosen us in him (Christ) before the foundation of the world,—“Having predestinated us,” &c. The reason why man cannot determine his acts long beforehand is because he has not the wisdom, knowledge, and power, necessary to qualify him for it. There are so many unforeseen agencies and circumstances to come in, that if he makes his calculations he will have occasion to change them before he can carry them into execution, or he will be entirely foiled. If he knew everything beforehand, he might determine accordingly, founding his determinations on his foreknowledge. God is infinite in all his attributes, knows the end from the beginning, and is well qualified in every respect to predetermine his own acts. He is just as well qualified from eternity as now to determine his acts of to-day, so that it requires no stretch of credulity to believe that what God does he always intended to do.

Anterior to creation, God must decide, as all will admit, what to make and by what laws to govern it, so that the laws of phys-

ical necessity in accordance with which, the universe is controlled, are the results of God's unconditional purpose. He determines them absolutely. The shining of the sun by day and the moon by night, the routine of the seasons, the ebb and flow of the tides, and all natural phenomena are just what God designed they should be. But how is it with man? Is he just what God designed that he should be?—As far as he is subject to physical laws independent of choice, he is subject to the same predestination and no farther. God determined to make man a free moral agent and not to infringe upon that freedom. As to his salvation, which, on his part, depends on his submission to God and compliance with the conditions of the gospel, and which God in predestination must regard, either fixing it the same as a matter of physical necessity, or else taking cognizance of human acts concerning it, as indispensable to his own. To suppose the former is to make man a mere machine, and moral freedom just like the freedom of the wind and tide, and to do violence to the common convictions of men. To suppose the latter, the question returns how can God consistently predetermine to save them that believe? That he does do it, we cannot deny, but *how*? That is the question.

The Bible everywhere makes repentance, faith, obedience, acts of the creature, a *sine qua non*, or indispensable ground of salvation. The Divine purpose or predestination varies with these acts as much as the retribution; and we expect that the judge will decide the final condition of all men "according to their works." So he predestinates them "according to their works." God, who "knows the end from the beginning," can by virtue of this knowledge determine their condition "before the foundation of the world." He is not limited by time. His days are not numbered. Time belongs to us. It is one eternal present with God; so that it no more infringes upon moral agency to say that he determines to save us from eternity, than it does to say that he will save us at the Judgment, because all the conditions as really exist in the mind of God in one case as in the other. Strictly speaking there is no such thing with God as *pre-destination* and *fore-knowledge*. These terms are employed by way of accommodation to ourselves as relating to time,

foreknowledge having the logical priority. "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate;" i. e., whom he did foreknow "conformed to the image of his son," him he did predestinate to salvation. Many endeavor to confound these terms or to misplace them; but to me, they are distinct, and in order of sequence foreknowledge has the precedence. In this way moral freedom is left intact.

With ourselves there is a difference between knowing and determining a thing. So there must be with God. If we can make a distinction between the two ideas, the point is gained. Let us try and discriminate. Suppose that a being independent of God could create a world, endow it with laws, and people it with intelligent beings; yet God who knows all things, would know all about it, and all about its inhabitants, although, according to the supposition, he had nothing to do with determining it. This would not be the case if the two things were not distinct; for wherever we suppose one to be, there we must suppose the other to be. If we cannot understand the mode of divine knowledge, or purpose, we may perceive the distinction between them; and how God may know the act of a free agent as *free* beforehand as well as afterwards; and how predestination, if based on prescience, cannot affect the acts; but if not based on prescience, how it becomes absolute and fixes the same necessity in human conduct as in the revolution of spheres, or in the pattering of rain.

Applying this philosophy to the predestination of the text, we have the doctrine that God, foreknowing that those of whom Paul spoke would believe in Christ and comply with the conditions of salvation, predestinated them by Jesus Christ to sonship according to his own pleasure or purpose. The predestination is not absolute but restricted to sonship, or a life of faith in Christ. In this way God predestinates to eternal salvation, by virtue of his foreknowledge, any and every person who will comply with the conditions of salvation which he has revealed.

This is Arminian theology in distinction from the Calvinistic, and we believe it is just such theology as Paul advocated in the text and elsewhere. As some will have it that Paul was a Calvinist, I may be accused of the same; but claiming to be an



Arminian I need no apology for farther discussing this point.

Arminianism is too often employed as a term of reproach—sort of embodiment of all heresy—by members of communions, a majority of which are true Arminians at heart, and would perhaps give their assent to the above exposition. Hence the necessity of making our position clear.

Arminius was educated under Calvin at the theological school of Geneva. He became a minister of the gospel at Amsterdam, and afterwards a professor of theology at Leyden—"a man whom even his enemies," says Mosheim, "commend for ingenuity and piety." Differing from Calvin, he entered upon a controversy with the benevolent object of uniting the Genevans and Lutherans, and eventually securing uniformity of faith in Christendom. Many of the most learned men of the age adhered to him. Among them were Barnevelt, Grotius, and Hoogerbeets; and afterwards the eloquent Episcopius who occupied the chair of theology at Leyden. They experienced the most bitter persecution, which resulted in the execution of Barnevelt, in the sentence of Grotius and Hoogerbeets to perpetual imprisonment, and in the celebrated council of Dort, in which the Arminians, though excluded therefrom, received sentence of condemnation and excommunication. They were then persecuted with the most inveterate malice. Being deprived of all their ecclesiastical and civil offices, all their ministers were accordingly silenced in their churches, or forced into exile.

What was all this persecution for? It was simply because the Arminians, as Mosheim says, "abandoned the common doctrine of the majority in the Reformed church respecting predestination and the divine decrees, and went over to the side of those who believe that the love of God and the merits of our Saviour respect the whole human race." They differed at first from the Reformed "in nothing except the five propositions concerning grace and predestination; and it was on this ground that they were condemned at the Synod of Dort." These propositions may be found in ecclesiastical histories and theological dictionaries. The first which lies at the foundation of the whole is on predestination. It is as follows, according to Mosheim, "Before the foundation of the world or from eternity, God decreed

to bestow eternal salvation on those who, he foresaw, would maintain their faith in Christ inviolate until death." This is the doctrine we have been advocating,—that God from eternity could determine to save an individual by virtue of his foreknowledge which was shown to be distinct from predestination, and the logical antecedent of it, and which enabled him to foresee that he would believe in Christ and endure to the end. If this be Calvinism it is on Arminian ground.

On the other hand, the Calvinists maintained at the council of Dort, that God hath chosen a certain number of the fallen race of Adam in Christ before the foundation of the world, unto eternal glory according to his immutable purpose, and of his free grace and love, without the least foresight of faith, good works, or any condition performed by the creature." The distinction is obvious. The former predestination is based on foreknowledge, and is consequently conditional, while the latter is absolute, and is itself the logical antecedent of foreknowledge. In the one case, God predestinates because he foreknows, in the other, he foreknows because he predestinates. In the first, he determines what he will do on the conditions of repentance and of 'persevering faith ; in the second, he determines what he will do unconditionally. He predetermines not only his own acts but also the acts of the creature. As in nature, God foreknows a 'physical event because he has predetermined it according to a law of physical necessity ; so here in the moral world he has predetermined " whatsoever comes to pass," by a necessity which, though called *moral*, is no less certain and no less indispensable. There is no such thing as foreknowledge, logically speaking, antecedent to the decree ; it is posterior and has no influence upon it whatever. It is absolute, predetermining the final results and all the means, including the acts of the creature, necessary to secure those results. We do not make these statements without authority. Calvinistic creeds, the instructions of their Theological Seminaries, and their distinguished authors sustain us.

Edwards maintains that " God has decreed every action of men, yea, every action that is sinful, and every circumstance of those actions. Again he says, " All the sins of men are foreordained and ordered by a wise providence." He argues that God

could not foreknow a contingent action, or a free voluntary action, as Arminians, against whom he writes, use the term, in distinction from a necessary action, because foreknowledge would render the action of man certain. But Arminians contend that certainty is not a quality of the human action, but of the mind that foresees the action, so that it belongs to the mind of God and not to the action of the creature; and that God's foreknowledge of the action is antecedent to the certainty, somewhat as our knowledge of a fact is antecedent and indispensable to our certainty of it. The action is logically antecedent to the foreknowledge and the foreknowledge to the decree. In other words the action may be said to determine the foreknowledge, and the foreknowledge the decree. God's decree is in accordance with his foreknowledge and his foreknowledge is in accordance with the act to be foreknown; i. e., God knows what we do as a free act because we do it. If we did not do it, he could not know it, because it would not be to be known. The fact is indispensable to the knowledge everywhere.

But Edwards declares, "There certainly will come to pass no more good than God has *absolutely decreed to cause*, and there certainly and infallibly will no more believe, and no more be godly, and no more be saved, than God has decreed that he will cause to believe, and cause to be godly, and will save." "Election is not from a foresight of works or conditional;" and why? Because "God could not foreknow that things would be, unless he had *decreed they should be.*" This he says of human action. The decree is antecedent to the foreknowledge. According to this philosophy human action is governed by the will and the will is governed by the strongest motive, and the motive is governed by God, so that by a fixed concatenation, God governs man just as *absolutely* as he governs the brute by instinct, or the river by gravity. Volition with him is an effect which must have an adequate cause—a cause which will produce that effect and no other. This cause is not the will, nor anything which the will can control; for then in some sense, it could determine itself, which he denies; but it is what he calls motive, meaning by it "the whole of that which moves—whether it be one thing singly or many things conjunctly." The motive which governs is the *strongest*

because it governs, i. e., because it is the strongest. You must wait until the will acts before you can possibly decide which motive is the strongest, and then, it may be that what you consider the weakest will appear the strongest. In a given case where there are several motives, one is called the strongest not because it is so *per se*, or in view of the conscience or reason, or because it would be considered so by the majority of men, but because at that time the will acts in that direction. If at another time, it acts in the direction of another motive, then that would be the strongest. We claim the power to follow either motive in either case, the will being the free cause of its own acts. Our appeal is both to consciousness and conscience. When a wrong and right course are before us with their motives and we choose the wrong, we are conscious that we could and ought, at the same time, to have chosen the right; and hence our conscience will condemn us for choosing the wrong. Calvinistic predestinarians deny this power. Volition is an effect as we have already said, and the motive is a cause which will produce that effect and no other; and to suppose a change in the volition, we must suppose a change in the motive; and therefore under the circumstances the volition and the consequent act could not have been otherwise. Thus human conduct is determined by a necessity as fixed and unalterable as the laws of nature. This is the corner-stone of absolute predestination, and we have said enough already to show that we have no faith either in the foundation or the superstructure.

5. *Why does God predetermine to save?*—It is “To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved.” We are told in the text that “love”—“the good pleasure of his will”—“his grace”—“riches of his grace”—“his good pleasure”—were brought to bear on this matter. It is not on account of the merit of acceptance, that God predetermines to save, though acceptance is indispensable on our part, but it is an exhibition of his pleasure and love—an act of pure grace or favor on his part—a mere gift offered freely to all. If a present were offered in good faith to each and every one of the inhabitants of a town, on the simple conditions of acceptance, with which a part comply and the rest do not, it does not fol-

low that the reason why the offer was made, was because a part would comply with the conditions, or because there was any merit in acceptance. This may be a reason on their part why they have the benefit of it while their neighbors do not, but it is not the reason on the part of the donor why it was offered. So the ostensible reason why one is a Christian and another is not, is because one accepts proffered mercy and another does not; but this is by no means the reason why mercy is proffered and the Spirit vouchsafed us. This is mere grace or Divine favor. The question arises, Why do not all accept? It seems as if they would—as if the strongest possible motive with all men was in that direction, and yet they do not, and why? Simply because they will not. This is Christ's answer: "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." The sinner will have forever no one to blame but himself; "for the grace of God that bringeth salvation (or saving grace) hath appeared to all men."

The third and concluding sentence of this chapter, including nine verses, is simply a prayer for the Ephesian brethren, from which we infer that prayer should be intimately blended with doctrine.

Paul praised God for their Christian virtues of which he had heard since he visited them about half a dozen years before, and he prayed that God would give them wisdom or make them wise to comprehend these things, and reveal to them more of Christ for their further acknowledgement of him; would give them enlightened understandings that they might appreciate the hope to which they are called and the glorious riches provided for them, and especially the exceeding great power to save which he had exercised towards them. The same power was also manifested in raising Christ from the dead, setting him at his right hand, and above every thing else putting all things under his feet and making him the head of the church. Such power it was safe for them to trust.

In conclusion we simply say, accept the terms of salvation, be a Christian, a persevering Christian, and you will be one of those who are predestinated to salvation from the foundation of the world.

## ART. IV.—THE BOOK OF JOB AND ITS LESSONS.

Probably no portion of the sacred volume has more perplexed sincere Christians than the book of Job. It portrays before us a man of no common goodness, perfect and upright, and yet his sufferings are without a parallel in the records of the human race. Satan is represented as his accuser and the agent or instrumentality by which he is afflicted. With the exception of his life, he has full power over Job's property, family and person, thus being at liberty to afflict him in any way that he could devise. Why God should deal thus with one that served him with so much fidelity, is a question over which many a pious soul has been long and sorely perplexed. Some have concluded that the story must be an allegory, or fable, designed to teach important truths illustrative of the providences of God, while many reject the book altogether. If it be a true history of a man that really existed, then its lessons should be carefully studied, for it is written for our instruction and profit. Was there such a man as Job? when and where did he live? who is the author of the book? and what are the lessons it teaches? are legitimate questions for discussion. We will now consider the first question, Was there such a man as Job?

The principal argument urged against the belief of Job's literal existence, are drawn from the manner in which satan is represented as the accuser of Job,—the severe trials the Almighty permitted to fall upon a perfect and upright man, and the completeness of the numbers by which his wealth is described. With regard to the argument drawn from the incredibility of the conversation said to have occurred between the Almighty and satan, who is represented as "returning to the celestial regions with news," "an able commentator," says Horne, "has remarked, Why should such a conversation be supposed incredible? The attempt at wit in the word news, is somewhat out of place; for the interrogation of the Almighty, Hast thou fixed thy view upon my servant Job, a perfect and upright man? instead of aiming at the acquisition of news, is intended as a severe and most appropriate sarcasm upon the fallen spirit.

Hast thou,—who, with superior faculties, and a more comprehensive knowledge of my will, hast not continued perfect and upright,—fixed thy view upon a subordinate being far weaker and less informed than thyself, who has continued so?" It was a fitting rebuke for his audacity. His appearance at the court of heaven, shows that he is accountable to the same tribunal as the human race,—a doctrine elsewhere taught in the Scriptures of truth. The part assigned him is the same as he performed in the garden of Eden, only there he used flattery, and here he used affliction. It is in perfect keeping with his character as presented in Scripture: "Your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." 1 Pet. 5:8. The other arguments adduced to prove the non-existence of Job, are of little weight. The summing up of his wealth in round numbers is a very natural way of expressing it, and the writer of such a poem as the narrative under consideration, could hardly be expected to be exactly literal in a matter of so little importance. There is no evidence, however, that the numbers are not literally correct. We need no fable or allegory to tell us that the Almighty, for wise purposes, permits heavy calamities to fall upon upright men, who "fear God and eschew evil." It is a matter of every day's occurrence, and of every man's observation. Such providences are dark, but they are nevertheless facts, and we can only say, "Clouds and darkness are round about him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne."

It has been the uniform belief of the Jewish and Christian church that Job was no myth, that the book bearing his name contains an authentic narrative of a real person. Independently of these considerations, which we think are sufficient to remove the objections against the belief of Job's actual existence, there are unanswerable arguments in proof of it. No one entertains the slightest doubt that Noah and Daniel really existed, the former at the time of the deluge, and the other at the period of the captivity of the Jews in Babylon. Nor can we believe that the Spirit of God would associate a fictitious person with Noah and Daniel as preeminent in piety and prayer, or present an imaginary being as an example of patience. Ezekiel says,

“though these three men, Noah, Daniel and Job, were in it (the city), they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness.” Here the prophet ranks Job with Noah and Daniel as powerful intercessors with God, Noah for his family, Daniel for the wise men of Babylon, and Job for his friends. Now since Noah and Daniel were veritable men, we conclude that Job was no fiction. “Behold, we count them happy that endure. Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord, that the Lord is very pitiful and of tender mercy.” James 5 : 11. Here Job is presented as an example of patience. Would an inspired apostle present to the tried and afflicted Christian, a fictitious person, who never had an existence only in the imagination, as an example of patience for his imitation and comfort? What comfort could one in trouble derive from the consideration that, centuries ago, some one imagined that a man had borne great afflictions with patience? Is the Lord very pitiful to fictitious persons? Certainly he is, if Job had no real existence. But besides the evidence adduced from his inspired writers, the narrative itself is written in the style of a true history, giving the names of persons, places and facts. The number of Job’s children are recorded, the conduct of his wife, his wealth, the names of his friends, their visit to him in his great sorrows, their misapprehension of the cause of his afflictions together with his recovery and prosperity. All these are related in a manner perfectly consistent with literal occurrences. Besides, the fact of Job’s existence is proved by the concurrent tradition of all the eastern countries. The author of the book of Tobit speaks of him, and he is often mentioned by Mahomet. “The whole of his history,” says Horne, “with many fabulous additions, was known among the Syrians and Chaldeans; many of the noblest families among the Arabians are distinguished by his name and boast of having descended from him. So late even as the fourth century, we are told there were many persons who went into Arabia to see Job’s dung hill, which in the nature of things could not have existed through so many ages; but the fact of superstitious persons making pilgrimages to it, sufficiently attests the reality of his existence, as also do the traditionary accounts of the place of his abode.” Horne’s In-



roduction, Vol. 2, p. 228. From these evidences there need be no doubt, there can be no reasonable doubt, that the book of Job is the narrative of a veritable man and not a fictitious character.

*The age in which he lived.*—Having found evidence sufficient to establish the fact of Job's existence, we next will inquire, in what age, or period, of the world's history did he live? On this point, there is great diversity of opinion among critics and commentators. Some fix it in the days of Moses, because the style of the narrative bears so much resemblance to that of the Jewish lawgiver; others in the time of the Judges, some in the days of Ahasuerus, others make him contemporary with Solomon, while again others contend that it was Solomon himself. These conjectures rest upon such puerile and trifling circumstances that they require no confutation, and only need be named to be rejected as unworthy of confidence. See Horne's *Int.*, Vol. 2, p. 228. All agree, however, that the style of the narrative indicates great antiquity.

The Bible chronology fixes Job's trial 1550 years B. C., which was a short time before the children of Israel left Egypt. That the book was written before that event, is probable from its silence concerning the miracles attending the exodus, and the subsequent journey of the Jewish nation. As the remarkable events, such as the passage of the Red Sea, the giving the law at Mt. Sinai, the manna in the wilderness, &c., all transpired in the vicinity of the country where Job lived, and were so appropriate in the discussion of the providences of God, and were certainly known among the surrounding nations, they would not have been overlooked by Job and his friends. The cities of the plain, Sodom, Gomorrah and others were still nearer to Idumea where the scene is laid, and yet no mention is made of the terrible catastrophe that befell them. This has led to the inference that Job was anterior to the migration of Abraham to the land of Canaan.

Job survived his trial 140 years. It is conjectured by some that he was 70 years old when it occurred, so that his subsequent age was doubled as well as his possessions. This carries him back to the patriarchal era, prior to the days of Moses when the

age of man was reduced to 70 years. That he had attained to 60 or 70 years previous to his calamities, is evident from the fact that his seven sons were grown to manhood and settled in their several homes. Job 1:4. That he was considerably advanced in years, is evident from several expressions in the book itself. In the 13th chapter, 26th verse, he speaks of the "iniquities of his youth," and in chapter 29, of the prosperity of his youth. That he did not live at a time much earlier than is fixed in the chronology of the Bible may be gathered from the narrative itself. Bildad directed Job to inquire of the former age, assigning as a reason the comparative brevity of life at that time. "For we are but of yesterday and know nothing, because our days upon earth are a shadow." In the seventh generation from the deluge, the age of man was reduced to about two hundred years, which was only a shadow compared with the lives of Noah and his sons.

Men of the fifth or sixth generation might have conversed with Noah's sons, possibly with Noah himself, and thus deriving wisdom from the fountain head, have been well qualified to instruct the generation in which we fix the time of Job.

That he lived in the patriarchal era, before a regular priesthood was established, seems evident from the fact that he officiated as priest in his own family, and offered sacrifices for his sons, even after they were settled in their own homes. Job 1:5. There were others who were priests of this primitive order. Melchizedec and Jethro belonged to this class. Prostrations before men of distinction, common in the eastern world, is said to have been unknown in Arabia at that period; and though the highest respect was shown to Job, who was the greatest man in all the East, yet no one is represented as falling prostrate before him. When the young men saw him they hid themselves through respect, the aged arose and arranged themselves about him, the princes and nobles were silent, and gave audience while he spoke. There was great respect but no servile cringing as was common at a later period. After the deluge, for a time the true God was the only object of worship, but idolatry soon crept in until it corrupted all nations. The worship of the sun at his rising, and the moon at her change, appear to have been the earliest

form of idolatry, though other objects such as animals and serpents were soon added. Job thus alludes to the worship of the sun and moon. "If I beheld the sun when he shineth, or the moon walking in brightness," &c. This was the only form of idolatry to which he refers. We infer, then, that he lived after the worship of the sun became common, and before other objects of worship were adopted, which, certainly, places him prior to the days of Moses and probably anterior to Abraham.

Dr. Hales has, by astronomical calculation, fixed the time of Job's trial 184 years before the birth of Abraham, for, by a retrograde calculation, he has found that the principal stars mentioned by Job were the cardinal constellations of spring and autumn, and from their longitude at the present time and the usual rate of the procession of the equinoxes, he ascertains the date of Job's calamities. See this more fully explained in Horne's *Int.*, Vol. 2, p. 229. Upon this calculation Dr. Hales remarks, "Since, then, these calculations critically correspond with the positions of the equinoxes at the assumed date of Job's trial, but disagree with the lower dates of the age of Moses, and still more of Ezra, . . . we may rest in the assumed date of the trial as correct. Such a combination and coincidence of various rays of evidence, derived from widely different sources, *history*, sacred and profane, chronology and astronomy, and all converging to the same common focus, tend strongly to establish the time of Job's trial as rightly assigned in the year B. C. 2337 (2310 of the common computation), or 818 after the deluge, 184 years before the birth of Abraham, 474 years before the settlement of Jacob's family in Egypt, and 689 years before their *ex-ode*, or departure thence." Perhaps these figures are not all correct, yet there seems little reason to doubt that the time in which Job lived dates back to the patriarchal ages, prior to the days of Abraham.

This view receives still further confirmation from the consideration that God has had faithful witnesses to the truth in all ages; as in the works of providence "he left not himself without a witness," so he has always had some faithful ones on earth to confess his name. But we have no record of any between the confusion of tongues at Babel and the call of Abraham, un-

less it be Job. Job, therefore, may have been, in that age of error, the faithful witness to the hope of a glorious Redeemer, who in the latter day should stand upon the earth, whom he should see for himself and not another. The period in which he lived, however, is a matter of little significance to us as it does not affect the authenticity or authority of the sacred narrative. After examining the various theories concerning this point, each one must decide for himself which is the more probable. It perhaps can never be clearly ascertained. It is far more important to us to receive and comprehend the lessons his narrative imparts. His doctrine was the patriarchal theology, embracing the fundamental principles of Christianity, i. e., "The creation of the world by one Supreme Being; the government of that world by the providence of God; the corruption of man by nature; the necessity of sacrifices to propitiate the Deity, and the certainty of a future resurrection."

*Where did he live?* The country in which Job lived is said to be the land of Uz. Some have located it in Stony Arabia and others in Sandy Arabia. From an expression in Lam. 4: 21, we learn that the land of Uz was situated in Idumea, or perhaps was that identical country. Idumea is a part of Arabia Petrea, situated on the southern border of the tribe of Judah. See Num. 34: 3; Josh. 15: 1.

The land of Uz appears to have been situated between Egypt and Philistia; see Jer. 25, where a list of the nations between Egypt and Babylon is given, nations known to be on the southern border of the land of Canaan. "In effect," says Horne, "nothing is clearer than that the history of an inhabitant of Idumea, who bears the name of Job, is the subject of the poem, and all the persons introduced into it were Idumeans or, in other words, Edomite Arabs." Horne's Introduction, p. 230; to which the reader is referred for a further illustration of this subject.

*Who is the author of the book?* The learned are no more agreed on this than on any other point. Some ascribe it to Moses, others to Elihu, Solomon, Isaiah, Ezekiel and Ezra, while not a few think it was written by Job himself. The arguments in relation to the age in which he lived render it certain that it could not have been written at a later date than the time

of Moses. The history of the book was probably this: Job wrote the narrative himself, for no one could tell the story of his sufferings so well as himself. And then there are so many particulars, so much in detail, so much that no one could know as he knew it, that it is probable he was the author, and that Moses obtained it while in the land of Midian: and perhaps used it to comfort and encourage the children of Israel. This will account for the readiness with which the Jews received it as a sacred book. It was always a part of the Jewish scriptures. "The encouragement," says Horne, "which this book holds out, that every good man suffering patiently will finally be rewarded, rendered it a work peculiarly calculated to minister mingled comfort and rebuke to the discontented Israelites, and might, therefore, well have been employed by Moses for this purpose." All commentators and critics agree that this book is the most ancient work extant; but the time, place and author are of far less import to us than the lessons it imparts. It is enough for us that it is a true narrative of the life and unparalleled sufferings of a good man, and that it has been received by the pious of all ages as a book of divine authority. It was written for our instruction and comfort, and we do well to study its contents and learn its lessons.

*What are the lessons it teaches?* "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable," and was written for our instruction that we may understand more of the ways of God toward man. The Pentateuch gives the only reliable account of the origin of the human race, the establishment and government of the Jewish nation, their laws and forms of worship; the historical books narrate the political and religious events in their history; the poetical are replete with sound morality and piety, written in strains of sublime eloquence and grandeur; the prophetic predict the future of the Jews and also that of other nations, and foretell the advent, life, work, teaching, sufferings and death of the great REDEEMER. But what are the lessons of this book?

One of them is the momentous doctrine of the retributive justice of God, proving beyond a doubt that the wicked shall not go unpunished. This doctrine was the basis of the severe cen-

tures and accusations of Job's friends. They believed God was just and would by no means clear the guilty. But they falsely supposed that retribution for wicked deeds was meted out in this world, and that the afflictions sent upon Job were proofs of great wickedness. They could not understand how a just, holy and benevolent Being could ever permit such terrible calamities to fall upon one of his faithful and obedient children. Though their views of the government of God were dark, yet they teach the doctrine of final retribution. They show that the principle of retributive justice is a universal belief; that it is impressed upon the mind of man, even without the revelation God has made in his Word; that it commends itself to the conscience and sober judgment of all created intelligences,—a most conclusive proof of its truth. Hence the belief among the heathen, that, beyond the narrow bounds of life, there is a state of reward and punishment for the deeds done in the body. It also teaches that the afflictions of this life are not meted out to man according to his wickedness; that this life is not the *time* of retribution, and consequently sustains the idea that final retribution is in a future state. It is still a somewhat popular idea that men are punished and rewarded here; that all sin is punished in this life, and that all afflictions and calamities that fall upon any one, are punishments for personal sins. This narrative illustrates a very different doctrine. Here is a man pre-eminent in goodness, one who is spoken of by the Almighty as a perfect man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil. There is no mistaking his character. It is described by God himself. This man is afflicted as no other man ever was. And why? What has he done? Is this the reward of his goodness? If these terrible sufferings were the punishment for his sins, what will be the end of those that revel in wickedness every day? The doctrine suggested by this narrative is clearly taught in other parts of the volume of inspiration. Jesus says, "Suppose ye that the men on whom the tower of Siloam fell were greater sinners than all they that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you, nay." If this life is not the time when men receive a full retribution for all they do, the doctrine of future punishment is true. The case may be stated thus: God is a righteous moral governor of

the universe, and will reward every man according to his works. This impartial administration of justice is not seen in this life. Consequently there must be a future day of retribution in which God will vindicate his character as a righteous moral governor. It teaches, further, that conscious integrity and a firm reliance upon God will sustain the soul in the deepest affliction. Job's calamity was great,—stripped at once of his wealth, bereaved of all his children in one day, smitten with a sore and loathsome disease, falsely accused by his pretended friends,—his cup of sorrow was full. It only wanted one more element to complete his misery and drive him to despair—the pangs of conscious guilt. From this he was free. His conscience did not accuse him. He knew that he was innocent. He felt that a man's integrity would sustain him, for he knew in whom he believed, and could say, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him." We are also taught that the more we see of God, the humbler we shall be. Job stood up boldly to vindicate himself when censured by his friends. He knew their sentence was unjust. He would appeal at once to God. He knew God would not abandon him in time of need.

But when God spake to him out of the whirlwind and made him see his utter unworthiness, "Then Job answered the Lord and said, . . . I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." Whether Job had a vision of God as Moses had, or only more clearly understood the holiness of his character and claims, we need not inquire, (perhaps it was both,) but its effect was to humble him in the dust before his Maker.

From this book we learn that the sufferings of God's people may serve the double purpose of benefitting themselves and blessing others. Though Job was a good man, one that feared God and eschewed evil, yet his severe trial developed the remains of inbred corruption, and led him, in his earnestness,—while defending himself against the false accusations of his friends,—to speak peevishly and unadvisedly with his lips. Of this he deeply repented when God convinced him of wrong, and by this discipline he was still more purified.

"Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous,

but grievous; nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." Heb. 12 : 11.

Job's sufferings were designed to develop his integrity, to perfect his character, and at the same time give consolation and hope to the Christian in coming ages. O the depth of the riches of the goodness of God! "How unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out." His bright example of patience and faith has nerved many a tired and suffering disciple to bear submissively their far lesser trials. Could he have foreseen the good that through his sufferings would accrue to others, how he would have welcomed them! How he would have rejoiced in the privilege of thus honoring God! Suffering, afflicted Christian, God is giving you in a smaller sphere the same rich privilege of honoring him that he gave his servant Job.

---

#### ART. V.—PULPIT ELOQUENCE.

Eloquence is a duality. It has both a soul and a body. The latter is dependent upon the former for its vitality, and the former upon the latter for its manifestation. The soul is the inherent spirit of eloquence, including the thought, the emotion and the mental circumstances which beget it; the body is the mode of its expression, including style, gesture, and whatever else serves to render utterance effective.

Hence, there is no little difficulty in developing the full idea of eloquence in a simple definition. The idea itself is complex; for it includes a variety of particulars, and is found associated with diverse and opposite characteristics. Hence, the reference to different kinds or types of eloquence, even when we are perplexed to determine the varieties in degree. To take familiar examples: John B. Gough may be regarded as a representative of one class of eloquent men, and Daniel Webster as the representative of another. They are as unlike, in their relation as



public speakers, as they may well be; and yet few if any would fail to recognize many of the elements of the same idea in both. While under the spell of the former, his enthusiasm, his pathos, his dramatic attitudes which throw life into his creations of fancy and personality into his narratives of fact, his sudden and felicitous transitions of thought which never fail to leave the sympathetic emotion stirred and grateful, compel us to recognize in him a master of his art. And so, too, while listening to the latter as he was when among us in the days of his strength, one would find,—in his majestic mien, his distinct and deliberate utterance, his strong and lucid sentences, his steady and stately march forward to his object of which he never allowed himself or his hearers to lose sight, and in his crowning outbursts of strong feeling, enthusiastic or indignant,—a full proof of the power which inhabited his speech. The impression received in the two cases might be such that we should be unable to decide which of the twain ought to be regarded as the more efficient speaker. We should never—we could never—confound those two types; they would be as distinct in our view as though they were called by names entirely unlike; and yet we could deny to neither the possession of any element essential to a high order of eloquence. Dissimilar as they are, they certainly possess something in common, and that something, whether it can be defined or not, is to us the grand characteristic of eloquence—its primitive and universal quality. And this quality is discerned, not so much in the man or in the manner as in the effect it produces,—in the impression it makes. Not that it is not in the man and the manner chiefly, for there it unquestionably is, but that our cognition depends mostly on its effect. And hence the difficulty of conveying to another the full idea of an eloquent effort, and the still greater difficulty of copying the peculiarities of the speaker. The only way in which a truly eloquent speech could be fully and fairly reported, would be by exhibiting our own sensibility on which it had impressed itself.

We shall here attempt to define eloquence no farther than to call it effective utterance. By its being effective, is meant that it possesses a power which enables the speaker to accomplish in a high degree the objects at which he aims. By utterance is

meant any form in which thought or emotion may find an outward expression. In this comprehensive sense we may often meet with eloquence of a high order where there is no audible voice, as when dumbness solicits our charity to drive away starvation by its own significant signs. And even a brute may thrill us with a silent eloquence, through the appeal which its own suffering may make to us.

The pulpit is eloquent, then, when it utters itself effectively—when, through its arguments, its appeals, its pictures addressed to the imagination, its persuasions, its earnestness, its emotion, its action, regarded separately or collectively, it accomplishes its true objects in a high degree. For there is nothing in the nature or the functions of the pulpit that serves to render this general definition less applicable to that than to any other sphere in which human instrumentality is employed in similar forms.

The practical question, however, is still before us. What are the conditions on which this effective utterance depends? The limits of this essay will allow of but a very slight and superficial discussion of the points suggested by this inquiry.

“True eloquence,” says the distinguished man to whom reference has been made, “does not consist in speech. Words and phrases may be marshalled in every way but they cannot compass it. It must exist in the man, in the subject, and in the occasion. It comes, if it come at all, like the outbursting of a fountain from the earth, or the breaking forth of volcanic fires, with spontaneous, original, native force.” All this is true, and, therefore, where there is neither the man, the subject, nor the occasion, all attempts to be eloquent by learning and endeavoring to apply mere outward rules, must result in failure if they do not beget disgust. But this is not quite all the truth on the subject. If it were, then all attempts to render utterance more effective than “the man, the subject and the occasion” would naturally make it, would be futile. Correct views on the subject, study and effort may, perhaps, do something to put the spirit of eloquence within him, to create or combine the circumstances which aid its development, and multiply the inspiring occasions at will. Demosthenes was hissed from the Athenian stage on his first attempt at oratory; and there is no reason to

suppose that he would have succeeded better had he made that first attempt on the same occasions and under the same circumstances which contributed to the power of his terrible Philippics. As it was, he lost only his reputation; as we have supposed it might be, he would probably have lost his life. It was study and trial and perseverance that changed him from the stammering tyro, encountering only ridicule, to the eloquent patriot, shaking all Athens with sympathetic indignation against the tyrant. To native ability and fortuitous circumstances eloquence owes much, undoubtedly, but not every thing. The spirit of eloquence, doubtless, struggles mightily in many souls, and circumstances and occasions combine happily to manifest it; but, for want of the effort necessary to prepare an appropriate medium of expression, it discloses little force and produces little effect. And, on the other hand, effort has made utterance highly effective where occasions and circumstances have been less favorable, and the original ability vastly inferior. These specified things may be indispensable conditions of eloquence, but they are not themselves causative of it. True eloquence may never exist without them, but it will not necessarily always exist with them.

A few conditions of Pulpit Eloquence may be specified as follows:

1. *There must be strong, fresh and vital thought.*

In speaking thus of the necessity for strong, vigorous thought, it is not meant that it must always be profound, metaphysical or scientific, and incomprehensible except to deep and critical thinkers; or that it should never be pathetic and marked by delicacy. Much included in the former classes is not really distinguished for innate vigor; while much of the latter kind is adapted to stir the spirit to its very depths. We mean simply that utterance, to be effective in the true sense, must be expressive of thought, and of such thought as is adapted to make a strong impression upon the listener. Words derive all their force from the thoughts they embody or suggest; and the same remark is equally true of all other forms of utterance. Manner, gesture and the expression of the features may do much to render a speaker eloquent, whose mere words are next to powerless,—simply because they either express or suggest more thought than

his language. It is not to be denied that some objects can be gained by the pulpit in the absence of such thoughts, but these are not the true objects. The sensibility may be aroused, the passions set on fire, the heart made to throb and the tears to flow without employing the element referred to. But in all such cases it must be obvious that the pulpit is really doing but little toward the attainment of its true object—nay, that, on the whole it is doing very little to suggest those objects. Nor will it leave any lasting impression of power on the minds of those who are brought under its influence. From a law of their own, the emotions will sink into quietness again so soon as the exciting cause is removed, and as that cause is not strong thought, which might exert its power indefinitely, but something belonging to the pulpit itself, it is obvious that the impression must fade out so soon as the pulpit and its accompaniments disappear. In such a case the soul is a mere mirror, reflecting the features of the agency which is before it, and the reflection requires the actual presence of the agency.

Now, instead of a work like this, it is the chief business of the pulpit to teach, and this implies the development of thought. It need not be afraid of rousing the sensibility;—true eloquence always does this;—but it should reach it through the intellect. And if it can succeed in lodging a strong thought in the soul of its audience, it need have no fear that the emotions will remain quiescent. They will own its presence and respond to its call until the thought itself is forgotten. And such emotional activity will be healthy and strengthening; whereas that which is produced artificially is emotional and perverting. It is the very abuse which creates sentimentalists, both literary and religious. And no one supposes that the true objects of literature are very much promoted by multiplying novel readers, nor that the true objects of religion are more largely subserved by increasing the number of those who are forever thirsting, not for purity and moral strength, but for the frenzy of mere emotional excitement.

The pulpit, therefore, cannot be truly eloquent except as it becomes the medium of thought. Nothing will or can atone for its absence. It may employ classical terms, expressive gestures,

The graces of rhetoric, finely modulated tones, and all the winning forms which artificial polish can bestow;—it may be impassioned, vehement and terrible, lift up its voice like Jupiter, wing its arms with the force of Vulcan, and shake its locks like Samson;—it may soar in its imagination like Milton and pour out words with the fluency of Apollo;—it may avert its eye and speak in tones as subdued and plaintive as Sorrow herself, bending over the grave of her last hope; and yet, whatever may be the measure of skill displayed in any of these departments, if there is no thought corresponding in force to the external manifestations, one of the primary elements of true eloquence is absent. Indeed, as a general thing, the power of the speaker will be lessened by any such outward excesses; for all outward forms tend to create disgust which are seen to be artificial—which fail to become the exponents and effects of an inward force. The small talk of fashionable life is not destitute of the graces of manner, but it requires much patience to listen to it without curling one's lip. A dandy will discuss, with great accuracy of language and some discrimination of idea, the covering of a button, become enthusiastic over the tasselling of a cane, go off into a rhapsody at the odor of perfumery, and foam like a maddened lion when his honor is called in question; but we should hardly carry away from any one of these exhibitions a high idea of eloquent speaking. And it is because the thoughts in question are so inherently, as well as relatively small, that no language or manner can give them force, but instead, are themselves belittled by the association. And no sacredness which may be supposed to belong to the topics and ideas of the pulpit can wholly obviate a similar impression when barrenness of idea is sought to be atoned for by vehemence of manner, affectation of sensibility or grandiloquence of style. Thought governs the world. And in constituting it the ruler of men, men were constituted to yield submission to it. None are so mighty as to be above its reach, and none to whom the pulpit is wont to speak so feeble that they will not become the ministers of its power. And it is the strong, vigorous thought appropriately expressed that is most readily and widely appreciated. Universal truths are those which commend themselves most nearly to

universal comprehension. Their magnitude makes them visible, and their force makes them felt. And, hence, the highest specimens of eloquence are those which are recognized to be such by all classes. The true orator is he who thrills the peasant at the same time that he subdues the philosopher.

We only add that this element of eloquence the pulpit has always at command. It is specially related to the highest as well as to the most sacred departments of thought. Its sphere covers the whole field of moral and religious truth. God, in his being and character and government, and man in his nature and relations and destiny, belong to its province. It has the whole past, as far back as induction or imagination can go, offering to it its collected wisdom, and the future speaks to it from those infinite depths to which neither our computation nor our thought can fly. It may draw arguments from every science and illustrations from every page of history. It is the proper exponent of philosophy and the tongue of fact; the high interpreter of nature and the medium of revelation; the standing explanation of time and the herald of eternity. There if any where should utterance possess the effectiveness of thought;—there if any where may and should be found the first condition of eloquence.

2. *Pulpit eloquence requires that the language fairly measure and be appropriate to the thought.*

This condition would lead us into extensive analyses, if it were thoroughly discussed. Let us simply indicate a few particulars. Language should be a true mirror of thought. It should express as clearly as possible the idea sought to be embodied in it, and in terms as little ambiguous as possible. Otherwise the attention of the hearer will be divided between two objects,—the thought and its drapery,—and the first can not produce its full impression.

There is doubtless a correspondence between thought and language; by which is meant that there is a tendency in every thought to clothe itself in appropriate words. But this affinity is neither so strong nor so independent of circumstances that thought will, in every case, find its fittest expression. The tendency may be thwarted by ignorance, by a perverted taste, or by

inattention. And, hence, there is no certainty that, however distinctly a thought may be apprehended, it will be most appropriately and forcibly expressed. To express an ordinary and familiar thought in high sounding terms, or in a paradoxical manner, is not, generally, to add to its force; and the habit of doing so is likely to lessen the force of those thoughts which are more novel and striking. Language, in such cases, ceases to be a correct index of ideas. Often it is found deceptive, and this fact tends to put the hearer on his guard against imposition. He has found that many striking sentences, when analyzed, convey little meaning; and, hence, he hesitates about receiving an announcement which embodies one of the noblest ideas most eloquently expressed. The straining after high sounding terms, the multiplication of superlative epithets, when the subject matter does not require it, often detracts from the force of the speaker rather than adds to his ability.

Generally a thought which admits of a brief and simple statement is more forcible for finding such an expression. Especially is this true of what may be regarded as strong and striking thought. In such a case it expends its whole force at once, and so deepens the impression; just as a single severe blow on a yielding substance will impress it much more than several which, combined, possess the same force. The expression, "And God said, Be Light, and Light was," owes much of its force to its simple and brief form. Express it by an extensive circumlocution and it will lose its distinctive sublimity. Take Henry Ward Beecher's remark,—“The Bible is sown as thick with Revolutions as heaven is with stars,” and dilute it with a more complex phraseology, and it ceases to impress us as it now does.

Language thus always employed, would, however, be an extreme. Few ministers would be able to fill up an hour and a half each week with such sublime aphorisms—such condensed gems of speech; and if they were, there is not one in a thousand among their hearers whose mental apparatus is competent to digest such a mass of material. It would be a sad waste of power, and, besides, it would satiate by its excess. Every variety of truth is to be uttered, and eloquence requires that there be the same varieties in the verbal medium. The language of

the pulpit should not be barren of ornament, neither should it superabound. There should be sufficient to gratify the taste and the sense of the beautiful of which none are destitute, but not so much as to weaken the force of the thought by attracting the chief attention to the garb. The nature of the subject should govern the employment of it. Exclusive metaphysical and scientific terms would be strangely out of place in speaking of Eden or heaven, and figures of rhetoric would yield little assistance in developing the ground of moral obligation, or in showing the distinction between a verdict of the conscience and a belief of the reason. The language must correspond to the thought if true eloquence is to be attained. Each will then add force and impressiveness to the other, and both will do not a little to render the utterance of the pulpit highly effective.

*3. A third condition of Pulpit Eloquence is Independence.*

Fettered speech can never be really and highly eloquent speech. By independence is not meant that no restraint should be laid upon it. Truth, sincerity and courtesy are its rightful and absolute lawgivers. We speak of independence as opposed to the timidity which fears to utter what the convictions and circumstances seem to require, lest offence should be taken or sympathy lost; as opposed also to that implicit submission to popular customs and accredited sentiments which makes them the standard of excellence and the test of orthodoxy; and especially as opposed to that servility which makes the speaker a copyist or a plagiarist—the mere echo of some mightier man's voice, or the parrot uttering simply what it has learned to imitate.

He who, in the pulpit, gives evidence that he is regarding himself as on trial before the critical tribunal of his audience, and is awaiting their verdict with anxiety, may be elegant but not eloquent in any high sense. If, under the inspiration communicated by his topic, his heart is swelling with emotion that seeks escape, he must restrain it; if a radical but just word rises to his lips, he must strangle it before it comes to life; if an inference that shall bear personally and severely upon his hearers is forced on his attention, he must suppress it. That timidity encloses his spirit and his utterance in a strait jacket, and they are as incapable of majestic and commanding activity as would be



the body dressed in the habit of the insane asylum. No man is eloquent till he gains the mastery over the sensibility and measurably over the will of his audience. Eloquence is a ruler, not a vassal; a dictator, not a sycophant; a majestic law-giver, not a trembling culprit. Its heart is all courage, its forms all freedom, its utterance all frankness. "Give me liberty or give me death," is always the expression of its spirit, whether threatened by the military force of a kingdom, the dissecting knife of unjust criticism, or the crucifixion of malice.

Internal conviction and perceived propriety alone keep guard at the door of an eloquent soul. Begotten of self-reflection, they hold their appointment by the highest authority. Well endorsed rules and theological formulæ may not supplant them but by violence and injury. And he who will or can bring his mind to say what by the simple virtue of his position he is expected to say, merely because it is expected; or who feels satisfied to utter himself in certain forms which custom has prescribed, merely on account of the prescription, and without the sanction of his own highest convictions, must satisfy himself with an utterance that neither is nor can be truly eloquent. He is not true but false to himself, and the more inspiration he acquires, the more will his insincerity reveal itself to his own eye and divest him of his confidence and his power. His heart is in rebellion against his rules; there is an intestine war; the unity of his being and action is lost; a portion of his power is withdrawn from his outward effort to still the mutiny within. Not that eloquence is lawless and reckless of authority; it rather shows its perfect allegiance to law when it tramples such authority under foot that it may submit itself to that which seems higher and divine. It defies the world, not because it loves bullying, or because it honors the world less, but because it hates mental despotism and will not dishonor itself.

The occupant of the pulpit must be and act himself, if he would hope to utter himself effectively. If he cannot find the elements of eloquence in himself, in his topics and position, it is useless for him to seek them in an attempted imitation of others. He who is capable of attempting to act such a part is incapable of acting it well. Being conscious that the excellences of

thought and manner he attempts to display are not his own, his conscience, if it be not seared, must charge him with a kind of hypocrisy and destroy the manliness of his bearing. His attempts at copying must be followed by defeat, obvious to others if not to himself. All such effort to attain eloquence will and must be a perpetual failure. The part will be too high to be sustained. If he soar now on the pinions borrowed of his model, he will find his strength unequal to the task of keeping them in motion, and his descent will be all the more sudden and rapid for his elevation, and significant of the artifice which explains his position and reveals his shame. It were as vain to hope to become Demosthenes by creeping within a hollow statue of the Grecian orator, and reciting his harangues through the marble lips, as to attempt to be really eloquent by seeking to personify the great masters of pulpit oratory. They may be studied with advantage if we will simply allow them to teach us; but they are to us dangerous beings if they are suffered to absorb us. And, if it were possible to act this assumed part fully, there would be all the difference in the result that would be seen in an oak built up by human hands from without, compared with that which had gone up to its matured grandeur in obedience to the vitalizing force within. True eloquence is a life and not a statue, an active power and not a senseless image. Its thought is projected, like volcanic lava, from the depths of the internal fire, and, like the same lava, its forms are determined by the material and the medium through which it passes. And it were as easy for a juggler to counterfeit Vesuvius as for a clerical copyist to reproduce Whitefield. If eloquence be possible, it is only so by developing, through legitimate self-culture, the elements lodged in our own individual being.

4. *The fourth condition of Pulpit Eloquence is Enthusiasm.*

We do not use this word in its objectionable, but in its best sense. This it is chiefly which gives ardor and spirit and hopefulness and confidence to human effort. It is usually conjoined with an active imagination and strong emotion. It is the parent of the heroism which makes human history an epic. It does not merely sit down and passively and firmly endure, but it fearlessly defies and invades. It is not strength merely, but ac-

tive energy; not simply a determined resistance, but an impulsive crusade. It is not merely the strong-nerved hunter refusing to fly at the wolf's hungry howl, but the daring Putnam bearding him in his own den.

The province of eloquence reaches over into the domain of the emotions, as well as covers the sphere of the intellect.—Its office is to bring not only light but warmth; it not only constructs but animates. It has to do with souls no less than with understandings. Its office is not only to guide by its teaching, but to allure by its earnestness and its zeal. While its thought flashes illumination upon the true path of man, it has yet to inspire him with the disposition to follow it by its own kindling example.

If the pulpit would be eloquent it must be enthusiastic. It must put itself in full and deep sympathy with the truths it utters, with the promises it reveals, with the prophetic pictures it delineates, and especially with those who hang upon its lips. It is no place for stoicism, or for the rigid severities of technical speech. The minister has not to deal with mathematical abstractions which require the steady, uniform and exclusive exercise of pure reason for their development. His themes are all vital in importance, and to him it is given, if he will, to make them leap with life. In his own kindling eye, in his transfigured countenance, and in his glowing words which bring the prophetic and unseen into view, he may incarnate his themes. He may make, through this enthusiasm, the feeble confidence soar up to the verge of vision; and the dim eye, wearied with watching for deliverance, shall behold chariots of fire hastening from heaven to the rescue at his bidding. Faint hearts grow strong in such a presence, and trembling limbs are nerved mightily for the race of virtue.

The world is full of examples showing us what enthusiasm may of itself accomplish. It gave the Arabian impostor empire over half the world; it animated and projected the crusades of the middle ages; and, even now, it can precipitate a regiment of life-loving beings upon a forest of bayonets. There is nothing so contagious. It has a universal language of which every word is an inspiration. It can lift a man or a multitude

into a new existence till their former selves are well nigh lost. Perverted, it is a dangerous instrument, but employed under the guidance of truth and reason, it is one of the essentials of true eloquence. And it finds one of its most appropriate dwelling places in the pulpit. We do not speak of affected enthusiasm, but of that which is true and real; not of that artificial creation of weak and barren souls, but of that inward vitality which distinguishes the strong and gifted. And if living, burning, creative utterance be any where needed, it is surely there where heedless and slothful souls come to be quickened by immortal and unseen and forgotten things. This it is that will annihilate the chasm between selfishness and duty, between the outward and the spiritual, between man and God.

From this imperfect view of Pulpit Eloquence it will be inferred that the conditions on which it depends are rather internal than external. Men of a certain stamp are, of course, if not of necessity, eloquent in speech when they speak at all. Strong thinkers, good rhetoricians from taste, independent and enthusiastic, they open the lips only to let eloquence find an avenue to the outward world, for it is the native dialect of their being.

And so, too, it may be seen that this power is to be acquired, not so much by an attention to outward forms as by inward culture. He who aims at eloquence merely for its own sake, is not in the true path to the goal. By being artificial, it will part with spontaneity, and in doing so it will lose the locks of its strength. He who is possessing himself of higher and stronger thoughts, who labors effectually to develop them clearly to others, who is nurturing true independence of spirit, and growing enthusiastic in his vocation, is most effectually contributing to the power of his utterance. Such a character will dignify any office, and commend its objects powerfully to the sympathy of all men. And, carrying into the pulpit a character which befits a man, and especially befits a minister,—carrying there that inspiration of the Almighty which giveth understanding,—that direct, lucid speech which becomes the topics and the place,—that trueness to intelligent conviction which allows no word to be uttered carelessly, but represses no syllable through fear of the censure of expediency,—and that zealous energy which is the

soul of all effort and the offspring of deep and true sympathy,—no man can speak as God's ambassador without something of that high order of eloquence which convinces while it stirs, and secures benefit while it awakens admiration.

With many of the questions which have been raised over this subject we have no space to deal. But it seems obvious that a confinement to notes must, as a general rule, divest any speaker, and especially the minister, of much of his power. It constrains manner, it takes away the moral power of the eye and of the varying expression of the countenance, while it leaves no opportunity for fresh suggestions from the circumstances, and for the employment of illustrations which may be borrowed from what is before the eye.

We have said nothing respecting the importance of cultivating eloquence in this sphere. But it is universally felt, however little sympathy is sometimes expressed toward it in words. No man can be indifferent to the manner in which instruction is conveyed to him. And they who have sought to depreciate the value of pulpit eloquence, and have declared against its cultivation, have themselves, it may be unwittingly, sought to be eloquent in their warfare against it. Paul was called *Mercurius* from his ability to speak with force, and the foes of Jesus came away awe-struck by his manner, declaring that never man spake like this man. Over the eloquence of the pulpit is thrown the endorsement of Paul's sanctified genius and the Saviour's infinite authority. And their powerful utterance speaks to us impressively, saying, "Go and do thou likewise."

---

#### ART. VI.—THE RESURRECTION.

**RESURRECTION** means to quicken, to revive, to rise, as from the dead. It is sometimes employed in a civil sense, to denote the restoration of a person or nation in distress, as in the case of *H Ezekiah* and the Jewish nation. It is also used in a spir-

ual sense, to represent a state of death in sin, from which persons are regenerated. Resurrection is also applied by some to the church, when it shall increase in numbers, strength, and millennial glory, called the first resurrection. But the term resurrection is more commonly understood to be the raising of corporeal bodies from the dead, which is the theme of the present discussion.

The question is sometimes asked, Can the resurrection of the dead be proved from the works of nature? We answer, No! True, there are many things in nature that are suggestive—many analogies, though not parallel, such as the decay and resuscitation of vegetation, the transformation of certain insects, the changes and revolutions in the moral world, etc. Yet these alone are not satisfactory on a subject of such vast importance to the human race. Though nature teaches many practical lessons, and unwise is he who does not profit by them, yet its teachings are not sufficient to settle this point. The doctrine of the resurrection is, therefore, a matter of revelation, and from this source, principally, are we to be guided. What, then, does the word of God teach relative to this subject?

It teaches, first, the doctrine of a general resurrection from the dead.

It is a doctrine of the Old Testament. Some deny this because comparatively little is said on the subject by the saints and prophets. But this is no real objection; for enough is said to prove the fact. Christ affirms that Moses preached the doctrine: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed in the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Job who, as some suppose, lived in the days of Moses, expresses a sentiment evidently bearing on this point: "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." Says David: "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave; for he shall receive me." The prophet Isaiah speaks in the following language: "Thy dead

men shall live, together with my dead body shall they rise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for the dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." Daniel says: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

It was expected by the Jews. "Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." "Women received their dead raised to life again; and others were tortured not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection." True, some were skeptical on the subject, as were the Sadducees, who had departed from the truth and simplicity of the religion of their fathers, and did not give full credence to all the Old Testament writings. But Christ, in answer to a question proposed by them on the resurrection, plainly told them, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." The Pharisees, on the other hand, were professed believers in the resurrection, and in this belief agreed with Christ and the apostles.

It is not incredible. "For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven." "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?"

It is not contrary to reason. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

It was assumed and proved by our Lord. "And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." The last passage proves the doctrine to a demonstration.

It was preached by the apostles. "Being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead." "Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics encountered him. And some said, What will

this babbler say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods; because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection." "And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust."

The credibility of the resurrection is shown by the resurrection of individuals. Christ enters the ruler's house, and restores life to the body. "And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many." "And he came near and touched the bier; and they that bare him stood still. And he said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise. And he that was dead sat up, and began to speak. And he delivered him unto his mother." "And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave clothes; and his face was bound about with a napkin. Jesus saith unto them, Loose him and let him go."

The certainty of the resurrection is proved by the resurrection of Christ. "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen. And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ; whom he raised not up, if so be the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only, we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept."

In the four gospels we have a full history of the life, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension of the blessed Saviour, upon whom is predicated the faith of the saints. No doctrine of the Bible can be proved by a greater amount of Scripture testimony than that of the resurrection. The passages here brought forward are only a small portion that might be quoted; but these are sufficient to prove the doctrine and satisfy any reasonable



person believing in the inspiration of the Scriptures. The New Testament treats upon the subject under a variety of features and circumstances. Christ himself expounded the doctrine on different occasions, before different classes of people, proving by his works, and, finally in his own person, the reality of a resurrection from the dead. The apostles and primitive Christians believed the doctrine, and Paul proclaimed it in Athens to the philosophers, and alluded to it in his defence before Agrippa. In the fifteenth chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, he treats the subject by a power of argument not excelled.

Second, the Scriptures teach that the same body, though greatly changed, will be raised from the dead.

From the account given by the evangelists, it is certain that the body of Christ was raised. It was identified by his disciples, bearing the marks caused by the nails and the spear. In order to remove their doubts and quiet their fears, he says, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet." As Thomas was not present on this occasion, and was unbelieving, Christ, wishing to remove every doubt, even from the most faithless, bade Thomas behold his hands and thrust his hand into his side. In the whole transaction relating to the resurrection of Christ, there is not the least indication of deception practised, either by Christ or his disciples. As the body of Christ died and rose again, so will the bodies of the dead arise, and those of the saints "be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself."

As a further proof that the body will be raised is John 5 : 28. "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." God, in the creation of man, formed him of "the dust of the earth," which undoubtedly means his body. Now Solomon says, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." From this we learn that the spirit does not, as some contend, go down into the grave—it is the body. And it is the body that comes forth, as alluded to in the passage, not the spirit. Paul says, "Even

we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our bodies." "He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies by the spirit that dwelleth in you." "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body."

These quotations fully affirm the resurrection of the body. Still, with all the light that the Scriptures furnish on this subject, which is not a little, there are doubts expressed and objections made to the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. But these objections are generally made by those who are skeptical concerning the Scriptures, to convince whom it would be quite difficult. Among the objections the most prominent is, that the body, in this life, undergoes many changes, and is, every few years, composed of different particles of matter, and, hence, cannot be the same body at a later period in life. Besides, when life becomes extinct, the body is decomposed, and the particles of matter enter other bodies and become subservient to other uses and purposes, and therefore a literal resurrection of the same body is impossible. Now to the believer in revelation this is no objection, because the resurrection is regarded in the light of a miracle, as was Christ's own resurrection. He who made the body is abundantly able to restore it to life, notwithstanding the changes of the material organism previous to and after death. The Christian confides in the power of Omnipotence. Though skeptics may deny every thing in the natural and moral world, yet the true disciple of Christ is unmovable, having built upon the rock, the sure foundation, against which the tempest has no effect.

Still this objection is not so formidable as it at first appears. Can not physical identity be preserved without identity of matter? Let us examine a little further. Does not a person retain his personal identity from youth to old age? Does not the person who is emaciated almost to a skeleton, by a protracted illness, retain his personal identity? Yes, even admitting that identity of matter is lost. No one would pretend to say that the man who lives to-day is not the man who lived ten,

twenty, thirty, or forty years ago? Even if his body had undergone a thousand changes, it would not destroy his identity; and, if this be preserved, of what consequence are the particles of matter which originally composed his body? If he has a body which the mind recognizes, this is sufficient. He knows it to be his body, while he may be unconscious of the waste and renewal of the floating particles of matter. He has a body, and this he retains until he enters the grave, and in the resurrection his spirit will be re-united with what he recognized as his body on earth. Yet the Scriptures admit that the body undergoes certain changes, as stated in the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians. Here we learn that this mortal body is sown in corruption, is sown in dishonor, is sown in weakness, is sown a natural body; but that it is raised in incorruption, raised in glory, raised in power, raised a spiritual body—the very elements necessary to its admittance into heaven. The apostle does not deny its identity, and why need those with less of reason, discernment and inspiration attempt to do so?

Third, the Scriptures teach that the resurrection is to take place in the future.

On this subject there is a variety of opinions. Some contend that the resurrection takes place immediately after death. But this theory is not consistent with revelation, which teaches that the resurrection will be at the the last day, or at the end of the world. Daniel, in speaking of the resurrection, evidently means the end of time. Christ says that “the hour is coming,” meaning a future period, when all that are in their graves, the good and bad, “shall come forth,” some unto the resurrection of life, and some unto the resurrection of damnation. Paul declares “that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust, agreeing with the Saviour that it is a future event, to be taken in its most unlimited sense. To make it more conclusive, as an event in the future, Paul said concerning Hymeneus and Philetus, who declared that the resurrection was past already, that concerning the truth they erred.

“And this is the Father’s will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me,

that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day. No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day." "Jesus said unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." In these passages it is not difficult to understand what is meant by "the last day." It evidently means the end of the world, placing the resurrection at that period.

"And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat upon it, from whose face the heaven and the earth fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works." This quotation plainly shows the universality of the resurrection, the end of the world, and the day of judgment, when the dead will be judged, "every man according to his works."

The Bible teaches that the resurrection will take place at the close of Christ's mediatorial reign, or second coming. "Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," &c. "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them that are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we

which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised," &c. "Seeing that it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled rest with us; when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe."

These passages plainly show that there will be an end of the gospel dispensation, and an end of Christ's mediatorial kingdom, at which time Christ is to make his second appearance, and the dead will be raised and judged. As to the precise time when this sublime and glorious event will take place, it is not for us to know with certainty, as some have supposed. But all may rest assured, from Scripture, that it is yet in the future, "at the last day," when time shall be no longer.

---

#### ART. VII.—PERSONAL CHRISTIAN DEVELOPMENT.

We sometimes hear persons speak of childhood as if it were the happiest period of human life; and they intimate or declare, that in that portion of our sojourn on earth, there is more real enjoyment, and less of care and trouble, than at any subsequent time. But, on reflection, every intelligent man must see that

this is true, only when the child grows up ignorant, idle, and irreligious; because whatever the joys of childhood may be, they are not equal to those pleasures which are connected with the increase of uncorrupt knowledge, or which result from the exercise of useful labor, or are secured to us by the possession of true religion. If men have more cares and trials than children have, it should be remembered that they are better able to bear them. The troubles of childhood, insignificant as we sometimes think them, and much as we may be disposed to treat them as unworthy of consideration, are to the child as real and as painful, as more important and heavier trials are to men of mature years.

There is also an opinion more or less prevalent, that the Christian has most happiness at the commencement of his Christian course; and that he then obtains clearer light and enjoys more of a sense of union and communion with God than he afterwards possesses. Those who hold this opinion speak of the days of their first love and of their early Christian enjoyment and sigh over them as lost blessings, and they talk as if the return of such days would be to them an invaluable boon. But this opinion is true only when the Christian neglects his duties or slights his privileges, so that he remains ignorant, weak, and worldly, when he ought to be wise, strong, and spiritual. We are aware that the change from darkness to light, from bondage to freedom, from danger to safety, from anxiety to peace, from fear to love, is a great and striking one; so great that it will make a lasting impression upon the mind and will lead the Christian to look back with satisfaction and delight and to exclaim,

•                                   “O happy day that fixed my choice,  
  On thee my Saviour and my God.”

But this is only the starting point of his Christian course, the morning of his day, the beginning of his freedom, the commencement of his safety, the introduction of his peace, the kindling of his love; and he will come to regard that day, not only on account of the change then produced, but also because of the higher and more precious blessings that have flown from it.

We think that the views we have here advanced are in accordance with the teachings of the Scriptures. Thus Peter writing to those who are "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ," (1 Pet. 1: 2,) says to them, "As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, *that ye may grow thereby.*" (1 Pet. 2: 2.) And he goes on to instruct them in the course to be pursued that they may secure this end. So also, in his second letter, addressing "them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," (2 Pet. 1: 1,) he not only expresses the wish concerning them, "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord;" (2 Pet. 1: 2,) but he enjoins it as a personal duty to "*Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.*" (2 Pet. 3: 18.)

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is asserted that there had been a lack of Christian development, and the complaint is made, "For when for the time *ye ought to be teachers*, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat." (Heb. 5: 12.) When he wrote to the saints "at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus," Paul spoke of coming "in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive. But speaking the truth in love, *many grow up* into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ." (Eph. 4: 13—15.) And he seems to intimate that he was himself the subject of this growth and development, when he says in his letter to Timothy, "I am now *ready* to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." (2 Tim. 4: 6, 7.) We believe that this Christian growth and development will be progressive and continued, not sudden but gradual. Thus when the growth of the child of God is referred to in the

Psalms, it is said, "The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree, he shall *grow like a cedar* in Lebanon." (Ps. 92: 12.) The cedar of Lebanon is a tree of slow growth, but of large development. The growth of the child of God is also continued. It is not ephemeral, but persistent. The Psalmist declares this, when contrasting his condition with that of "the man that made not God his strength, but trusted in the abundance of his riches and strengthened himself in his wickedness," he says, "But I am like a green olive tree in the house of God: I trust in the mercy of God for ever and ever." (Ps. 2: 8.)

And in accordance with this view, but using another figure, it is said, "The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." (Prov. 4: 18.) The idea suggested in this text, we think, may be thus illustrated. We have sometimes started on a journey in the night before a clear and pleasant day. At first it was dark, perhaps very dark. But after awhile there were some *faint streaks* of light in the east. These increased in size and number, blending together, and spreading over a wider surface, till a glorious radiance covered the eastern sky. Then, as we looked, we saw the first rays of the sun, and these increased till it was fairly above the horizon and shone forth in dazzling splendor. And all this time our path had been growing brighter and brighter, till there was "perfect day." So it is with the Christian. He is at first enveloped in the darkness of sin and of exposure to the wrath of God, but when mercy is extended to him through Jesus Christ and he is led to trust in him as his Saviour, there are streaks of light; and from this time, if there are no counteracting influences, his path becomes brighter and brighter till he reaches "the perfect day" of heavenly glory and unclouded and unending bliss.

First, we may expect the progressive and continued development of Christian character, because the Christian gains an increased acquaintance with the Bible, and hence better understands truth and duty. When the believer commences his religious life, he has but little scriptural knowledge. He may have neglected the Bible, not caring to know anything of its contents, and hence, neither reading it nor placing himself where he



would hear it read and expounded. Under such circumstances, he must of course be unacquainted with its contents. Or he may be the child of pious parents, and have been accustomed to listen to the reading of the Bible at family worship, and at other times to have it explained in the Sabbath School, and to hear it expounded and enforced from the pulpit. He may have read and studied it for himself and have felt some interest in its statements. But though under these circumstances he may have acquired considerable acquaintance with its contents and much knowledge of its doctrines, he does not fully understand it, for his eyes have been blinded by sin; and "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." (1 Cor. 2:14.) When the eyes of his understanding are opened, his previous knowledge of the Scriptures will prepare him the more readily to understand them, but he does not fully perceive the spiritual truths they contain, and he will find that many of his opinions, as to the truths taught therein, are incorrect.

When the Holy Spirit enlightens the understanding of a man, the first things that arrest his thoughts, are his guilty and dangerous condition and the depravity of his nature. And as he reads the Bible, or remembers what he has read or heard, those portions which refer to these topics, are those which most strike his attention, and he exclaims, "What shall I do to be saved?" "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me?" And then as the Holy Spirit sets Jesus Christ before him as the Saviour of the lost, he is led to trust in him as his Saviour. He has now learned most valuable scriptural knowledge, and he cannot estimate it too highly, yet it may almost all be comprised in the statement,

"I'm a poor sinner, and nothing at all,  
And Jesus Christ, he's my all in all."

Hence, when Satan comes with evil suggestions, perhaps, (as when he tempted Jesus Christ,) accompanying them with misapplied texts of Scripture, the young Christian does not know how to repel him, and he is sorely perplexed. So also when skeptics bring their cavils against the Bible, against religion and

against Christians, although he is satisfied that the skeptics are wrong, for he has an internal evidence of the truths of the Bible and of the value of Christianity, yet he is still in comparative ignorance, and does not know how to reply to their cavils. So also with reference to questions of duty. The young Christian wishes to do right, and to act in accordance with the will of God in all things. But he is often uncertain as to the manner in which he should act under certain circumstances in which he finds himself placed, because he is not sufficiently acquainted with the Bible to enable him to decide his duty. But its constant study increases his knowledge, unfolding the character of God, so that he sees it in new lights. The will of God is made plain, and he learns how he may please him. Scripture explains Scripture. An acquaintance with its various parts reconciles apparent discrepancies. In proportion to the diligence with which he studies the Bible, the clearer is the knowledge he obtains, and the brighter the light that is shed on his pathway. "For the commandment is a lamp, and the law is light, and reproofs of instruction are the way of life." (Prov. 6: 23.) "The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple." Thus the constant study of the Bible enables him to repel the suggestions of Satan, meet the cavils of skeptics and detect misapplications of Scripture. Hence he may say, "By the word of thy lips I have kept me from the paths of the destroyer," (Ps. 17: 4,) and "Through thy precepts I get understanding, therefore I hate every false way. (Ps. 119: 104.) A constant perusal of the Bible also teaches us the details of duty, how we should act in peculiar circumstances into which we may be brought. Sometimes this is learned from recorded examples; at other times from direct precepts, and still again, by deduction from definite principles which are found distinctly declared. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." (Rom. 15: 4.) "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. 3: 16, 17.) Thus as the Christian gains

an increased acquaintance with the Bible, and acts on the knowledge thus acquired, his Christian character progresses and becomes more fully developed.

Secondly, we may expect progression and continued development, because the Christian increases in spiritual strength, and thus has more power to perform his duty and to resist temptation. If we look at natural life and examine its characteristics we find that a few persons remain always physically weak and helpless. They increase in years and grow in size, but not in strength. The muscles enlarge, but there is very little increase of physical power; they continue dependent on those around them, and perhaps on arriving at manhood are nearly as helpless as when infants. Usually, such persons are idiots as well as weaklings. A feeble mind is connected with a feeble body. Again, there are persons who grow physically strong and have the full use of their muscular powers, who yet remain mentally weak, and pass their lives in a state of imbecility. But these cases are exceptions to the general rule. In every one of them we know that there is something radically wrong causing this feebleness of body or mind; for the general law is, that food and exercise develop muscular power, from infancy to manhood; and that the use of the intellectual faculties expands the mind, causing it to grow stronger and stronger, and increasing its ability to grasp those special matters to which it gives particular attention.

So, also, the use of Christian privileges and the exercise of religious duties develop and expand the Christian character, so that it is less difficult to resist temptation. Duties become easier. It is affirmed of wisdom, i. e., true religion, "Her ways are ways of pleasantness." This is true! But it is also true, that the young Christian sometimes finds his duties trying, and the path of self-denial painful. Stimulated by his new-found love to Christ, he is willing to make sacrifices and to relinquish what he once loved. Yet he sometimes realizes that while the spirit is willing the flesh is weak. But by faithfulness in the performance of these duties, he grows stronger and stronger, till that which was once hard and difficult becomes easy and pleasant, and he can say, "I can do all things through Christ which strength-

eneth me." "I delight to do thy will, O my God." And he can sometimes add, "We glory in tribulations also, knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed: because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." (Rom. 5: 3—5.)

In such circumstances, it is less difficult to resist temptation. We are exhorted in the Scriptures, "Giving all diligence, add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity." (2 Pet. 1: 5—7.) And it is added, "For if ye do these things, ye shall never fall." (2 Pet. 1: 10.) Thus by the practice of Christian duties, and the participation of Christian privileges, we lose our relish for the things we once loved, increase in spiritual strength, and are continuously perfecting our Christian character. Thereby we may expect the progressive and continued development of Christian character, from the increased experience of communion with Christ. At first the believer's hope is comparatively feeble. We say comparatively, because we are aware that there are differences in this respect. In many cases, the commencement of a hope in Christ is very weak, while in others it is more decided in its character. Some young Christians think that their hope is very strong indeed. But we have no hesitation in saying, that whatever it may be at first, it is comparatively feeble to what it may become. A man taught by the Holy Spirit that he is a sinner, trusts in Christ, because he has a realization of his personal danger; and learns that Jesus Christ died to save him. This is his only hope, his last resource, the single way of deliverance from ruin. But he has had no experience of the blessedness of this trust, and he cannot realize the wondrous personal results which will follow in consequence of this act of faith; "as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." (1 Cor. 2: 9.)

He has been deeply anxious concerning his state, and it may be has been filled with terror and alarm lest eternal ruin should

overtake him. Now, "being justified by faith, he has peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ," (Rom. 5: 1,) and he finds that it is a "peace which passeth all understanding." He enters into his closet that he may pray to his Father; and in a fuller sense than he expected, he finds his Father there and receives a rich blessing from his gracious hand. He reads the Word of God and meditates thereon, and God speaks *directly* to him through this word so that he understands it better than ever before; and finds it the special truth which he needed. He listens to the preaching of the gospel, and that preaching unfolds new views of truth, and his soul is fed thereby. He meditates on the works of God, and again God reveals himself to him in a special manner. He attends to some duty which he expected would be irksome, but he finds that it is pleasant, for the Holy Spirit is near, aiding him in its performance. While engaged in the general business of life, he is constantly looking to God for guidance, he seeks in every thing to glorify God; and he feels with reference to every thing which he does, "Even this is for God."

He has aid in circumstances of trial. Difficulties come upon him, and sorrows weigh down his spirits. It may be that business arrangements which looked fair, grievously disappoint his expectations. Perhaps his own familiar friends are estranged, or his Christian brethren too readily believe some evil report concerning him, and therefore treat him as a transgressor. Sickness may enter his family, or may lay himself aside from active employment, disarrange his plans and interfere with his temporal prosperity; or death may bereave him of dearly loved ones,—perhaps stroke after stroke coming in quick succession. But in these or other heavy trials God sustains him; and though his heart is sore and his anguish great, he can exercise implicit trust and confidence in God. Knowing that "all things work together for good to them that love God," he can say in the midst of these trials, "Yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation." (Heb. 3: 18.)

He has deliverances from temptation. Perhaps this comes upon him with powerful force, and he trembles under it. It may be a temptation to indulge in some former evil habit, or it

may be something before unthought of. Either way, while he hates the sin, he may be sorely pressed by the temptation. But God manifests his delivering power. He resists the devil; and the devil flees from him; and he understands the force of that statement concerning Jesus Christ, "For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." (Heb. 2: 18.) He realizes in his own experience that "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation." Thus his hope grows stronger and is the necessary result of his increased and varied experience. These seasons of communion with God are repeated; this aid in circumstances of trial and difficulty is frequently afforded, and these deliverances from temptation recur again and again.

The hope of the Christian is strengthened because he is getting nearer the end of his journey. Once he was only at its commencement. All before him was strange and untried. He knew only by report what difficulties he should encounter, and only by faith, the help he should receive. But now he has passed over a large portion of the pathway, and all along it he has found grace to help him in time of need. All the promises of God have been in Christ, "yea, and in him, Amen." (2 Cor. 1: 20.) Thus he has more confidence that he shall finally overcome through Jesus Christ. He is able to trust more fully in Christ: and he believes that all through his journey help will be afforded him. He believes that Jesus is able to keep him from falling, and to present him faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy. And in this confidence, he exclaims,

"His love, in time past, forbids me to think  
He'll leave me at last, in trouble to sink."

He now has clearer views of heaven. When he first believed in Jesus Christ as his Saviour, he received not only a knowledge of sins forgiven, but also a hope of heaven. Yet that home of the Christian seemed a long way off; now it seems nearer and he thinks of it more as *his* home. John Bunyan has well illustrated this in his "*Pilgrim's Progress*." When the pilgrims had escaped from Doubting Castle and had reached the Delectable

mountains, the shepherds on these mountains shewed them many things and finally took them to the top of the high hill called Clear, and gave them the perspective glass to look at the gates of the Celestial City. But before this, they had seen the men whose eyes had been put out by Giant Despair, stumbling among the tombs; and the last thing they had looked at was the door on the side of a hill which they were told was a by-way to Hell, and this having excited their fears, the remembrance of it caused their hands to shake so that "they could not look steadily through the glass, yet they thought they saw something like the gate and also some of the glory of the place." But when these same pilgrims reached the land of Beulah, they were "out of the reach of Giant Despair, neither could they from this place so much as see Doubting Castle. Here also they were within sight of the City they were going to," and "here they heard voices from out of the City, loud voices, saying, 'Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy salvation cometh! Behold, his reward is with him!' . . . and drawing near to the City, they had yet a more perfect view of it." In these circumstances, whatever difficulties may present themselves to the Christian, he can say, "The Lord God will help me; therefore shall I not be confounded; therefore have I set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed. He is near that justifieth me; who will contend with me?" (Isa. 50: 7, 8.) Such a Christian has grown "strong in the Lord and in the power of his might."

But if, as we assert, it is both reasonable and scriptural to expect this progressive and continued development, it may be asked how we account for the prevalence of the opposite opinion, and for the fact that so large a number of professors of religion make very little progress, and continue comparatively feeble. We think that there are many things which will prevent spiritual growth and development, and that wherever these are hindered, the opinion will be encouraged that they are not to be expected. We will name some of them. Prominent is the neglect to make a public profession of faith in Christ. This is one of the first temptations that assail young Christians, and it is pressed on them by specious reasoning. They have seen many, after making a public profession, grow cold, or live inconsistent

lives, and they think they would rather make no profession than do this; or they wish to wait and be sure that they are fully decided before they take this step, lest they also should wound the cause of Christ. Or, instead of inquiring what the Bible requires of young Christians, they are waiting for some special impressions to guide them in their path, and not receiving them they are content to neglect a public confession of Christ. Perhaps there are some obstacles in the way of their being baptized. They may expect opposition, and they shrink from the conflict; or they may settle down in the opinion that "a man may be just as good a Christian out of the church as in it." We have sometimes been asked the question, "Cannot one be a Christian without joining the church?" To this there is only one answer. As we believe that no one should be admitted to the church unless he is a Christian, it follows that we believe there are Christians out of the church. But can they *grow* while remaining outside, as they can by entering it? Let experience and observation answer. We admit that there are *many* in the church who are not as consistent, earnest, and active, as they ought to be. But look among all those who profess to have been converted, and who from any of the causes we have named, deliberately and persistently neglect to make a public confession of faith in Christ, and see if you can find *one* earnest, active, growing Christian among them.

Next comes the neglect of other religious duties. We have referred to the fact that the powers of body and mind need to be used in order to physical and mental development. It is equally necessary that the Christian use means in order to his spiritual development. God has appointed such means and, if they are neglected, it follows, as a matter of course, that the Christian character will not be fully developed. If the closet is an unfrequented place, if the word of God is not read and studied, if trifles serve as excuses for absence from public worship and from the social meeting, and if constant attendance at the Lord's supper is thought unnecessary, then it is no wonder that the neglecter does not grow, and that he persuades himself that growth is not to be expected.

We are aware that there are differences as to the talents which



men possess. God dispenses these talents in different proportions, "dividing to every man severally as he will!" But there is also a great difference as to the use which men make of the talents given them. No one knows what he is able to do till he tries. There was a time when those who are now strong and active in the service of God, were weak and feeble. An effort to do a thing will often carry with it the power to do it; and continued efforts to do little things will increase our power for performing great ones. The use of each one of these different means of which we have spoken will have an extended and a reactive influence. The study of the Bible will not only increase our knowledge of spiritual things, but this increase of knowledge will lead to prayer, thankfulness, and watchfulness, and to Christian activity. Prayer and its attendant duties will not only increase our piety, but this increase of piety will lead to a desire to know more and to do more. And Christian activity will not only develop spiritual strength and lead to usefulness, but the possession of this strength will incline to the study of the Bible, and to prayer.

Thus our spiritual development may continue and progress. We shall not come into a condition from which we cannot develop more fully. We shall not reach a bound beyond which we cannot pass. We shall not attain a height from whence we cannot ascend higher. But we shall be "rooted and grounded in love;" "we shall become strong in the Lord;" we shall "be strengthened with might by his spirit in the inner man," and we shall "be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length, and depth and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge." And with all our acquirements, however large and extended they may be, we shall still be disposed to say :

"O for a closer walk with God,  
A higher, holier frame,  
A brighter light upon the road  
That leads me to the Lamb.

Rich blessedness e'en now I know  
 In converse with the Lord ;  
 Soul quickening views are granted me  
 Of Jesus and his word.

But there are lengths and breadths of love  
 My spirit would attain ;  
 Deep things of God that I would search,  
 Heights that I long to gain.

\* \* \* \* \*

So shall my walk be close with God  
 Calm and serene my frame ;  
 And heavenly glory gild the road  
 I journey with the Lamb."

---

ART. VIII.—DOCTRINE AND POLITY OF THE FREE-  
 WILL BAPTISTS.\*

The division of the Protestant Churches into a considerable number of different denominations is often complained of as a scandal and accepted as an element of weakness. The Romish Church boasts of its long continued unity as a proof that it holds all essential truth, that it shares the constant guardianship of God, and that it must be an instrument of controlling power. It points at the schisms and feuds of Protestant Christendom as an evidence that a fatal fall must be awaiting that ecclesiastical house which is so split into factions and divided against itself.

---

\* The following article was originally prepared by request and read before an Association of Ministers, in reply to the question, What are the views and peculiarities of the Freewill Baptists? Though presenting nothing specially new or striking, it was thought by the writer that such a plain and connected statement might not be without profit to the readers of the Quarterly, and it is therefore offered for insertion. We sympathize with that view and cordially give it a place.—ED.

But the changeless unity of a fossil is not the highest kind of unity. It may preserve its form, but it does so at the expense of its life. It is fixed because it has changed to stone. And the outward unity of a Church which is secured and maintained, not by an intelligent inward sympathy, but by external pressure,—by forbidding independent thought,—by prescribing a creed and forcing it down reluctant throats,—by frowning upon inquiry and giving all conscientious dissent a martyrdom,—thus strikes at all genuine life, and defeats the very object for which the Church was built. When a Church becomes a sepulchre to bury souls, instead of a school to quicken and consecrate them, it is to be adjudged a nuisance and abated as soon as possible.

A new denomination often springs up as the fruit of a reaction against ecclesiastical tyranny, or appears as an embodied protest against errors that refuse to yield to milder treatment, or is called into life and action by some neglected truth which can get no adequate expression from the lips of existing teachers, and so it summons forward a new speaker that shall send it ringing through the air, and compel attention to its claims. To one or the other of these causes may be referred every new denomination of history that has made any moral mark in the world, and undertaken the accomplishment of any distinct and needed mission. And until there is moral breadth enough in the life of a single denomination to allow all truly religious thinkers room for study, and all truly religious workers fields for effort; and till there is an appreciative charity that shall both tolerate and welcome all the minor diversities of belief and form that can coëxist with a true Christian spirit, separate religious denominations may be expected to remain and perhaps to multiply; and they may also be looked upon as something better than un-mixed evils. When Lot and Abraham cannot work together without contention, it is better that each settle in his own sphere and spend his strength in agriculture, than that they dwell together and wear out their lives even in honest quarrels. If one cannot triumph through believing with Calvin, let him win his victory by working with Arminius. If the liturgy proves a strait-jacket to an aspiring soul, let him journey calmly upward in meditation with George Fox, or mount the chariot of sponta-

neous fervor with Whitefield and the Wesleys and go speeding to the sun.

In view of what has been said it is easy to infer that the strictly denominational life of the various sects expresses the truth only in part and imperfectly. Each stands chiefly as the symbol of certain truths, or principles, or methods, which others are supposed to ignore or unduly subordinate. Most of them hold the great central truths in common, while the denominational differences often have respect to the less essential characteristics of doctrine and polity. Or the differences may largely result from the different degrees of prominence given to the various elements of denominational life. One exalts a sentiment to the first rank and the controlling position which another puts into a very inferior and unimportant place; and so the results are various. Nitric acid and atmospheric air are composed of about the same elements, but the different methods of mixture give us quite dissimilar products. So religious denominations, appearing radically unlike when seen in their concrete character and life, often differ very little in the elements which enter into them. One has an abundance of oxygen, and so exhibits a powerful and active vitality; another has a larger percentage of azote, and so is passive, speculative and dreamy.

No denominational life can be properly understood, nor its value fairly estimated, until something at least is known of its origin, history and providential mission. It must be seen in its relation to the special necessities which it seeks to meet, to the errors against which it comes forth to wage war, and to the truths which it undertakes to vocalize and exalt. Its special doctrines will be true or false, in the broad sense of those words, in proportion as these doctrines needed a strong and faithful assertion and secured it; and its polity will be really a right one just as far as it wisely organizes Christian sentiment and energy for an effective service in the field where that polity appears. Luther's tenet of justification by faith, which quickened despairing Europe into a hopeful and energetic life, and threw off the oppressive burden of popish ceremonialism, would have been a poor rallying sentiment for a people festering with the vices of a pharisaic antinomianism. Colonial and State Rights might

well be pleaded when George the Third sought to bind down the spirit of American Independence by royal mandates; but every patriot rouses to swell the cry of "National Unity" when the apostles of secession come preaching their desperate and bloody crusade against constitutional liberty. A truth may be so asserted as to make it as mischievous as any lie; and one may glorify a method in such circumstances as render it subversive of all practical good.

The Freewill Baptist denomination should be studied and judged in view of the causes and occasions of its separate development; and its doctrines and polity will not be sure of a fair estimate unless we comprehend their special relation to their sphere and era, as well as their general adaptation to the work of aiding Christianity in its struggle to win the mastery of the world. Only a few words can be said upon either topic, and the limits of this essay will allow almost nothing in the way of setting forth the doctrines and polity themselves in any philosophic form. They are not the result of any careful and studied attempt on the part of the founders of the Body to frame a system of divinity, or to produce an elaborate ecclesiasticism. The theology grew up under the influence of a vital force within, rather than by successive accretions from without. The fathers of the denomination were chiefly occupied in defining, developing and defending the separate truths, rather than in fitting them to each other in a body of doctrine; and the different elements of what is now a well-defined church polity were seen and adopted without any clear apprehension of their logical relations. Necessity stimulated their search: needing a method, they found or invented one. Experience subjected each arrangement to the real test; if it worked well it was retained; if badly, it was abandoned, or modified till it served its purpose. They hardly knew that they were aiding to fashion a body of doctrine or a scheme of polity; they only felt assured that they were bringing out the real teachings of Scripture against its false interpretations, and providing a genuine New Testament Church life for the hearts which could find no true spiritual fellowship in the ecclesiastical bodies around them. They collected the materials; it was left for their successors to classify

and build them into harmonious and goodly structures.— In the main, Freewill Baptists hold views of the nature and attributes of God, of the divine manifestations, of the Scriptures and their authority, of the spiritual world and the future life, not materially different from those generally avowed by other denominations known as evangelical. So far as there are points of divergence, they appear where God and man are brought into moral relations with each other. Though there may not be thorough uniformity in detail among Freewill Baptists, as there cannot be among any considerable number of independent and thinking minds, the following statements are believed to express the settled convictions of the great mass of Freewill Baptists on the points to which they relate.

#### THE FALL OF MAN AND ITS MORAL EFFECTS.

Without attempting to decide how thoroughly literal the account in Genesis respecting the temptation and fall of Adam may be, the Scriptures are held as teaching plainly and unequivocally the fall of the human race from the state of innocence and the fellowship with God which were originally enjoyed. In the ordeal through which every moral being must pass, in order to develop a personal and settled moral character, Adam failed and fell; and with him began the human experience and the mischief of sin, which have swept down the whole course of time and affected the life of the whole race. But it is not believed that, in consequence of Adam's representative character or federal headship, all his posterity sinned in him or with him, or that they share any portion of the guilt or responsibility of his transgression. He sinned for himself, and each and every other human being sins for himself. Nor is it believed that any human being is guilty for any depraved tendencies that may be inherited in consequence of Adam's sin. Strictly speaking none are born sinners, nor are any exposed to the just retribution of God in consequence of the fall of Adam. Real sin and just condemnation pertain to acts of known and voluntary transgression against moral law. Every human being is put, as Adam was, face to face with the law of God on the one side, and the temptation to evil on the other; and so he must individually

decide between good and evil, life and death, God and Satan. Hence, in an important sense, the temptation and fall of man are repeated all through history. Adam's failure did not cheat any of his posterity out of an opportunity for a moral trial, nor bring to them a condemnation before they had made a failure.

True, Adam may have had fewer and weaker inward impulses and outward pressures to evil; and he may also have had more and stronger aids,—inward and outward aids,—to a life of obedience. Standing, too, at the very fountain-head of the stream of life, his obedience or disobedience may have sustained more important moral relations to the race than the obedience or disobedience of any other human being. He struck the first discordant note in the psalm of moral life,—he made the first divergence from the true path,—he gave the first wrong impulse to the human will,—he paid the first act of homage to selfishness which was required by duty,—and so he set in motion the evil forces that now gather about every soul for its overthrow. Sensual appetites, quick and strong passions, active desires that centre in self,—these are now the sad inheritance to which each succeeding century has made a contribution,—this is the increasing burden beneath which souls are so ineffectually summoned to walk upward. Add to this the corresponding stupidity and weakness of the higher powers of the mind that make us conscious of God and bind us to his service, and the moral effects of the fall stand out in rational and impressive clearness.

#### DEPRAVITY.

The fact and the significance of depravity are therefore brought out by the view already stated. But the use of the phrase "total depravity," though susceptible of an explanation that makes it allowable and actually preferred by some Freewill Baptists to any other phrase of similar import, is freely and quite generally objected to, on account of its ambiguity, its false implications, its need of verbose definition, and in view of the extreme and false sentiment of which it so long stood as the symbol. In spite of this hereditary depravity, whatever may be its nature or extent, the Reason and Understanding act legitimately, the Con-

science truly affirms moral obligation, the Social Affections are often unselfish, beautiful and strong; and the whole moral nature consents unto the law of God that it is holy and just and good. It is this comparative mental rectitude, and this remaining moral appreciation of that which is true and right, that render the human soul properly subject to moral law, make transgression a personal fault, and constitute the ground of appeal for the gospel.

#### MORAL AGENCY.

In spite of inward depravity and outward evil, the mind retains the power of free volition, and the ability to determine its own choices. It is not passive and helpless in the direction of good. It is not governed by motives addressed to it, but governs itself in the presence of motives. It is not coerced in any given direction; it chooses its own path freely, through the exercise of a power which made a contrary choice possible. It lacks no essential element of ability to will in the direction of God's claims, and in opposition to the depraved tendencies within itself, and the pressure of evil influences from without.

#### THE ATONEMENT.

But in view of what sin has done in violating the divine law, in depraving the soul; in view of the opposition it has awakened and multiplied and brought to bear against a right way of life, and in view of the personal transgressions of which men become guilty,—there was the most pressing need of some provision for dispensing pardon without robbing moral government of sanctity, of some added gracious influences from God to secure the moral victory and safety of the tempted and perilled soul, and of some method of bringing the assurance of pardon and the inspiration of faith to the guilty and despairing transgressor. This was effected by the work of Christ, who has come to make an atonement, and thus effect a reconciliation between men and God. He does this by furnishing, in his own sacrifice for us, an obvious ground for our faith in God's forgiveness of sin on the condition of our penitence. He thus exalts the holiness of the law which



has been broken,—makes sin appear more grievous while opening the way of forgiveness,—assures us of divine sympathy in all our proper efforts to be right with God,—sets before us the true way of life,—cheers us with promises and restrains us with warnings,—and brings to act on us new and stronger influences to aid and make successful our endeavors to keep pure hearts and live true and dutiful lives.

#### REGENERATION.

Chief among these offices, thus set forth by the service of Christ, is the work of renewing or regenerating the human soul. This consists in the infusion of a new spiritual energy into the soul, under the influence of which the understanding is enlightened to see spiritual things more clearly; the conscience is quickened into a higher and truer activity; the moral affections are roused and animated to find new satisfaction in holy things; the will is aided to exercise itself in stronger and more controlling choices of that which is right; the tendencies to selfishness and sin are mastered, subordinated and relatively weakened; and the inward and outward life is put under the control of religious principle, and swayed by the healthful impulses of Christian affection. But in all this work the soul is not irresponsible and passive, but free and resolutely active. It must take what Christ offers; it must do what Christ directs; it must put away what Christ prohibits; it must believe what Christ says; and it must thoroughly identify itself with the cause which Christ comes to promote. It must work out its salvation while Christ works within the spirit to will and to do according to his good pleasure.

#### SANCTIFICATION.

And the same earnest, practical, resolute, appropriating spirit which is necessary in order that this new life may have a beginning, is equally necessary to its continuance and completion. The true Christian life is always a fight of faith. The new life, though effective and from God, displaces or transforms the elements of the old life, not all at once and completely, but by

steady and gradual service; the spiritual overmasters, transfuses and fashions that which is merely natural, by successive advances, —bringing thought, affection, plan, purpose and effort into willing, grateful and harmonious subjection to the law of Christ. And this process is sanctification, and its end a full redemption.

#### ELECTION, PERSEVERANCE, ETC.

But the question whether Christ shall work this work of regeneration and sanctification in a human soul depends on the free and responsible choice of man, rather than on the arbitrary determination and sovereign election of God. He gives the power to obey him, sends the aiding influences to the soul, earnestly calls upon it to accept and be saved by them, and pledges eternal redemption to all who will receive him as Master and Lord. But he coërces no will in order to give life; leaves no part of the race to perish without sympathy; fashions no souls as simple vessels of wrath doomed to destruction by his decree, and leaves none to such a fate by cordially consenting that they should perish. He would have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. Nor, even in the case of those who really receive an infusion of divine life in regeneration, does God compel a continued obedience, nor secure them against final failure by the work wrought at the beginning. The soul is free after as before regeneration; and nothing but the exercise of the same spirit which won the divine influence at the first, can retain it, or reach the redemption which it comes to secure. However God's approval may have been given to a soul when it entered the true way of life, if it afterward draw back he has no longer pleasure in it. Only they who endure to the end find themselves fully partakers of eternal life.

#### THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Freewill Baptist Church polity differs only in some of its details from that of other Bodies which hold and maintain the principle of Independency, in opposition to Popery, Episcopacy and Presbyterianism. They hold that Churches are companies of Christian disciples, banded together for Christian purposes, with

full power to manage all the interior affairs of the Body, and amenable for its exercise chiefly to Christ. They may not only claim exemption from any foreign dictation, but they are disallowed by Christ to transfer or delegate their responsibility to other hands. They, however, recognize the usefulness of ecclesiastical associations for mutual edification, for promoting purity of doctrine, and adding to their power in carrying forward the objects of the gospel. The ecclesiastical organization is such as to combine the advantages of both Independency and Presbyterianism,—without the isolation which sometimes pertains to the one, and free from the graduated legislation, the friction resulting from a reversal of decisions reached in the lower judicatories, and the subversion of Christian equality, which attend the other. The Quarterly Meeting, Yearly Meeting and General Conference have each their own offices, functions and spheres, and neither needs to trench upon the proper prerogatives of the other. Doing their legitimate work, the thorough independence of the churches remains intact, while the wisest counsels of the highest body are properly appropriated by the members of the feeblest church.

#### CHURCH MEMBERSHIP, ETC.

Actual Christian disciples and believers are alone regarded as proper persons to be admitted to membership in the church. It is freely conceded that the church is a school for the training of souls; but it is claimed that its Great Founder authorized none to be admitted fully as its pupils till they have taken the attitude of learners at his feet. Baptism is held to be the immersion of Christian believers in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Hence, sprinkling and pouring are discarded, as failing to involve the central idea of Baptism; Infant Baptism is rejected, as wholly inadmissible on account of the absence of true Christian faith in the subject; and unconverted children are not admitted to church membership, on the ground of lacking the essential element of discipleship. The point may be thus stated: The practice of sprinkling overlooks the central idea of Baptism; the administration of it to children

virtually abolishes what Christ has instituted as an ordinance ; and the admission of unregenerate persons to the church substitutes a human ecclesiasticism for the New Testament method.

#### FREE COMMUNION.

The Lord's Supper is regularly observed as a divinely appointed ordinance, and is prized for its high spiritual uses. No supernatural nor sacramental claim is set up in its behalf, and it is not regarded as a privilege guaranteed exclusively to the members of the particular church or denomination with which it is celebrated. It is deemed a fitting service for the culture and expression of Christian fellowship, as well as for the quickening of religious affection by recalling, through its symbols, the grace and mercy and condescension and faithfulness of Christ. Hence, all who truly love and are faithfully endeavoring to serve Christ, as his disciples, are usually invited to share in the service. The feast is regarded as having been spread for the whole body of true disciples, and hence they are bidden welcome to the board.

#### THE MINISTRY, ETC.

The ministers of the denomination constitute no independent element of power, and have no organic unity or function. They are members, generally, of the churches to which they minister, and ordinarily preside at the meetings of business ; but they have only a single vote on any question, and no influence beyond that of any other member of the church, except as they may acquire it by superior talent, tact, or character. They are set apart to their work by prayer and the imposition of hands ; and fill their pastorates, through a mutual arrangement to which themselves and the churches are parties ; or occupy themselves in traveling from place to place and preaching the word as evangelists, where opportunities are offered.

#### GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS.

The Freewill Baptist Denomination, as a separate ecclesiastical body, came into existence as a natural and needful reaction from the High Calvinism, the unspiritual ministry, and the cer-

emonial routine of the New England churches, near the close of the last century. Hence, there has ever been a high appreciation of fervor in manner and depth in experience, during the entire period covered by its life. There has also been a strong and general demand for a ministry that undertook the sacred offices and functions from the highest sense of duty to God and to the world. And no single point in theology has been more constantly and earnestly insisted on, than that which asserts man's moral freedom to accept the gospel's offer of salvation, which it is claimed is made in good faith to every human being that hears the message. Human responsibility is asserted always in the strongest and most unequivocal terms, and God is exonerated from the charge of giving over any part of the race to helplessness and a predestinated destruction.

As might readily be inferred, the proper sphere for Christian teaching and principle is regarded as wide as the world. Freewill Baptists have ever insisted that religion was meant to be a practical thing. They have believed eminently in faith and works. A correct creed, a devout Sabbath worship, a scrupulous attention to religious forms, have been regarded as proper, but still incomplete expressions of the Christian life. They have insisted that the law of God was meant for the whole domain of conduct, as well as the truth of God for the whole domain of faith. Hence, they have refused to endorse any civil statute which manifestly contravenes the Decalogue, and have condemned every social institution which puts the Sermon on the Mount out of the way. They have opposed Intemperance as a barrier to the work of the gospel, which calls for purity and self-denial; and they have protested against Slavery as a practical and violent denial of the most sacred rights of the individual soul. They have asserted the legitimate and indefeasible right of Christianity to rule in the market-place as well as in the church, and have pointed out the moral mischief of recklessness in politics as well as of heresy in the pulpit. The doctrine of equality before the law they deduce from the doctrine of equality before God; and Christ's claim to supremacy they interpret as a claim to be the Lord of all human life. And, hence, they have ever been known, so far as known at all, as earnest

to have a true Christian reform go through society, as well as a true Christian experience go through the Church.

The grim theology against which the denomination rose to protest, has greatly relaxed during the present century; the piety which the Freewill Baptist Fathers demanded for the pulpit and carried there, is now generally demanded as a necessity, and generally found; a vital experience, such as they insisted on, is now almost everywhere set above the correct creed which once had the supremacy; and the cry for social and civil reform which they swelled when they had few supporters, is now taken up and echoed all along the line of the Christian host. It may not be immodest for Freewill Baptists to believe that they have really contributed something to produce these changes; and they are sure of having the right to rejoice in what seems to them proofs that truth is mastering error, that moral principle is acknowledged to be the true guide where political expediency once led the nation on the downward road almost unchallenged, and that men are recognizing the awful sanctities of manhood where once they saw only the stamp of merchandise. The great ideas once contended for amid reproach, are now blazoned on the banners of every marshalled host that wins the faith of the people, or marches to a noble victory. It is no time to withdraw confidence, or abate zeal, or fritter away our peculiarities in deference to a false courtesy, or compromise them in the hope of outward gain. Whether or not the denomination may remain and grow to give them a special and fuller embodiment,—we may be certain that whatever in them is valuable and vital will survive all outward changes, give the heart of humanity a higher throb, and aid in bringing in with more haste and glory the final victory of the Messiah.

## ART. IX.—ART IN INSTRUCTION.

In the Chateau de Versailles, as the visitor is led on from one gallery of paintings and sculpture to another, he discovers that he is steadily following the course of French History across the stretch of centuries. Each room comprises a chapter, each group a section, each single piece of art a paragraph. The steadier movements of French life are indicated by a succession of ordinary paintings and sculptures,—portraits of the monarchs, busts of the philosophers, representations of death in the palace or of coronations in the cathedral. When this regular movement is broken up by a revolution, a great battle, or the coming in of a new dynasty, there the artist has put in an imposing picture, which, by its great size, its gorgeous coloring and its suggestive character, at once arrests the attention, impresses the heart, and writes the illuminated story on the memory. These great masterpieces are the successive headlands which the French nation has thrown out upon public observation;—or the cataracts in the stream of its life which compel the traveller to linger and listen and meditate. And in this significant, unique and impressive method Horace Vernet has told the story of France to the peasant who had no time, nor money, nor taste, for ordinary libraries, and imparted new vividness to the impressions on the mind of the most laborious and diligent student.

Now almost precisely what Vernet has done with French History, and done for the ordinary peasant and the hurried traveller, the teacher, in every sphere which he occupies, is set to do with his varied knowledge, and for the various and successive classes of his pupils. The implements used are different, but the aim and the method are almost precisely the same. The painter employs his pigments and brushes; the teacher uses words and vocal expression. Colors are the alphabet of one instructor; tones are chiefly resorted to by the other. But both alike are seeking to embody their inward thoughts, conceptions and emotions. Both are endeavoring to unfold ideas. Both are seeking to present to another mind the image of what is within themselves. And so both are artists, working in the true sphere of art. And as the painter is to be estimated according to the character of

his conceptions and the vividness with which he sets them forth on the canvas, so the teacher is to be judged by the real wealth inherent in his knowledge and ideas, and by the distinctness with which he presents them before his pupils. The teacher must instruct by means of pictures no less than the painter; and his success as an artist is dependent mostly on the same conditions as those which indicate the road along which the student at Florence or Rome must walk to triumph. It is the fruit of study—the ultimate reward of much and long-continued and patient effort. A high aim and the zeal of labor make up its parentage.

Words are pictures of ideas, as a photograph is the picture of a face. And these pictures are always presented to the mind. A word on a printed page carries the image of the idea to the mind through the avenue of sight; a word spoken carries the picture to the mind through the avenue of hearing; but in both cases the idea is hung up at last in the same gallery. Modern printing involves the same principles as the ancient bas-reliefs of Assyria, the rudest inscriptions in the Roman Catacombs, or the still more recent picture-writing of Mexico. The range of representative ideas has been enlarged, the methods have been simplified, and the facilities for rapid execution have been increased; but the same great law underlies the whole.

Nor are the verbal symbols of ideas wholly arbitrary. The thought and the word,—the thing and the representative,—have often marked and obvious correspondences. There is something more than accident in the consent to employ certain words as the significates of certain notions or things. The matter is not wholly explained when we say that men have agreed to employ a given word as the significate of a given thought. There are often reasons,—obvious reasons, too,—why they have thus agreed. And, in multitudes of cases, where the reason is not obvious, we may be sure it existed.

No one can fail to perceive how strikingly such words as the following suggest, and how naturally they would be suggested by, the very objects and mental states which they denote;—viz., *hiss, crash, screech, thunder, drawl, jingle, roar, drum, sing, lullaby, clatter, glide, quick, &c.* The very words themselves, as we hear them pronounced, carry their meaning very largely to the



ear of a foreigner. Nearly all the words employed to denote purely mental states or processes, exhibit, by reference to their original use and etymology, the reason for their present use, and glow with the distinctness of their meaning. So much has been done by recent writers to direct attention to this feature in language that there is little need of dwelling on it. A single and familiar example may be found in the word *educate*, whose etymology and history make it denote the leading out of the various powers of the mind, that were lying latent, concealed and inefficient, to disciplined activity and conquest; just as a military commander takes the untrained citizens of a state, organizes, drills, harmonizes and inspires them, and then marches them to the overthrow of enemies and the deliverance of a groaning state. That simple word *educate* is really such a complete picture of military organization, discipline and conquest. And yet it may be that many teachers have used it a thousand times without making their pupils discover more than the smallest fraction of its meaning, and, indeed, without discovering it themselves. Though it be such a thrilling picture, hanging always before them, they see nothing more than the letters which spell its subject; as a strolling plodder through the galleries of Hampton Court might discover nothing but "Paul preaching at Athens," "Elymas the Sorcerer," &c., against the corresponding numbers on his catalogue, as he stood before the immortal Cartoons of Raffaele. And what is true of this word *educate* is true of a very great portion of the large class of words to which it belongs, used with the same freedom, and yet never brought forth from the mist by study.

Phrases that involve comparison or carry a metaphor often possess a high wealth of picturesqueness, and are full of suggestive power. The development of this wealth, and the employment of this power measure, with considerable accuracy, the genius and eminence of poets. Children,—who are generally poets by instinct,—fill their speech with such picture-making words. The most vivid objects alone impress them, and their verbal pigments are distinguished for their bright colors. With them the objects described are "*white as snow*," "*sweet as honey*," "*red as blood*," "*bright as the sun*," "*big as a house*;" *the pain bites, a cough is*

*naughty, sleepiness is to feel lazy.* How often in after years do we acquire what we call accuracy, at the expense of vividness and force!

Words, then, are simple pictures, or single features in a complex picture, or so many pigments of varying hue which the teacher-artist is to employ in representing his knowledge and ideas to his pupils. True enough, no genuine teacher will, or can, wholly confine himself to mere words in giving instruction. The same word will mean much or little, one thing or another, and awaken variant mental moods in the pupil, according to the tone in which it is spoken. It is said of Channing that he would utter the word *immortality* so as to draw tears from half his audience. Words naturally implying reproof may carry a compliment; and a verbal prohibition is often a mental license. A negative answer is sometimes justly interpreted affirmatively; and a terrible threat now and then lurks in the irony of an apparent permission. And how a teacher's face, lit up with enthusiasm, will make a common sentence overflow with eloquence, and the driest solution in mathematics is delicious with flavored juices when the expounder is on fire with zeal! A mere look will sometimes so reveal the sadness and yearning of a teacher's heart, that the wayward boy whom punishments only made defiant, breaks down in penitence, like Peter beneath the glance of the Messiah. Whatever pictures, or helps to picture, the teacher's spirit to the pupil's apprehension, is an element of influence, and surely contributes to the final result.

From what has been said it is obvious that, other things being equal, the success of a teacher will generally be measured by his power of vivid representation;—always taking it for granted that his pictures are accurate copies rather than striking caricatures. He who thoroughly understands the office of words, and compels them to magnify that office; who perceives their exact and implied meaning, and forever holds them up when and where all their contents will be obvious to his pupils; who reproduces his own ideas with such definiteness of outline and vividness of coloring that every feature is forced upon the notice of the observer;—he will not labor in vain nor spend his strength for naught.

To the question,—How is this power to be gained and exer-

cised? there is room for only the briefest answer; and this even must take, like the rest of this essay, the form of simple hints.

First of all, a teacher needs accurate conceptions. He can clearly portray only what he clearly sees. He can explain only what he really understands. If his own ideas are in the mist, he cannot put them into the bright sunshine for another eye. If he has only half mastered a subject, he will put his pupil in contact with it only to bring him a defeat. If twilight makes the original dusty, the copy-picture will be dark with the shadows of night.

This accuracy and clearness of thought may be somewhat owing to peculiar mental endowment,—to the strength and activity of imagination,—to the training which has been received, and to other circumstances which were determined *ab extra*. But this is by no means the only or the adequate explanation. Some minds consent to abide in a perpetual fog. When the eyes have been opened sufficiently to “see men as trees walking,” there is contentment; and so the healing stops half way to the cure. Every man knows some things thoroughly. And a strong, practical resolution to know whatever is possible in the same way, would scatter the mist from many a half-hidden idea, as a north-western breeze scatters the mists of Newfoundland and uncovers the bold headlands of Cape Race. A natural animation of manner, and an enthusiasm which takes fire with as little friction as phosphorus, are valuable traits, without doubt; but a clear, piercing vision is far better. Indeed such definite conceptions fill manner with animation, and constitute the soil from which a genuine enthusiasm springs.

A ready command of language is certainly of great service. And yet that natural “gift of gab” which so many covet, and to which such marvels are attributed, is a thing rarely found, and when it is, it is apt to be greatly overestimated. The old maxim, that “the orator is born, not made,” as usually interpreted, carries a falsehood with it. The accurate and fitting and skilful use of speech is always a laborious attainment. A man who never waited for a word is a man who takes an immense number of wrong ones. The language of a perpetual talker is

apt to be greatly diluted, or thick only with mud. He who is ready to go off at any time the moment one touches the trigger, will be generally found to be loaded with blank cartridges, or the discharges will be only the rapid explosion of caps. A diarrhœa of words is usually a great affliction, for it wastes all the healthy vigor of thought. A teacher who can talk on the gallop for an hour, on any common topic, usually bewilders his pupil in the forest of verbiage, instead of affording him a clue to the highway. Such a teacher, considered as an artist, is occupying himself much as the painter would be, if he were to catch up the pigments from his palette,—blue, orange, green, purple and vermilion,—and dash them on to his canvas by the handful. The daubs would be abundant, but the pictures wanting.

A recognition of the office of words, as intended to picture accurately the ideas and moods of the mind, and a careful study of their significance and powers, would make any teacher's knowledge available, and render his daily instruction magnetic. Dull eyes would brighten, enthusiasm displace languor, perplexed minds find the way of deliverance, and latent forces come forward for definite work. Teaching would be something more than a routine of recitations, and successive classes would be beckoned to other service than to follow an instructor around the tread-mill. The knowledge which cannot be told is of doubtful value. The thoughts which we have no power to reproduce in pictures are like the dreams which cannot be definitely recalled, and which are beyond the reach of actualization.

Accurate and vivid speech may be gained, and that is always impressive. It is of less consequence how much shall be said, than what shall be said. There is as much danger of too many words as of too few. The orator's pauses are as vital as his vehement words. He makes his silence help him as well as his sonorousness. He must know when to stop as well as when to begin. It is not the amount of paint which the artist puts on which determines the quality of his work. He must use the right colors, and dispose them judiciously. And when he has produced just the right shade for the needed effect, another stroke of his brush would mar or ruin the whole work. And

with such a skill must the teacher-artist paint with words. Can any inherited garrulousness furnish such an ability as this? Can the persistence of patient study wholly fail of attaining it?

It was no small praise which Theodore Parker awarded to Webster, when he said,—“He could make a statement better than any other man in America.” That was rather a doubtful compliment which a plain Christian paid to a commentator, whose exposition of John’s gospel had been recommended to him. Being asked how he liked the volume, he *naively* replied;—“I think I understand John very well; and I hope by and by to be able to understand Dr. ———’s Notes.” And only when a teacher uses his words as so many elements of the picture by means of which he is to put his thoughts into contact with his pupils, will his instruction elucidate instead of ‘mystifying’ the topics with which he deals.

Let the teacher realize that nothing is really done till he has transferred the distinct conceptions of his own mind to the sphere of the pupil’s vision; let him remember that each statement is an artistic effort which can be successful only when the verbal colors are rightly blended and disposed; let him learn to estimate his prospective success by the vividness which he imparts to every representation, and his work will rise in dignity and command new devotion. For his pictures are to constitute the furnishings of that spiritual gallery where the bygone experiences are to look down forever from the walls, and where the life is to be spread out in an illuminated panorama for the inspection of immortal eyes.

## ART. X.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

## CYCLOPÆDIA OF BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE.

Prepared by the Rev. John M'Clintock, D. D., and James Strong, S. T. D.  
Vol. II.—C. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1868. Royal Octavo. pp. 933.

Such a work as has been undertaken by the learned gentlemen whose names appear above, would only mock ambition and disappoint all high expectation, were it not for the fact that the results of all previous study and research have been freely laid under contribution, and that the co-operation of many eminent living scholars has been secured in the preparation of many important articles. We spoke of the general plan adopted, in a notice of the first volume of the work, in terms of high commendation, and of the successful working out of that plan in the first installment with which we had then been favored. An inspection of the second volume confirms, in the main, the views then expressed. It is a noble undertaking. The labor involved is immense. The judgment and skill and patient industry required are of the highest order. A large and minute learning is indispensable to guard against inaccuracies, omissions, redundancies and repetitions. Only a mind that is at once critical and comprehensive, analytical and synthetical, is competent to plan wisely such a work as this,—much less to direct in the details of its execution. It is peculiar in its scope and aim, having its own sphere and limits, and yet entering, in the exercise of a unique eclecticism, many departments of study and literature which it can by no means ignore, but which it does not pretend to exhaust. Where the subject treated is such as to require it, the very latest information that is available is wrought into the article at the last moment before going to press, so that, though the material for nearly the entire work is already prepared, there is a large amount of labor to be still expended in the way of revision and emendation before the successive volumes take their final shape.

As an indication of the extent of the plan, and of the effort made to embody it as completely as possible, we find that the present volume contains nearly 2,500 separate articles, and about 300 wood-cuts for the better illustration of the text. Of course most of the articles are comparatively brief; but more or less of them,—as for example, those found under such heads as Calvin, China, Christ, Christology, Church, Chronology, Congregationalists, Daniel, David, Deluge, Divination, etc., are little less than carefully written and exhaustive treatises. References are also made to the sources whence the information here afforded has been derived, and to such works as will enable the reader to find fuller and more detailed information on the various subjects, should he desire it.

It is not at all likely that this Cyclopædia will or ought to satisfy everybody. It is imperfect, like all human productions. It is not difficult to quarrel with it, and to find a justification for adverse criticism both in

view of what it is and what it is not. The ecclesiastical proclivities for the compilers could be easily guessed by any shrewd Yankee. The prominence given to whatever is specially Methodist is easily discovered even by those who have no real inclination to look for weakness and faults. The special mental and religious culture which distinguishes the editors, crops out when there is no purpose to betray individuality or make an indirect plea for an accepted system. But this does not prevent the work from being eminently able and valuable, nor rob it of real fairness. There is manifestly a steady aim to do exact justice to every sect and subject that is dealt with, and the just grounds of complaint seem to us very few. They who find fault because the work does not sufficiently emphasize the peculiarities of their own sect, are only showing themselves guilty of the same sort of partisanship which they condemn in the editors.—The work is one of great and rare value, and whoever puts it into his library and makes himself master of its contents will find himself truly enriched, and will thank us for any word of ours that prompted him to make it his own.—The original announcement promised us the work complete in six volumes. Possibly it may be condensed within that number, but the fact that two volumes only take us over four letters of the alphabet, hardly looks like it.—Whether six or ten volumes are filled, we trust that the plan adopted will be fully and fairly worked out.

**HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR.** By John William Draper, M. D., LL. D., author of "A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe," etc. In three volumes. Vol. II. Containing the events from the inauguration of President Lincoln to the Proclamation of Emancipation of the slaves. New York: Harper & Bros. 1868. Octavo. pp. 614.

In the first volume of this work Dr. Draper seems to have completed the task of stating his peculiar theories of national life in general, and of our own national life in particular. These theories are nearly the same as those which have become so closely associated with the name of Mr. Buckle, and aim to expound human life, character and history by reference to climatic conditions and physiological laws. In the present volume he devotes himself to the legitimate work of the chronicler and the historian, and has given us an excellent, straightforward, vigorous, instructive and trustworthy account of the operations in the cabinet and the field during two memorable years in our history. He writes out of the most abundant and detailed information, and in a style the eminent merits of which not even his severest critic will hardly venture to dispute. The publishers have given to the work the very highest and most substantial mechanical excellences.

**THE POEMS OF JOHN GODFREY SAXE.** Complete in one volume. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1868. 16mo. pp. 465.

Mr. Saxe is a pleasant and popular poet even if he be not a great one. His wit is always juicy, his humor is rotund and broad-faced even when

it is quiet and subtle, his feeling toward the world is manifestly a kind and charitable one even when he is lashing its vices at the cart-tail and putting its follies into the pillory, and when his song is not winged for a lofty flight, and has less sweetness and majesty than some other strains that keep the air tremulous, one can readily perceive that it was born in the heart, and it is sure to win both a hearing and sympathy. He has written many beautiful and some really meritorious poems, and the publishers have done an admirable service in putting them all together in this volume, which is rich in appearance without being extravagant in cost, and delicate without daintiness. It will pay for every lover of poetry to buy and read it.

**THE NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY.** With an Introduction, connecting the history of the Old and New Testaments. Edited by Wm. Smith, D.D. With maps and wood-cuts. New York: Harper & Bros. 1868. 12mo. pp. 780.

The series of volumes issued by these publishers under the general title of "The Student's Histories," is unsurpassed in its way by anything that has appeared elsewhere. They are for the most part admirable epitomes of larger works, and the condensation and arrangement have uniformly exhibited no ordinary evidences of skill and good judgment. Among them all, nothing can be found better adapted to render a high service, both as a text-book and a volume for reading and frequent reference, than this compilation, intended to afford a view of the substance of what research and criticism have accomplished in one of the most interesting and important departments of modern study. Dr. Smith is well known as one of the most learned and critical scholars in every department of sacred literature, and his various contributions have possessed such a high value that his name attached to any publication is accepted as a reliable guarantee of its worth. He is eminent both as an authority and a critic. He is exhaustive when he elaborates and eminently satisfying when he epitomizes.

The chief merit of this volume is not at all in its absolute originality. It is not a fresh treatise but a well prepared compendium. It embodies the best results of much study, and the works of many eminent scholars have been laid under contribution that it might be full enough for ordinary purposes. It is the quintessence of a considerable library, and the plan and arrangement adopted in its preparation, the numerous tables and ample index render its contents readily available. As a text-book in our higher institutions of learning it would have no rival, and as a hand-book for use in the study it must prove really serviceable. The first 175 pages are devoted to the same general object as the great work of Prideaux. It presents the connection of the Old and New Testament histories, and the secular history of the Jews from the time of rebuilding the temple under Nehemiah to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans under Titus. In an appendix there are essays upon the several branches of the Jewish people, the Jewish Scriptures, the Synagogue,



and the various sects of the Jews. The second book gives us a connected history of Jesus Christ, followed by an essay on the Four Gospels, and a table setting forth their harmony. Book III. is devoted to the history of the Apostles, and the founding of the Christian church, in which we have in a condensed form whatever is known respecting the lives and labors of those men, aside from what is found in the narrative of Luke and the allusions in the epistles. Two Appendixes deal with the books of the New Testament, discuss the canon and present the testimony in support of its fulness and accuracy; and several chronological tables of New Testament history connect the leading events of the sacred record with those of the secular and civil powers that were closely related to the life of the Jews and the early church.

We heartily commend the volume as one of real merit without pretension, pleasant and plain, in a style that never offends good taste, rationally calm but truly reverent, ample in instruction without a tinge of pedantry, and calculated at once to inform the student's understanding and confirm the disciple's faith.

**NOTES, CRITICAL, EXPLANATORY AND PRACTICAL, ON THE BOOK OF PSALMS.**

By Albert Barnes, author of "Notes on the New Testament," etc., etc. In three volumes. Vol. I. New York: Harper & Bros. 1868. 12mo. pp. 374.

The general characteristics of Mr. Barnes's Notes on the Scriptures are too well known to require any detailed statement. Though not always thorough, sometimes jumping the real difficulties and spending too many words on what is easily understood, yet he is always manly and wholesome. He may almost be said to have introduced a new era of Scriptural exposition with the preparation of his Notes on the New Testament. He struck a happy medium between the learned, critical and scholarly commentary and the superficial expositions and devotional aids which had previously appeared. For ordinary use in the family and Bible Class, they have proved, on the whole, thoroughly acceptable on both sides of the Atlantic, they have been multiplied in foreign tongues, and have done not the least important part of their work in prompting many other eminent scholars to enter the same field. He announces in the Preface that this is his final effort as an expositor. Increasing age and infirmity, and especially the failure of his vision, will not allow the further prosecution of a work which wonderfully illustrates what may be done in the course of years by an early riser and a laborious student, who uses the ante-breakfast hours according to system, and lays the Christian world under many and great obligations.

Mr. Barnes shows in this latest of his works, that he has kept himself familiar with the accumulating results of Biblical criticism, and that ability grows by use. His Notes on the Psalms indicate a skill and vigor as an expositor that his comments upon Matthew fail to exhibit. He is broader, deeper, richer,—ministering more abundantly to the understanding and more gratefully to the heart. His Introduction is con-

cise and plain, but suggestive and valuable; so are the accounts given of each Psalm in order to embody the most of what information has been gathered by the research of scholars and the inquiries of critics. The authorship, dates, and the general character of these compositions are concisely set forth, and the main discussion is devoted to the imprecations found in the Psalms,—a topic which has called out much inquiry and controversy, and which Mr. Barnes has here dealt with in a manner that will not fail to interest inquirers and relieve more or less minds from perplexity. This last of the author's work will be welcomed with general satisfaction and will be sure to meet an extensive demand. The mechanical features of this volume are decidedly superior to those which appeared in the Notes on the New Testament—a fact we are glad to announce.

**NEW POEMS:** By Owen Meredith. In two volumes. *Chronicles and Characters, Orval, and other Poems.* Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1868. 16mo. pp. 507, 518.

Owen Meredith, as Lord Lytton chooses to call himself, is a laborious, cultivated and artistic *litterateur*, and a poet of unquestionable genius. Though having neither the fire nor the grace, neither the majesty nor the sweetness, which appear in the verse of some other bards, yet he has neither mistaken nor belittled the function of the poet. No man capable of writing *Lucile* will be likely to sing feebly, or vex the air with ambitious discord, or prostitute his muse to any ignoble purpose.

In these two beautiful volumes, which embody the exquisite but masculine taste of these well-known publishers, Owen Meredith has given us something unique and noticeable. It is a series of representations, in numerous short and independent poems,—which are nevertheless so many sections in a great panorama,—that set forth the human being and race, as successively seen in history, fable, art, philosophy, religion and science. The salient points of human character are grasped as they come out in their successive and more striking developments, and the poet is afforded an opportunity to scatter his theories and comments among his pictures. Much digested learning, critical thought and genial philosophy appear on these pages. The volumes embody the work of seven busy and laborious years; and while they contain many simple and pleasant things which even a hasty reader will both comprehend and appreciate, yet nothing but time and study and reflection will put one in full possession of what he is here bidden to take as freely as he will and can.

**WHERE IS THE CITY?** Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1868. 12mo. pp. 349.

A title-page to provoke curiosity, a book to win and hold attention, a series of denominational portraits which will probably be more satisfactory abroad than at home, and a conclusion which many will think would have been more properly put into the Preface than on the last page, since

the whole argument of the book was so manifestly shaped with a view of justifying it. A young man, Israel Knight, reads in one of the prophets of a city whose name is, "*The Lord is there*;"—he infers that this means a church on earth, and so he makes a tour among nine different denominations, whose theology and spirit he sets himself to describe. He is unable to unite with any one of them, though finding good things in them all, and so decides to remain outside, keeping a charitable spirit and promising himself to recognize and commend every true worker among them, and be a brother to all the saints that may be developed in these rather badly regulated religious households. It is only just to say that Israel is rather a nice sort of young man, that he means to be fair even when he exaggerates and fails, that he shows a kind spirit even when he yields to the temptation to be satirical or patronizing; and while the egotism of the book appears on almost every page, it is never allowed to be haughty and offensive, but is genial and juicy even when it is transparent and mischievous. The volume is, however, very readable and interesting; it may perhaps do something to promote charity among different denominations; but it seems to us quite as likely to nurture an easy indifference to the great things which are vital to human welfare.

**THE HISTORY OF NAPOLEON III. EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH.** Including a brief narrative of all the most important events which have occurred in Europe since the fall of Napoleon I. until the present time. By John S. C. Abbott, author of "*History of Napoleon I.*," etc. With Illustrations. Boston: B. B. Russell & Co. 1868. Royal Octavo. pp. 690.

Mr. Abbott is a voluminous writer, always pleasant but never profound, with a style at once easy and picturesque even when the reach after effect is obvious, and the reader is compelled to believe that the pictures are overdrawn. His admiration of the Bonapartes is well known, and so nobody is disappointed to find him challenging the general verdict of the civilized world in his portraiture of the present Emperor of France, and hanging him all over with garlands of panegyric. An American democrat, he sees in Louis Napoleon a champion of the rights of the people. A Protestant clergyman, he kindles over the guardianship which French bayonets have been compelled to yield the Papacy when the Italian people had become weary of its burden and disgusted with its immoralities. A professed hater of ambitious aspirants who seek and perpetuate personal power by intrigue and at the expense of justice, he says the famous Coup d'Etat of December 2d was "a sublime deed, sublimely performed," and predicts that "it will be pronounced by history to be the most brilliant and meritorious act of his life." Indeed the Emperor is held up as a model ruler and almost the ideal man actualized; this so called history would be better termed a eulogy, and what is most thoroughly Napoleonic gets the most extravagant praise. This ought to disappoint nobody, for the antecedents of this book clearly foretold its character. Years since the author became the clerical whitewasher of the whole

Napoleonic dynasty, and his love for his occupation seems to grow upon him with his years.

So much must in justice be said of the author and of his new volume. But there is no need of disguising the fact that he has here given us a book full of interesting information, compiled with labor and care, arranged with real skill, and served up in a way that is eminently entertaining. It is a book that will be read with more than the ordinary interest, and, while many important facts are kept in the background or wholly suppressed, and the reader is treated to panegyric and partisan comment quite too freely, he will find himself in a position to comprehend much of the life of France during the last fifty years that had been difficult to explain. The publisher has done his part of the work very creditably. The book is beautiful to the eye,—the type, paper and illustrations being all that could reasonably be asked for. Sold by subscription.

**THE SCIENTIFIC BASIS OF EDUCATION;** demonstrated by an analysis of temperaments and of Phrenological facts, in connection with mental phenomena and the office of the Holy Spirit in the processes of the mind: In a series of Letters to the Department of Public Instruction in the city of New York. Second Edition. By John Hecker. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1868. Octavo. pp. 227.

It is a significant title which has been chosen for this volume. It does not simply call attention to the need of a scientific basis for education, nor merely indicate where and how such a basis may be formed; but it brings forward what is termed *the* scientific basis, as though it were here and nowhere else—this and no other;—as though the alternative were to adopt the theory and method of Mr. Hecker or go on without any rational system at all,—striking at random and meeting more of failure than of success.

But putting aside the assumption which thus meets one at the very threshold of the volume, and looking fairly at the facts and the theory from which the treatise springs, one finds much that deserves attention, Mr. Hecker has carefully studied his subject, he is a man of keen observation, of somewhat logical habit, independent and yet deferential, intensely strong in his convictions yet still waiting for more light, full of enthusiasm and faith, though having a reason for every opinion which he advances. He confesses his great obligations to Gall and Spurzheim, accepts in the main the classification of faculties brought forward by Phrenology and uses much of its nomenclature, pleads for special divine influences as required by the human mind to give a real royalty to the spiritual nature, and makes as much of the doctrine of moral freedom and of the work of the Holy Spirit in the soul as any evangelical Arminian could desire. The chief value of the book is found in the views presented respecting the different temperaments that mark children and pupils, and the need of classifying and training them in our schools in accordance with the temperamental peculiarities and requirements. The information imparted on this point is often very clear, fresh and inter-

esting, and the suggestions made deserve special attention. Teachers have much to learn on this point, and the work of the school-room would be better and more efficiently done if the knowledge which Mr. Hecker has presented on this subject were possessed and used. The volume is well worthy of a careful reading, and will not fail to stimulate inquiry and put it upon promising lines of thought.

Like most other men who believe themselves to have struck out a new scientific theory, our author makes a hobby of his scheme of education and drives it quite beyond its proper domain. He imagines that he has found the solution of the great problems which the Christian Church has been so long struggling to solve. He has his explanation of conversion, furnished by his theory of the human mind and the classification of its functions; he undertakes to point out the essential features and the actual and radical defects in the church as an organization, and proceeds to assure us that if it were constituted in harmony with this scientific basis, it would speedily grow up into spiritual majesty and regenerate our social life. On this topic he writes with great confidence, but he is often as weak, indefinite and fanciful as he is oracular. His meaning is frequently doubtful, and when it is obvious, he often provokes a start and a smile of surprise by the crudity and superficiality which mark it. Thus he says,—“In order to possess the powers which Christ authorized his Church to exercise, his disciples should be united in households of twelve, in the internal subjective unity of the spirit, and that thus united, they should receive the external objective authority to teach, which should properly be derived through the most legitimate order of succession from the apostles whom he commissioned.” That sounds more like a faint and confused echo of Swedenborg than like the vigorous and matured statement of an instructed scientific Christian. Bating such extravagant pretensions as this, and separating the illegitimate from the authorized suggestions which the author's facts are made to offer, the book may be read with real profit and set down as a fresh and genuine contribution to our educational literature.

WHAT ANSWER? By Anna E. Dickinson. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1868. 12mo. pp, 301.

Miss Dickinson is well and favorably known on the platform. Her strong grasp upon plain moral principles, her fervid heart, her fine womanly tact in dealing with her audiences, her effective use of touching incident and incisive epigram, her ability to stir passion with her biting words of scorn, her power to kindle a really noble enthusiasm when she pictures the unselfish and the heroic in life,—all these elements of power are brought into free and effective play when she appears as a lecturer, and stands face to face with the sympathetic multitude which her fame has drawn. Her reputation as a speaker will create a strong and general demand for her first venture in the career of authorship.—“What Answer?” will be read; and the readers will own the power and genius

of the writer. It is a book that stirs the blood even in a phlegmatic nature, and it will temporarily thaw out the soul even of the iciest conservative who still manages to keep a conscience, and whose moral nerves are not hopelessly smitten with paralysis. As a protest against the prejudice that still basely and proudly discriminates against men and women because they happen to have a taint of African blood, it is skilful, noble, earnest, pungent, and occasionally almost terrible. It has logic, pathos, fire, and, at times, something akin to fury. There is genius in the book, and of not a low sort either; and every page shows that an intense moral purpose lies behind the attempt at artistic execution. On its literary side it has genuine merits and obvious faults. The writer is often too intense, artificial, jerky, explosive, abrupt, and apparently impatient of the labor that alone gives completeness and finish. She runs, in a few instances, near the verge of the forcible-feeble. She deals very largely in the exceptional and high-wrought. Her colloquies are sometimes too evidently manufactured to order, her incidents occasionally come in where they are only in response to much forcible dragging, and her characters,—in spite of her disclaimers at the end,—are somewhat in danger of being thought of as caricatures.—But we are grateful for the book as it is. It aims to do a much needed work, and will aid in it. It deserves to be read in all sections of the country, and it will be. It speaks to the heart of the American people, and it will evoke a reply. It assures us of yet better things than itself from the young prophetess whose lips Freedom has touched and whose pen Justice is guiding, and they will be likely to hasten and not wait.

THE NEW ENGLAND TRAGEDIES. By Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. I. John Endicott. II. Giles Corey of the Salem Farms. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1868. 16mo. pp. 179.

Longfellow is so great a favorite that his name on the title-page of any volume of poems will guarantee purchasers, and he has so much of true poetic genius, and so fine a capacity for rhythmic melody, that he cannot well write, even in carelessness and on unfitting themes, without putting beauty into his images and sweetness into his verse. This new volume of his illustrates all these statements. But it is well for his fame that it does not rest on this production, and such as this. It does him little justice in any respect, unless it be in setting forth the fine and genial and tender humanity that distinguishes him. He hardly appreciates the elements of genuine excellence that were inwrought into the Puritan character, and which abode through all the stern developments and grievous excesses in the name of religion that at times disturbed its harmony and made it appear unlovely on the surface; and he has written not a little here that rather unpleasantly illustrates the meaning of the statement,—“Homer sometimes nods.” The poems do merit a reading, and have some beautiful and admirable things; but as a whole they will hardly serve to set off the brilliance of Mr. Longfellow's genius.

AK











NOV - 5 1943



(NOV - 9 1971)



