



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/>



3 3433 06912991 8

Freev

THE
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

REV. WILLIAM H. BOWEN, EDITOR.

v. 17



Truth and Progress.



UNIVERSITY
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

DOVER:
FREEWILL BAPTIST PRINTING ESTABLISHMENT.
MDCCLXIX.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
571634
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
R 1912 L

NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

INDEX—PRINCIPAL PAPERS.

Ancient Christianity and Ritualism, - - - - -	1
Quakers and the Early Baptists. By Rev. Charles H. Malcom, Newport, R. I., - - - - -	17
Jesus Christ. By Rev. A. K. Moulton, Concord, N. H., - -	28
United Netherlands, - - - - -	59
Method in Study. By James A. Howe, Olneyville, R. I., -	84
True Manhood. By Rev. G. T. Day, D. D., Dover, N. H., -	109
Struggles for Soul-Liberty. By Rev. Charles H. Malcom, New- port, R. I., - - - - -	126
Rationalism, - - - - -	131
Recognition in the Future State. By Rev. W. Hurlin, Antrim, N. H., - - - - -	157
Bunhill Fields. By Hezekiah Butterworth, Warren, R. I., - -	165
Jesus Christ. By Rev. A. K. Moulton, Concord, N. H., - -	170
Dr. Shepard's Sermons, - - - - -	204
The Divine Prerogative to Save and Destroy. By Rev. J. M. Bal- ley, D. D., Saco, Me., - - - - -	229
The First Resurrection. By S. D. Church, Brunswick, Me., -	239
Christ's Exaltation and Universal Drawing, - - - - -	250
Rationalism, - - - - -	259
The Doctrine of God's Special Providence. By Rev. S. E. Root, Gardiner, Me., - - - - -	279
Christianity a Mission Work. By Rev. I. D. Stewart, Dover, N. H.,	288
The Doctrines of Paul and James on Faith and Works, Compared with the Teachings of Christ, - - - - -	296
God's Way of Salvation. By Rev. A. H. Heath, Auburn, Me.,	306
Impediments to Self-knowledge. By Rev. J. M. Brewster, Dover, N. H., - - - - -	319
Sketches of Life and Labor in India. By Rev. James L. Phillips, Midnapore, India, - - - - -	337
Special Providence and Free Moral Agency not Incompatible. By Rev. S. E. Root, Gardiner, Me., - - - - -	361
The Disestablishment of the Irish Church. By Rev. W. Hur- lin, Antrim, N. H., - - - - -	372
Lessons from the Temptations of Christ. By _____, -	400
The Religious Condition of France from the Revolution of 1789 to the Present Time, - - - - -	408
The Office and Work of the Christian Ministry, - - - - -	431
The Renaissance and the Reformation. Translation, by Rev. B. F. Hayes, Lewiston, Me., - - - - -	447

INDEX.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

NUMBER 1.

1. The Law of Love and Love as a Law, p. 96. 2. An Introduction to the Study of English Literature, p. 97. 3. Passages from the American Note-Books of Nathaniel Hawthorne, p. 98. 4. The Gates Ajar, p. 99. 5. Recollections of a Busy Life, p. 100. 6. The Book of Genesis, p. 101. 7. Her Majesty's Tower, p. 101. 8. The Day-dawn and the Rain, p. 102. 9. Pre-Historic Nations, p. 103. 10. Sermons by Henry Ward Beecher, p. 105. 11. Under the Willows, p. 106. 12. Rural Poems, p. 106. 13. Close Communion, or Open Communion, p. 107. 14. Reminiscences of European Travel, p. 107. 15. Annual of Scientific Discovery, p. 108.

NUMBER 2.

1. Biographical Sketches, p. 217. 2. My Recollections of Lord Byron, 218. 3. The Evidences of Christianity, p. 219. 4. Sermons on the Failure of Protestantism, p. 220. 5. Isaiah, p. 222. 6. Religion and the Reign of Terror, p. 223. 7. Popular Commentary, p. 224. 8. Tobacco and Alcohol, p. 225. 9. Arctic Explorations, p. 226. 10. Jesus of Nazareth, p. 226. 11. Lectures on the First and Second Epistles of Peter, p. 227.

NUMBER 3.

1. The Old Testament History, p. 327. 2. Foreign Missions, p. 327. 3. Hymns of the Church, p. 328. 4. Oldtown Folks, p. 329. 5. Men, Women, and Ghosts, p. 330. 6. The Gates Wide Open, p. 330. 7. The Brawnville Papers, p. 331. 8. God's Thoughts fit Bread for Children, p. 332. 9. Sabrina Hackett, p. 332. 10. The Pearl of Parables, p. 333. 11. Seeds and Sheaves, p. 333. 12. The Dogmatic Faith, p. 334. 13. Woman's Suffrage, p. 335.

NUMBER 4.

1. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 466. 2. Sermons, p. 467. 3. Saint Paul, p. 468. 4. The Character, Claims and Practical Workings of Freemasonry, p. 470. 5. The Secret of Swedenborg, p. 471. 6. Diary Reminiscences, and Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson, p. 472. 7. Bible Illustrations, p. 473. 8. The Polar World, p. 474. 9. Mental Philosophy, p. 474. 10. Songs for Christian Worship, p. 475. 11. The Mount Zion Collection of Sacred and Secular Music, p. 475. 12. Sabbath Carols, p. 475.

THE
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

No. LXV. JANUARY, 1869.

ARTICLE 1 —ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY & RITUALISM.*

BY REV. W. H. BOWEN, OLNEYVILLE, R. I.

About forty years ago prominent parties in the communion of the English church began to develop strong proclivities toward the Roman Catholic church. Their opinions found chief expression in the "Oxford Tracts for the Times." No more skillful or formidable opponent entered the lists against them than that profound scholar and accomplished author, Isaac Taylor. In the attempt to tear away the disguises and show the baleful tendencies of the doctrines of these tracts, his deductions were made with such certainty that the present developments of Puseyism and ritualism prove him to have been a far-seeing prophet. We shall follow his thought with special interest and profit in its bearings upon important religious developments of to-day.

A tendency early manifested itself in the ancient church, to explain the Scriptures by the aid of philosophy. The Gnostics, as they are called who insisted upon and developed this method, tore asunder the divine and the human, the contemplative and

* ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY AND THE DOCTRINES OF THE OXFORD TRACTS FOR THE TIMES; by Isaac Taylor, London. 1839—1841.

the practical in religion, and ran into strange speculations, departing from the spirit and life of the Gospel. By fair and by foul means this heresy was, in its outward form, rooted up, but its seeds had been deeply implanted in the life of the church. In principle it still survived. This with a growing polytheism in ritual, make up the bastard religion of the middle ages—popery. While the modern Protestant churches have shaken off the grosser elements of this superstition, and have rejected the polytheism of popery, they have not wholly driven from their doctrines and practices the more refined element, the gnosticism of popery.

This element worked under many forms and spread over many centuries, progressing from East to West like a pestilence, bringing spiritual death wherever it went, from the Ganges to the Atlantic. We think of this ancient heresy as a trivial thing, led on by the manner of those books which speak of it a “mass of puerile absurdities; or a mere jargon, saved from contempt only by that daring impiety of the language which excites our resentment.” But the facts are not so. Were it really this and no more it never could have gathered to itself and fascinated the intellectual masses of the ancient world which were led on by as vigorous minds as have ever figured in philosophy. It captivated the meditative, the daring, and the pensive, as it taught them to tread lofty heights untrammelled by the restraints of reason. It compromised the moral attributes of God by refining his natural attributes; it was satisfied when it had fashioned a deity allied to the imagination, but not to the conscience.

As the several centuries passed on, constant variations gave a new aspect to the system almost every year, but its main characteristics and impulses remain the same. It expressed an agonizing desire either to solve or dismiss the problem of moral and natural evil, as disturbing the government of God. So, impelled by this spirit, Manicheism, the last and ripened form of Gnosticism, sprang forth, teaching that there is a personal, independent and eternal evil principle, waging an interminable war with the good. This extensive and powerful influence of Gnosticism upon the ancient church, solves the enigmas of church his-

tory and affords a key to the difficulties which at the present moment are distracting so many minds. Its essence was this: that the visible world with its discords, its things perishable, corruptible and hostile,—man degenerate and wretched,—was altogether unworthy of him whom they called “the Father unknown;” that this world is under the control of inferior and imperfect beings, ruling it with disastrous hand; but though so ruled, man, by steadily pursuing his better destiny, shall at length, and after long periods of trial and purgation, merge his being forever in the boundless ocean of light and life. By this teaching, the only opposite to the divine perfection was the finite and corruptible material world, of which one of the mere accidents was moral disorder, or sin. Man was told to extricate himself from so sad a condition, from his accident, by lofty contemplations and profound mental abstractions. The leaven has permeated society to the present day and marks our modern thinking.

“But Gnosticism had its Avater, its Christos and Logos, who was sent down to the earth by the Unknown Father to oppose the spirit of evil and lead the purer minds to their original place in the intellectual system. It had no vicarious Saviour, no Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world, no propitiatory death upon the cross; its Christos did not suffer when the man, Jesus, was crucified by Pilate. It had no such Saviour, nor wanted one.” All that prevented the spirit from happiness was its connection with matter; once freed from such a gross connection, and sin, its mere accident, would cease.

The church is still proving how fascinating those errors are that spring up in place of a truly devout waiting upon God. The mind deceives itself by asking the most plausible question: “Why may not we aspire to a higher level than the mere avoidance of sin, to the serene piety of seraphs? Why not attempt to reach something higher even than the outline of virtue which God has sketched for us?” But the history of the heart proves this desired seraphic piety to be no piety at all, but only a false pietism, a substitution of false principles for the motives of genuine virtue. That unearthly holiness which the church, at an

early period, ardently sought was not Christian holiness, which is to be gained by the growth of that virtue which separates the soul more and more from vice. That earthly ambition to change or neglect the first principles of religion is full of impiety and fraught with fearful danger. The endeavor to elevate or rectify Christianity deranges everything in its substitution of one principle for another.

If, instead of putting the doctrine of pardon and reconciliation foremost, as the source and cause of genuine religious feeling and real virtue, we put an ill-digested, half-philosophic, half-hindoo, notion of sanctity foremost, and if we bend our endeavors to it, as the main object, then, whatever profession we may make of faith in Christ, our motives will have none of the vitality nor the force of holiness. The sun is not indeed driven from the heavens, in such a system, but it is eclipsed; and the Christian, for such we must still call him, droops, becomes pallid, gloomy, superstitious, timid, punctilious; a trembling attendant upon rites, a perfunctory practitioner of ceremonies—fretting, fasting, upbraiding himself, impatient of earth, afraid to hope for heaven, and feeling like the dyspeptic patient who, in his troubled dreams, thinks himself to be laboring to mount a ladder, and yet, with all his painful efforts, not rising an inch from the ground. Such is the sad condition of those in whose spiritual perspective the truths which should occupy the foreground are seen in the distance; they are indeed seen, but it is “afar off, and as a cold glimmer.”

The Saviour may not really be thrust out from the temple in such a system, but he is put aside, while to the credulous multitude is shown the temple itself, its embroideries, its gildings, its surpliced ministry and its gorgeous imposing rites. The visible obscures all thought of the invisible, and hides all valuable help from the soul. The Master of Israel is imprisoned in the creeds and liturgies of the church.

“In entering the gorgeous edifice of the ancient church, one’s feelings are very much such as might belong to a descent into some stalactite cavern, the sad magnificence of which is never cheered by the beams of heaven; for there is no noon, there is no summer.

The wonders of the place must be seen by the glare of artificial light, which confounds objects as much as reveals them, and which fills the place more with fumes than with any genial influence. In this dim theatre, forms stand out as if a senate of divinities had here assembled; but approach them—all is hard, cold, silent. Drops are distilling from the vault; and every stony icicle that glistens in the light seems as if endued with penitence, or as if contrition were the very temper of the place; but do these drops fertilize the ground on which they fall? No, they do but trickle for a moment, and then add stone to stone—chill to chill. Does the involuntary exclamation break from the bosom in such a place—‘Surely this is the very gate of heaven!’ Rather one shudders with the apprehension that one is entering the shadows of the valley of death; and that the only safety is in a quick return to the upper world.”

It is a heart-stirring preaching of Christ that we need, rather than a dialectic and partisan orthodoxy, or a mystification of the sacraments and senseless forms in worship. The one warms and saves, the other chills as if we took the hand of a corpse. Sacraments come to be looked upon as remedial when the heart of religion is dying out, and these are distributed by the hand of the priest as if they were potent drugs to expel from the soul the poison of sin. For what did Paul traverse sea and land, enduring hardships and trials without number? Was it to impart the sacraments, and give men the right forms, the paraphernalia of religion; to appoint men who should dispense these to a sin-stricken world? Let those who plead the customs and teachings of the ancient fathers in justification of any modern obliquity of practice or doctrine, examine well the tendency and meaning of the following teaching by no less an authority and standard than Chrysostom, in his two exhortations addressed to candidates for baptism: “Although a man should be foul with every vice, the blackest that can be named, yet should he fall into the baptismal pool, he ascends from the divine waters, purer than the beams of noon.” He adds: “They who approach the baptismal font, are not only made clean from all wickedness, but holy also, and just.” Where, “O golden mouth,” is justifica-

tion by faith? we are constrained to cry, as our hearts declare "this is the way to Rome."

We have volumes of extracts from the Fathers where none of these absurdities and corruptions appear, and all seem delightful and sweet, so that the mention of the name Chrysostom is, to the superficial student in church history, one of authority and peculiar splendor. It is easy, by a series of artfully selected quotations, to give the speech of Chrysostom the clear ring of Luther's preaching or the correctness of Calvin. But let Chrysostom appear in all his guises, let him have representation on all occasions, and the illusion is dispelled. He says: "As a spark thrown into the ocean is instantly extinguished, so is all human sin extinguished more readily than that spark, when a man is thrown into the laver of regeneration; nay, he comes forth another man." Study the most evangelical and unexceptionable of the Fathers, and there will be need to hold their expositions for what they are worth after the author's sense of the phrases he employs has been ascertained from himself. The rite, in the instance above, is made most clearly to take the place of the spiritual reality and of the Saviour.

The Nicene system was precisely what popery has always been—a religion of sacraments. We see it in the style and doctrine of Ambrose, as he passionately pleads with God for the soul of Valentinian, who had died uninitiated, unregenerate, unjustified,—that is unbaptized. We find it in Gregory Nyssen, "between whose Christianity and popery, the distinction, if any, is of the nicest kind—hard to catch and harder to keep one's hold of."

But why may we not have a religion of church mysteries, a religion of sacraments, and at the same time exalt the spiritual in religion? The human mind is of such a nature that it continually seeks to adopt the ritual for the spiritual in religion; it cannot keep them on the same level; they were not made to dwell in equipoise. The Scriptures nowhere are inclined to give form the place of equality with spirit, to raise the shadow—the mystical—to a like position with the living substance. As a matter of history we find the ritualistic tendency, when once

adopted, crowding out the spiritual until the latter disappears almost wholly; its poisonous growth has blasted every fair plant and wasted all the field of healthful life. Formality and the grossest superstition follow closely upon the incoming of the ritual element. When we look for the symptoms of decline and change in the church, we find it in an increase of the tendency to adopt the forms and ceremonies which the natural heart would introduce, rather than the living power of the gospel. When over the temples of the Redeemer "Ichabod" has been written, it has been over a mass of formalities and idle, delusive rites.

The powerful mind of Chrysostom labored in vain to establish an equipoise between these two,—the spiritual and ritual elements in religion. "How does he toil and pant in this bootless task! Personally too much alive to the spiritual and vital reality of the Christian scheme to be quietly willing, like most of his contemporaries, to let it subside and totally disappear; and yet far too deeply imbued with, at once, the gnostic and brahminical feeling, and too intimately compromised, as a public person, with the church doctrines of his times, he could never rest as did others; but was ever tossing from side to side, like one borne helplessly on by an impetuous tide through a narrow and winding Hellespont;—now thrown upon the steep Asiatic shore, and now, as by a sudden eddy, carried right athwart the current toward the European shallows. Few great writers offer so little repose as Chrysostom; few present contrasts so violent. Scarcely is there a homily all of a piece; hardly are there two consecutive passages that can be read without a surprise amounting to a painful perplexity, until the secret of all this contrariety is understood; and then it becomes manifest enough that, within the writer's soul, a spiritual Christianity, which *should* have been uppermost, was ever wrestling with church doctrines and gnostic sentiments, which *would* be uppermost. From no one of the Nicene fathers might extracts be made so nearly satisfactory to the Protestant ear: from no one may there be gathered wilder extravagances, such as the papist makes his boast of; and from no divine of any age or communion, could such

instances be adduced of the two kinds in intimate combination."

Chrysostom left Nicene Christianity with no better elements than he found it. It was still a religion of asceticism, of sacraments and of "high church principles." If such a mind labored in vain, who shall hope to give the ritual principle a fairer record and a less baneful influence? How much soever he may have desired and labored for the purity and welfare of the church, all was rendered nugatory by such statements as these :

"Only let us dip you and you are regenerate, justified and ready for heaven." "I have said that many and *various* are the roads of repentance, so that salvation may be rendered the more easy. For if He had given us one only way, we might have rejected it, saying we cannot follow *that* faith, and therefore cannot be saved. But now, cutting off from thee any such pretext, he hath afforded thee, not one way only, nor a second only, nor a third only, but *many* and different; so that by the multitude of them the ascent to heaven may be rendered as easy to thee as possible." His various ways mentioned are, confession, mourning for sin, humility, alms-giving; by either of these alone heaven may be reached, and if the seeker finds one road too hard he can take an easier and pleasanter one. But the loftiest species of repentance, with him, is alms-giving. He also insists that it is from the communion of "the church" alone that men can go to heaven. "Hast thou sinned? Enter the church and wipe out thy sin." So the darkness thickened around the one only way of salvation, and the people strayed as having no shepherd of light to their souls. The work of the Holy Spirit was forgotten in their praise of the wonders of the justifying pool. The merits of Jesus were shadowed behind the merits of alms-giving and celibacy. When the most celebrated bishops and great divines of the fourth century became eloquent and full of energy, it was not with the exhibition of mercy in Jesus Christ, it was not justification by faith, but in presenting the formal, the ritual, the mere accessories of religion. Virginitv received the highest meed of praise, then followed fasting, prostrations, alms-giving, expiatory suffering, the wonder-working efficacy of the sacraments, the unutterable powers of the clergy.

Shall we hasten our steps in such directions, shall we seek Rome by so pleasant paths?

“Within the short period of two hundred years from the death of Chrysostom, and within less than a century from the death of the men whom he and his contemporaries had trained, and while still the Nicene system retained its integrity, Mahomet broke upon the world, and the tempest of heresy which he raised came as a blast of health upon the nations. What Mahomet and his caliphs found in all directions whither their scimitars cut a path for them, was a superstition so abject, an idolatry so gross and shameless, church doctrines so arrogant, church practices so dissolute and so puerile, that the strong-minded Arabians felt themselves inspired anew as God’s messengers to reprove the errors of the world, and authorized as God’s avengers to punish apostate Christendom. The son of the bond-woman was let loose from his deserts, to ‘mock’ and to chastise the son of the free-woman. We read in the story of the Moslem conquests, a commentary, written by the finger of God, upon Nicene Christianity. Or if we will not in that terrible history acknowledge God’s displeasure against this system of fraud, folly and impiety, we can hardly refuse to listen to the notices contained in the Koran and the Mahometan writers, of the impression that had been made upon the Arabian mind by the spectacle of the debauched Christianity of the Greek and African churches. It is here that we may most surely learn what was the actual result of the system embodied in the writings of Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory, Cyril, and their contemporaries.”

It is the teaching of the church of Rome that there is no middle ground, that there is no other ground, between infidelity and her communion. So she has won to herself many converts. The revival of a pure faith after the likeness of the Apostolic church, will destroy both infidelity and Romanism. But while we harbor the secret desire to save the forms and errors of the one, we cannot hope to remove the unbelief of the other. Deference to the principles of Romanism ruins the argument with anti-Christ in every one of its forms.

Pascal, with his mighty intellect, anxious for a purer faith,

strove to maintain Christianity from the ground of Romanism. While his argument embraced the follies and enormities of Rome, men like Condorcet and Voltaire were unimpressed by the cogent reasoning in behalf of Christianity itself. The encyclopædists had felt his power too much, if he had attempted only the defense of Christianity, to have attempted to set forth his labors aided by their comments and praises. They endeavored to strike a fatal blow to the heart of religion by showing that one of its ablest advocates was still bound by the absurdities of Romanism. Triumphant as Pascal was in the contest with the Jesuits, he wielded no power when the bases of religious faith were assaulted in the next century.

If we would combat with hope of success the growing atheism of the present, we weaken, nay we destroy the work we would do if we uphold those principles borrowed from a weak and corrupt state of the church and incorporate them in the form of processions, burnings of incense, postures and solemn rites, as essential accompaniments of the only true faith. We fatally compromise the gospel while we maintain the necessity of endless ceremonials to the neglect of the inmost spirit of the faith once delivered to the saints. We may look with dismay upon the work of Romanism, we may fondly hope and labor for its overthrow: "but the hour of popery, its dismay and fall, will also be the fatal hour of whatever has had the same origin, and of whatever breathes the same spirit, and of whatever is substantially of the same quality and tendency, and of whatever holds to it by any kind of vital connection. By the fall of popery can we think nothing more to be intended than a quiet restoration of the cup to the laity, a little decency observed in the adoration of images, a caution imposed upon the invocation of the virgin and the saints, a more discreet doctrine of purgatory, a narrower boundary line drawn around the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome? Are changes and modifications such as these all that was foreseen by the exile of Patmos, when he proclaimed, in loud exultation, as if it had been then transacted, the confusion of the woman clothed in scarlet and the fall of Babylon? The fall of the mystic Babylon, we may confidently as-

sume, will be nothing less than the sweeping from the face of the earth that great and ancient delusion which, springing at the first from the banks of the Euphrates, the Indus and the Ganges, has oppressed and supplanted the doctrine of Christ from age to age, and which even now is renewing its youth as the eagle. The only contention, then, among Christian communities, at the present moment, should be: who shall stand farthest from the brink of the pit into which popery is to plunge."

No such denunciations are used by our Lord against other sins, as those directed against the substitution of formalism for true devotion. When scribe and pharisee were rebuked, the condemnation goes out for all time against those who yield to that fatal aptitude of the human heart to contrive and follow a cheap religion of costly and intricate forms. What could be more plainly meant by the "washing of cups and platters," by the tithing of "mint, anise and cummin," than Chrysostom's doctrine of baptism, or the doctrine of Ambrose concerning the eucharist? Ceremonial sanctity finds no refuge in that gospel which most pointedly condemns a punctilious regard for the ritual and external in religion.

The advent of a religion of form, and therefore of superstition, is accompanied by a religion of intolerance. When the Nicene church gave itself to the work of garnishing the sepulcher of the saints; when the reverence for relics and for whatever was august and imposing in form gathered strength and the Creator was hidden by the devices of the creature, then ripened the spirit of intolerance. While bowing with superstitious regard around the tombs of the martyrs, the church was preparing, in the name of her Master new tortures for those who should protest against her authority. "Augustine's long allegorical reasoning on the story of Isaac and Ishmael formally established the lawfulness of dealing with heretics by force."

Ambrose goes with unchanged countenance from the spot whence the remains of saints were dug up, to the hall where the unfortunate Jovinian was condemned to be whipped and banished for protesting against prevailing corruptions. Superstition and cruelty are inseparable. One may bend with fondest rever-

ence over relic and martyred dust, and he will go away to join in the cry which intolerance raises against some spirit struggling for a purer faith. So they who garnish the sepulchers of the prophets, continually emulate the spirit of the murderers of the prophets.

They who hold to high church principles, fearful of incurring the contempt of all thinking minds by absolutely declaring the impossibility of salvation to those out of their communion, adopt some such declaration as this: "Christian folks may be Christian folks out of *our* church; for the mercies of heaven are infinite; but they are so by a sort of miracle, for they possess no ministry of the word, no sacraments, no regeneration, no covenanted forgiveness of sins, and can claim no viaticum." The wondrous efficacy of the means of grace which the church alone can effectually convey, is set forth in the strongest terms: "But the *auto-da-fè* of the holy office is nothing but the full ripe fruit of that tree, of which the sap is 'church principles;' in other words, the appropriation to a *particular visible church, in a late age*, of what belongs only to the true church, or universal body of genuine Christians. This tree may happen to have been planted in a shallow soil, where it could never show a proud head; or it may have stood exposed to the huffing gusts of political liberty, which have blighted its blossoms, year after year; but the tree is the tree—the sap is the same *succus amarus*, and we may certainly know what will come of it, in sunshine and shelter, even although, at present, there be nothing more to alarm us than the rustling of its melancholy foliage in Oxford Tracts for the Times; or than the plaintive sighs of the *Lyra Apostolica* despondingly hung upon its branches."

The efforts of those who would give us another religion than that of Christ and the apostles, are not directed at once to overthrow any of the great articles of the Christian faith, but to supersede them, to dislodge them from their place in the popular mind. Various pretexts are made for keeping these articles in the background, for throwing around them such a veil of mystery that the eye shall be attracted and held by some nearer object, though full of emptiness. This was the labor of the Ni-

cene church, and the Romish church has caught up and extended it, while the modern ritualist bends his efforts in the same direction.

The disciples were commanded to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." The unbiased mind conceives of this statement as embodying the widest freedom and as having the largest application. Because some are unwilling to hear it and reject it, is not sufficient reason for withholding it from any nation or any individual. But by the awful and mysterious sanctity thrown around the work of Christ, men are taught by the Oxford Tractarians that it is audacious for them to attempt to look upon the sacred radiance of the Sun of righteousness, it is safer for them to behold his reflection in some of the pools of human invention. Do not presume to look at Jesus, the resplendent one, says the Romanist, but fix your eyes upon the benign and lovely Mary. The direct contemplation of God and the Saviour is too difficult and audacious a matter for you to attempt, says the Ritualist; walk in lower paths where you can find something to grasp; let your soul go out toward God in significant acts of worship; it is fool-hardy to strive to converse face to face with God; there is no appropriate form for you in that way; but approach God with the *forms* of worship more suited to an august being.

So, in accordance with this spirit, men are told that when they build a temple for God's service, it should not have special reference to the benefit of man, it must be a costly one given as a valuable sacrifice to God, meant as a memorial pile, rather than as a Bethel where God shall meet and converse with the soul. We must be discriminating in our efforts to extend such a precious blessing among the masses, say these modern missionaries of a new dispensation of forms and ceremonies; it is too costly to be scattered like pearls before swine, we must be somewhat assured of the friendly dispositions of those before whom we display the pearl of great price before we offer it. No irregular zeal in promulgating the gospel is, for a moment with them, to be admitted. If men will not work like us in the livery which awes and dazzles, forbid them to work at all, for they

may do incalculable injury. So contempt is thrown upon one of the plainest and most valuable teachings of the Redeemer. Better say boldly and with one clear utterance, like the Romanist, "there is *no* salvation out of the church," than, like the ritualist, by nice circumlocutions to attempt to save the "no-salvation" principle, without exposing themselves to the contempt of mankind.

The following quotations from the Tract writers whom our author assails, may be applied with little change to the developments of this later day: "The prevailing notion of bringing forward the atonement *explicitly* and *prominently* on all occasions, is evidently quite opposed to what we consider the teaching of Scripture; nor do we find any sanction for it in the gospels."

"What St. Paul means when speaking of himself as preaching Christ crucified, of being determined to know nothing among those to whom he spoke but Christ crucified, although, of course, it implies the atonement, directly means something different. In fact, it stands opposite to the modern notion; it is the necessity of our being crucified to the world; it is our humiliation together with him, mortification of the flesh, being made conformable to his suffering and his death:—it is the doctrine that we cannot approach God without a sacrifice—a sacrifice on the part of human nature in union with that of our Saviour."

"And not only is the exclusive and naked exposure of so very sacred a truth (the atonement) unscriptural and dangerous, but, as Bishop Wilson says, the comforts of religion ought to be applied with great caution." "All these unhallowed approaches to our blessed Saviour which these principles indicate, will, in some manner, lead to a disbelief in his divinity, the knowledge of which was that which he kept from the unworthy."

We are thus taken backward to the corrupt principles of the Nicene church, and are led to look anew upon Romish practices and teachings; by this teaching of *coöperative human righteousness*. "Behold the Lamb of God!" exclaims John, and the earnest cry is taken up by the reformers and by every effective teacher of righteousness in every age. But it is "a great mystery," it is "too sacred a principle" to be set before the people plainly and

freely, declare the advocates of ritualism. Instead of thus defending Christ's divinity and preserving it from the assaults of the unbeliever, it is a grasping of the hand of the Socinian and adopting his gospel which declares: "Christ suffered for us as an example of patience, fortitude, meekness; and that he might animate his followers with a generous ambition to cultivate the stern, as well as the mild, virtues."

It is not necessary to denounce or assail the doctrine of the atonement to throw it into obscurity; such a course does not succeed like that which says little about the atonement. Let all free announcement of the doctrine be abstained from, let something else be put in front of it, let the mind be gradually drawn off from this central truth by some other teaching, and the cross of Christ becomes of no effect.

The result of such a system of religious teaching as the Oxford Tractarians advance, is exhibited in the Nicene and in the Papal churches. The gospel to which it gave rise is utterly discordant with the living word. The two gospels develop wholly different and irreconcilable states of mind and hostile religious practices. Our spiritual instincts, if kept pure and free, revolt from the gospel of sacraments and swinging of censers, while they cling to the propitiation of a living Christ and to the peace bringing doctrine of justification by faith. There is no concord, and there can be none, between the principles of Romanism, in whatever guise they may appear, and those of an effective belief in Jesus Christ. Whatever teaches man to place outward institutions above inner truths, to be careful in ceremonial observances while the offering of the heart is forgotten, to rest in the type and symbol rather than in the life-giving reality, brings dearth and waste to the soul. It is possible to fight for a creed and at the same time to be unmoved by the truths it holds. "Ichabod" is written over that heart and that church wherein "the sacraments, the symbol and the lettered creed, fill the sphere of its vision and draw forth its devotion."

An age of formalism, induced by whatever agencies, is more to be dreaded than an age of infidelity. The darkest hour in the history of the faith is not that when men, on all sides, rise up

to question and attack the word of life, but when the church is ritual bound, priesthood and people enslaved by the forms of religious devotion while the life has departed. At no time is the church so defenseless against the attacks of infidelity as when she offers to view the beautiful mosaics of human invention in place of the "lively stones" of the spiritual building.

The doctrines of the Tractarians, in respect to the church and the efficacy of rites, spread blight while they quench all spiritual life. The church and its ministry come like a cold shadow between the soul and the Saviour. The church, instead of Christ, becomes the almoner of spiritual blessings, which can only be dispensed by episcopally ordained men. Let us be Christians *ecclesiastically*, is the cry of multitudes, influenced by the teaching of formalism.

There is grandeur in the forms of nature, in the presence of the peace bringing mountains, in the midst of the glories of the setting day ; yet the heart may feel nothing of God in them all and die unblest amid the pageants of nature. So the pealing organ resounding amid the arches of the cathedral, the gorgeous ceremonial, the splendid ritual is powerless to regenerate the heart of man. "Ye must be born again," breaks in as a warning and a sure direction, upon the appointments of men.

"There are two ways of destroying Christianity ; one is to deny it, the other to displace it. To put the church above Christianity, the hierarchy above the word of God ; to ask a man, not whether he has received the Holy Ghost, but whether he has received baptism from the hands of those who are termed successors of the apostles and their delegates : all this may doubtless flatter the pride of the natural man, but is fundamentally opposed to the Bible, and aims a fatal blow at the religion of Jesus Christ. If God had intended that Christianity should, like the Mosaic system, be chiefly an ecclesiastical, sacerdotal and hierarchical system, he would have ordered and established it in the New Testament, as he did in the old. But there is nothing like this in the New Testament. All the declarations of our Lord and of his apostles tend to prove that the new religion given to the world, is 'life and spirit,' and not a new

system of priesthood and ordinances. . . . Let us not, then, esteem the bark above the sap, the body above the soul, the form above the life, the visible church above the invisible, the priest above the Holy Spirit. Let us hate all sectarian, ecclesiastical, national or dissenting spirit; but let us love Jesus Christ in all sects, whether ecclesiastical, national or dissenting.* “And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.”

*Geneva and Oxford, by Merle D'Aubigné.

ART. II.—QUAKERS AND THE EARLY BAPTISTS.*

BY REV. CHARLES HOWARD MALCOM, NEWPORT, R. I.

To a superficial observer nothing seems more improbable than that there can be any especial affinity between the Baptist and the Quaker denominations. At first sight, indeed, there appears to be a peculiar antagonism between these two religious bodies. The Society of Friends reject water-baptism altogether, but the Baptists think nothing less than dipping to be true baptism; and so, in this respect, these two denominations stand at the antipodes of Protestantism, one rejecting the very use of water, and the other requiring the overwhelming waters, in baptism. The Quakers declaim against a hireling ministry, organs, singing, steeple-houses, and costly church architecture; but the Baptists have all these, and think them necessary to growth and religious culture. The Friends have plain dress, plain language, and refuse to take an oath, even in a court of justice; but the Baptists have no scruples upon these points. In what respect, then, can

*GEORGE FOX, THE FRIENDS, AND THE EARLY BAPTISTS, by William Tallack, author of “Malta under the Phœnicians, Knights and English.” London: S. W. Partridge & Co., 9 Paternoster Row. 1868.

it be said that the Baptists and the Friends have near relationship to each other? This question is answered by Mr. Tallack.

He shows, more distinctly than has ever been shown before, that the constitution and doctrines of Quakerism were chiefly borrowed from the early Baptists. No one can peruse Mr. Tallack's book without perceiving that the Baptists and Quakers, though at first sight seeming so very opposite to each other, are really very near of kin. We may call them first cousins; if, indeed, they have not even nearer relationship than that. We confess our surprise at the array of proof our author produces to show the Baptist origin of the chief portion of the constitution of Quakerism. True, we had gleaned from other sources certain hints of remarkable similitude between these religious bodies, particularly in past generations; but we were scarcely prepared for so full and remarkable an illustration of the close kindred of these denominations as is shown in the work concerning which we now write.

Mr. Tallack divides his book into ten chapters, and thus discusses, under distinct heads, the chief phases of the origin and growth of Quakerism. He thus speaks of the influence of Quakerism upon the world, of the antecedents of Fox, of the difficulties which Quakerism encountered, and of other points which set forth the extraordinary system of religious faith and life embodied in Quakerism. It will be our purpose in this article, however, not so much to follow our author in his whole course of argument and history, as to trace the outline of his statements concerning the Baptist origin of Quakerism in general. We might fondly linger upon the portraiture of George Fox, and the account of his youthful character, home, and conversion; but, for the sake both of brevity and plainness, we will confine ourself strictly to the endeavor to trace the origin of the ecclesiastical system, founded by Fox, to a thorough Baptist source.

George Fox, in the year 1645, being two years before he publicly came forth as a preacher, visited his uncle, named Pickering, in the city of London. His mind was deeply exercised concerning religious things; and from this uncle, who was a Baptist, he

derived much spiritual instruction and comfort. Indeed, both before and after he entered upon his ministry, George Fox constantly associated with the Baptists; and one of his first sermons was preached to a Baptist congregation, at Broughton. Fox frequently records in his autobiography his intercourse with the Baptist denomination; and the more we study his life and ministry the more clearly we perceive how much he was indebted to that denomination for religious influence and suggestion. Both the personal character of Fox, and the circumstances of the times, tended to make him an apt scholar in the principles taught by his Baptist friends. His temperament was contemplative, pensive, and resolute; and the oppressive restraints long imposed by the state church upon religious freedom produced a reaction at this very juncture which greatly helped to give force and acceptance to his doctrines. He derived from his mother, as is common with great characters, those qualities of enthusiasm and moral fervor which carried him forward in his career with such vigor; for Mary Lago, his mother, inherited from ancestors, who had suffered for their faith as martyrs, that godly concern for holiness which was a marked feature in her son's character. She married Christopher Fox, a man of piety; and, though he was an humble weaver, he lived free from poverty, so that their son George was at an early age supplied with a reasonable amount of money.

The boyhood of George Fox was not eventful. It was passed in quietude, apart from the turmoil of city life, and amid the seclusion of rural scenes. In the quiet of Leicestershire he grew up a thoughtful and silent boy, loitering through meadows gilded with sunlight, or in winter passing long evenings gazing speechless into the fire as he sat in his mother's homely apartment. He cared little for the sports of the village lads. His mind was busy with thoughts of God and of eternity. His educational advantages were few. He learned to read and write, being taught, probably, by his mother. Beyond this, he received very little instruction. Yet his bright intellect, and wonderful moral perceptions, more than compensated for the lack of education. Some of his relatives, appreciating his sober and

devout disposition, desired that he might be educated for a clergyman ; but so far from that being done, he was placed in business with a village shoemaker, who at the same time acted as a wool-dealer. To the latter branch of his master's business, George seems particularly to have given his attention. Yet, his business failed to engross his thoughts ; for his hours of lonely meditations and his deep heart searchings increased upon him. Sore perplexities began to distress his mind, and already before his soul rose in shadowy outline those great thoughts that afterwards he embodied in doctrine and system.

In this frame of mind, George withdrew from the shoemaker's employment, and went to reside for a time at the neighboring town of Lutterworth. He was now nineteen years of age. From Lutterworth he proceeded to other places, seeking religious counsel and instruction, but finding no peace of spirit. Notwithstanding his meditations, his conversations with pious people, his prayers, and his ascetic habits, no light yet broke upon his soul. He often walked the lonely woods of Barnet Chase, waiting upon the Lord. Yet, clouds and shadows continued to surround him. While in this mood, he visited London, and spent some time with his uncle Pickering, and his Baptist friends. Here, for the first time, he discovered those who understood his spiritual conflicts, and who manifested towards him an intelligent sympathy. While his relatives and friends in Leicestershire were troubled on his account, fearing that his unsettled state of mind was the result of too frequent musings, his pious Baptist friends in London recognized the dealings of God's Spirit with his soul, and hailed these tokens with both awe and gladness. At home, his friends thought him visionary, excited, and in danger of insanity ; and, by various methods, endeavored to arouse him to active and worldly pursuits. Some urged him to take a wife ; others advised him to enter the army ; and the good parson of the parish, much interested in the worthy young man, recommended to him the soothing influences of the pipe and of singing ; yet, notwithstanding this good advice, George was not inclined either to matrimony or to the army ; and, as for the recommendation of the amiable clergyman, George replied that

tobacco was a thing he did not love, and as for psalms he was in no state of mind to sing them.

At length, after several years of weary effort to find rest for his soul, the Lord graciously granted his request, and bestowed upon him that peace which the world can neither give nor take away. This was in the year 1647, when he was twenty-three years of age, and four years after he had commenced diligently to search for truth. During those years of earnest spiritual exercises, he had especial conference with religious persons amongst the Baptists. It is perhaps not too much to say that thus early in his religious history the shaping hand of Baptist influence is chiefly seen; and, as he developed his system, that influence became more and more apparent.

The characteristic principles promulgated by George Fox, and which to this day form the essentials of Quakerism, may be grouped into six statements. First: The necessity for a practical individual experience of God as manifesting a living presence of the Spirit in the souls of men. Second: That the study of the Bible is comparatively useless if searched simply as a history, instead of making its teachings of practical application to daily behavior. Third: The duty of recognizing all men as alike God's children through Jesus Christ; and that, therefore, Christians should neither flatter the great nor despise the repulsive. Fourth: The call of every Christian to some sphere of work in the Lord's vineyard, and that hence spiritual monopolies are to be guarded against. Fifth: The importance of seeking the spirit of all religious matters, rather than resting in verbal creeds, visible ceremonies, or mere professions. Sixth: That all spiritual service is only to be entered upon under a sense of duty, and prayerful dependence upon God.

Let a Baptist now read over these six points studiously, and he will perceive that they contain principles very familiar to him. Before the time of Fox these characteristics had distinguished Baptist theology. In England both the General and the Particular Baptists had anticipated most of the doctrines, and also the system of discipline, adopted by the Friends; but, of these two branches of the Baptist family, it was the General

Baptists, who were a distinct body in the year 1608, that most fully exemplified the views subsequently attributed to Quaker origin. The violent discussion which arose amongst the Baptists relative to election and reprobation, resulted in many thousands joining the ranks of the Friends. We perceive, then, that George Fox, was rather the organizer than the originator of Quakerism. Even the doctrine of "the inner light," upon which Fox placed especial emphasis, had been anticipated both by German mystics and by English theologians.

In further proof of the extensive anticipation of Quakerism by the early General Baptists, and other Christians, we may now proceed to quotation, and more emphatic historical retrospect. As an illustration, we find that John Smyth, the father of the English General Baptists, who died in 1610, a generation before Fox, had earnestly contended for a New Testament church, "as a society of equals, voluntarily associated, to promote the glory of the Great Head of the Church;" and, like Fox subsequently, he published an exposition of his views, in which he bore strong testimony against ceremonials in religion. Like the Quakers, also, many of the Baptists and Puritans believed in the continuance of inward revelations from God. Thus, Grantham and Griffiths, both eminent Baptists of the time, had published in their works the sentiment that the Holy Spirit works in us not only by its own operations, but in an especial manner by the preaching of the word. The Baptists rejected infant baptism. Some of their predecessors, the Anabaptists, had rejected baptism altogether. Fox in this respect followed the Anabaptists. Some of the Puritans, at the commencement of the seventeenth century, had declared the unscriptural nature of war, tithes, oaths, and enforced payment for the ministry.

The General Baptists, in 1615, thirty-five years before the rise of Quakerism, vindicated their religious liberty; and, though they acknowledged their allegiance to the state in temporal matters, they affirmed their responsibility to God only in spiritual affairs. Afterwards, as appears from various authorities, about the year 1640, it was not uncommon, in some of the Baptist congregations, for women to engage in public discourses.

This custom Fox sanctioned. Another scruple entertained by some of the Baptists was that respecting the use of the names derived from pagan times. They rejected the names of the months and days, as January, Sunday, &c., and numbered both the months and days, calling them by their order, as second month, or fifth day. The early records of Baptist churches of that period afford many illustrations of this sort. One example of this kind will we give, taken from a letter of a Baptist church in Lincolnshire, dated, "Caxton, the 25th day of the 7th month, 1653." This custom George Fox also borrowed from the Baptists.

The system of church discipline established by Fox, and especially the methods of care for the poor, was largely taken from Baptist sources. So, in like manner, Quakerism borrowed from the General Baptists their careful attempts to avoid precise definitions respecting the nature of God, confining themselves to the use of Scripture terms; it cultivated, like the early Baptists, in a very earnest manner, the social element; and like the Baptists, the Friends protested against the necessity for colleges to educate ministers of the gospel. This latter idea had been prominently put forward by the Baptists as early as 1610, long before Fox's days; for, although the Baptists admitted the value of learning, they were far from making it a necessary qualification for preaching the gospel. Even the fierce protest made by Fox and his followers against a "hireling ministry" was not original with them; but here, also, we trace the idea directly to a Baptist source. In the seventeenth century, most Baptist ministers carried on business, and seldom received any compensation from their congregations. Sometimes their traveling expenses were paid, or they received small presents; but when in some cases it became necessary to contribute to their support, it was yielded to with much reluctance. At Berkhamstead, so late as 1679, it was considered a sin requiring church discipline to assert "that men ought to have a set maintenance by the year for preaching." Concerning the rejection of singing in religious worship, also, we find that Fox was anticipated by some of the early Baptists; for many of the Baptist congregations then re-

jected the use of psalms, as some do to this very day. The Quaker plan of encouraging the gifts of the individual members of the churches was in exercise by the General Baptists, and by other sects, before the rise of Quakerism. When any one of the Baptist brethren had improved his gifts to the edification of the church, he was recorded as "a brother confirmed in the ministry." In many churches there were several such recorded ministers. The Friends adopted the same plan, using the term "approved minister." The Baptists also rejected oaths, and in their declaration of faith said, "We look upon it as our duty to keep ourselves from oaths." The early Baptists protested with much earnestness against "superfluity of apparel," and dressed with marked simplicity; they anticipated the Friends in their especial care of the poorer members of the church; and the Quaker custom of marriages is nearly the same with that previously established by the early Baptists. The Baptists and Quakers alike in the seventeenth century termed their meetings for church business and government "meetings for discipline." In these meetings the Baptists considered the precepts of the New Testament as the only rule of discipline. These meetings for discipline were held monthly, quarterly, and yearly, just as the Friends now have them. At these meetings inquiries were instituted concerning the conduct of the members, and the doctrines preached by the ministers. Delinquent members first received private admonition; this failing, they were summoned before the meeting for discipline; and, if still obdurate, they were, after three admonitions, excluded. The method of Quaker discipline is almost identical. The Baptists, however, surpassed the Quakers in mercy to expelled members, inasmuch as the former sent frequent messengers to such persons, beseeching them to repent of their evil deeds, and extending a welcome back on proof of sincere reformation.

One marked peculiarity of the Friends is their use of the singular pronouns "thou" and "thee" in addressing persons; but this custom also prevailed amongst many of the early Baptists. Another very prominent feature of Quaker custom is the requirement that members shall marry, if at all, within the

bounds of the society. The Friends are much troubled if their members marry out of the church, and have dismissed thousands from their ranks for this offense. So, too, the Baptists were greatly grieved if their members married any but members of their own denomination; and, in such case, they usually disowned the delinquents. Learned essays were written by some of their preachers to show that Christians should only marry those in the Lord; and, in practice, this theory was frequently interpreted to mean Baptist Christians.

Our readers are thus able to perceive the remarkable similitude between the early Baptists and the Quakers. Indeed, the likeness of the Quaker institutes to those of the Baptists is so complete, that the Society of Friends may well be called an outgrowth of the Baptist sect. George Fox examined very studiously the doctrine and system of the Baptists, and largely drew the constitution of Quakerism from that source. True, Fox went beyond the Baptists in rejecting all outward baptism, and the visible celebration of the Lord's Supper. Yet, even here, Fox had been anticipated by the Lollards. The practice, also, of silent waiting upon God, which forms so conspicuous a feature of Quaker worship, had been cherished, long before the time of Fox, by the German Mystics. Hooker, in a work published ten years before the rise of Quakerism, describing the Baptists and their Anabaptist predecessors, some of whom were Lollards in the preceding centuries, shows their anticipation of some of the features which are popularly supposed to belong only to Quakerism. In that book, entitled "Ecclesiastical Polity," Hooker gives a remarkable portrait of the Anabaptists; and, if it had been written sixty years later, it might have been called a portrait of the Friends. Indeed, in many respects, the likeness is minutely the same. We are led to the conclusion, therefore, that Quakerism is chiefly a copy and continuation of the Baptist system. The Quakers may well admit and honor their Baptist ancestry; for, notwithstanding the extravagance of the Anabaptists of Munster, the Baptist sect was then, as it is now, taken as a whole, eminent for scriptural obedience and godliness. The Quaker child of the Baptist mother has followed in the blessed path of zeal, courage, and holiness; and, having received a

glorious inheritance, the child is using it for the honor of God, and the good of mankind. George Fox says of many of the doctrines and customs previously adopted by the Baptists and Puritans, that he was moved to declare them. It is plain from many historical proofs, however, that his "movings" were not new information, except through the medium of other men, and their interpretations of Scripture.

The attention of the writer of this article was directed to the remarkable similitude existing between the early Baptists and the Friends, long before this book of William Tallack fell into his hands. Indeed, he was fully persuaded that such likeness existed, before he ever saw any published allusion to it whatever; and further investigation has only confirmed this supposition. His mind was first led to suspect the original near relationship of the Baptists and Quakers from certain intimations which he discovered in the records of the church of which he is pastor. This church, the Second Baptist church of Newport, Rhode Island, having been founded in the year 1656, two hundred and twelve years ago, possesses records stretching back to the very time of the ministry of George Fox, and almost even to the commencement of that ministry. In reading these records, and studying the early history of this church, the writer discovered a very marked similitude existing between the original character of the church and the present character of Quakerism. This similarity of doctrine and worship he mentioned incidentally in an address delivered several years ago before the American Baptist Historical Society, at its annual meeting in Boston; and, since then, he has learned further particulars in this direction. Thus, in the early records of the church of which the writer is pastor, the days of the week are not called by their usual names, but are distinguished by numbers; a public meeting for worship was held every 'Thursday morning, called "the fifth-day meeting;" no singing was ever used in church worship; the church gave its "elder" no salary, and protested earnestly against an hireling ministry; there was a plurality of elders; women were encouraged to pray and speak in the religious meetings; plain dress was much used; after the chief elder opened a meeting, and expounded a portion of Scripture, any

brother or sister was at liberty to pray or prophesy ; and all the elders and deacons sat upon a raised seat, at one end of the meeting-house, as is now the custom with Friends. It was more than one hundred years before these peculiarities gradually faded away in this church.

The question naturally arises, When and why did this similitude between the Baptists and the Quakers cease to be so apparent? If the early Baptists and Friends were so nearly identical in doctrine and discipline, why is it that the latter have exercised greater influence, in proportion to their numbers, than the former? The answer to this question may be found in the fact that the Quakers have more logically and constantly carried out in practice the original Baptist principles. The Baptists have not continued as they were. They have relaxed their discipline ; have educated their ministers ; have built splendid church edifices ; have come to delight in music and organs ; and, in short, have grown up into a great, rich, and powerful denomination, with a strong disposition towards centralization and ecclesiastical ambition. A gradual change has come over the Baptists. We much fear this change has been away from original simplicity and holy living, and towards worldliness and self-complacency. At any rate, they have lost the peculiarities of Quakerism which they had in the seventeenth century. The Friends have now a more intense individualism than is possessed by the Baptists. They are less conformed to the customs of the world's people ; they seek more especially to have personal communion of spirit with God, apart from the intermediate agencies of creeds, ceremonials and religious teachers ; and, above all, they put a more intense emphasis upon individual piety, and upon the necessity of good works.

The lessons which are taught in Mr. Tallack's book are of profound interest to every Baptist. No member of the Baptist denomination can rise from the perusal of this volume without being conscious of a more prayerful desire for the purity and holiness of his sect. He can scarcely help asking himself several questions, as, for instance,—Why has the Baptist denomination not retained its original purity of discipline? Why has it not increased in godly influence, in proportion as it has in-

creased in members and wealth? Is there not some present apprehension that it is striving too much to build up an ecclesiastical system for the mere sake of power and worldly glory? Is there not a temptation now to crush individualism, if it at all doubts the popular opinion; and that, too, although the promotion of individualism, and soul-liberty, was the crowning honor of early Baptists? Is there not need of a reformation of manners and of living, which shall carry the sect back to its original model, and to a closer conformity to the blessed example of our Lord Jesus Christ? If these questions are asked in a thoughtful and religious frame of mind, we are quite sure they will receive such answers as must prompt to a closer walk with God.

ART. III.—JESUS CHRIST.

BY REV. A. K. MOULTON, CONCORD, N. H.

(Continued from the July Number.)

When this subject was dismissed in the July number of the Quarterly, the proposition under consideration was, that "*Christ is God.*"

The object of the second section under that proposition was to show, that "The same works and offices as are in some instances ascribed to God, are in other instances ascribed to Christ."

Under this head we purpose further to show, that both are said to search the hearts of men.

Compare the following passages: "And thou, Solomon my son, know thou the God of thy fathers, and serve him with a perfect heart and with a willing mind. For the Lord searcheth the hearts and understandeth all the imagination of the thoughts." "But, O Lord of hosts, that judgest righteously, that tries the reins and searchest the hearts." (1 Chron. 28: 9; Jer. 11: 20.) But He that liveth and was dead says: "All the churches shall

know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts." (Rev. 2 : 23. See other passages quoted in proof of Christ's omniscience.) Is here an obvious rivalry between two beings, or are they one and the same ?

Both are spoken of as *the final judge*. Under another head, too, I have shown that Christ is the final judge. Compare the passages adduced in proof of that fact with the following : " Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth ; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth ; . . . but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." " For God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing." (Eccl. 11 : 9, and 12 : 14.) " 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." (Rev. 20 : 12, 13.)

Dr. Peabody will do great service to the world by answering satisfactorily the following questions : (1.) Is not the scene here described identical with the one in Matt. 25 : 31, &c. ? (2.) Does this description of the judgment allow us to understand that God here acted by a deputy ; or did he accept the throne himself ? (3.) Does Christ, in Matt. 5th, or elsewhere, profess that he is to act as a deputy at the judgment day ? (4.) Does not the fact that Christ judges the world himself, sitting on the throne and performing the duties of the office personally at the last day, and the other fact, that God judges the world himself sitting on the throne and performing the duties of the office personally at the last day, prove that Christ is God ?

But leaving out very much of the proof which might be adduced, we would invite attention to the following : " Tell ye, and bring them near ; yea, let them take counsel together ; who hath declared this from ancient time ? Who hath told it from that time ? Have not I the Lord ? and there is no God else besides me ; a just God and a Saviour ; there is none besides me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the

ends of the earth : for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely he shall say of me, [marginal reading] In the Lord is all righteousness and strength ; even to him shall men come, and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed." (Isa. 45 : 21—24.) We quote this passage to show the use which Paul makes of it : "But why dost thou judge thy brother ? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother ? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." (Rom. 14 : 10—12.)

By a comparison of these two texts from Isa. and Rom., one of two things is certain : either that Paul quotes God's own declaration that he is the only God and Saviour and the judge of the world, to whom all must submit to prove that all shall be judged by Christ ; or that Isaiah makes Christ proclaim himself to all the world as Jehovah, the only God. But in either case the conclusion cannot be evaded, that God and Christ are here mentioned as identical, and each in turn as the judge of the world. (See Phil. 2 : 8—11.)

In contrast with the above, we give Dr. Peabody's exposition of the judgeship of Christ, which is as follows :

"It is often said, also, that none but God can be the final judge of men, and Christ's designated office as judge of the living and the dead is referred to in every defense of the Trinity, as proof positive of his supreme divinity. But of this office he says, 'The Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son,' and a few sentences afterwards assigns not his deity nor even his close connection with the Father, but, on the other hand, his relationship to man, as the reason why he is appointed man's judge. 'He hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.'" Of course Dr. P. cannot mean to say that Christ's humanity alone qualifies him to be the judge of the world, because this would decide that all other men are equally qualified, being equally human. In an earlier

part of this argument, it has been explained that the Saviour's humanity renders it more appropriate that he should be the judge than that this office should be filled by the first person in the Trinity, who, therefore, in conjunction with the Son, settled on him that honor. The same honors ascribed to God, are also given to Christ ; not similar but identical honors.

The same praise is also ascribed.

David says ; " Blessed be thou, Lord God of Israel our father, forever and ever. Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and majesty : for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine. Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as the head above all." John says : " 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 under 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." (1 Chron. 29 : 11, 12 ; Rev. 5 : 12, 13.)

This language in Revelation is almost a transcription of that in Chronicles, and is an ascription to the Lamb, of all the glory and praise claimed by God, who will not give his glory to another." (Isa. 42 : 8, and 48 : 11.) And in this description of the praise rendered to Christ, by all in heaven, earth and sea, is a fulfillment of the declaration of Jehovah by the prophet, that all knees should bow to him, and every tongue proclaim his praise.

The worship and service of Christ, which we have already proved to be a duty, is incontrovertible proof not only of his divinity, but of his identity with God.

The same homage is claimed. " Thou shalt have no other gods before me." " Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve." These passages contain a principle, than which, no other is more essential to all true religion. This fact is, we believe, acknowledged by all Jews, Mohammedans and Christians. No crime is more sternly prohibited, or more terribly punished than idolatry. This is a common sentiment with all

Trinitarians and all Unitarians alike. And these words are an eternal prohibition of the worship of Christ, unless Christ is God. All possible effort is therefore made by Unitarians, to prove that there is no scriptural warrant for paying divine honors to Christ. We have already shown that Dr. Peabody is no exception to this rule. We have also shown, as we believe, by incontrovertible scriptural quotations, that Christ is a proper object of divine worship, by angels and men, by all in heaven and all on earth. If there is a failure in the proof adduced, let Dr. P. show it. If not, he cannot deny that the divinity of Christ is proved, together with his identity with the one living and true God. God cannot reverse his own decisions. When he says, "Thou shalt worship me only," and adds, "Thou shalt worship Christ," he says substantially, "Christ is myself."

Various names and titles, originally applied to God, are quoted by New Testament writers and applied to Christ.

One of these titles is: the Rock. This title is applied to God, Jehovah, in Deut. 32: 4, also to God, in verses 15 and 18. To Jehovah, in verses 30, 31, 37. To God, in 1 Sam. 2: 2. To Jehovah, 2 Sam. 22: 2. To God, v. 3. To Jehovah, Psa. 18: 2; 92: 15, and in various other places; and yet Paul, in 1 Cor. 10: 4, says that the children of Israel all drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, which was Christ. To render this fact more emphatic let it be recollected:

1. That few, if any, circumstances mentioned in the history of the children of Israel are afterwards so celebrated in the prose and poetry of inspiration, as that of smiting the Rock, from which the waters flowed to quench the thirst of the perishing host.

2. That David, in a song of praise, declares that "God was their Rock and Redeemer," (Psa. 78: 35; Isa. 32: 2,) and Isaiah compares Christ to the shadow of a great rock.

3. That He who promised to be their attendant through the wilderness, and who was their ever present aid, was none other than the Lord God, the I AM. (Ex. 3: 14.) We have then Paul's authority for pronouncing Christ identical with the God of the Jews. The expression: "The Stone" is also used in the same manner in the Old and the New Testaments.

In a song of praise to the Lord, (Jehovah) David exclaims: "I will praise thee, for thou hast heard me and art become my salvation. The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our eyes." (Psa. 118: 21—23.) Isaiah says: "Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation; he that believeth shall not make haste." (Isa. 28: 16.) "Sanctify the Lord of hosts (Jehovah) himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offense to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble, and fall, and be broken, and be snared and be taken." (Isa. 8: 13, 14.)

In these passages, "Jehovah," "Jehovah of hosts," is the stone which breaks those who fall upon it. The question to be settled now is, are these terms so applied to Christ as to prove his identity with God?

At the conclusion of the parable of the vineyard, in which Christ represents himself as the son of the owner of the vineyard, and represents the Jews as the murderers, it is thus added: "And he beheld them and said: What is this then that is written, The stone which the builders rejected the same is become the head stone of the corner? Whosoever shall fall upon this stone shall be broken, but on whomsocver it shall fall, it shall grind him to powder." "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes." "And the chief priests and scribes the same hour sought to lay hands on him; . . . for they perceived that he had spoken this parable against them." (Matt. 21; Mark 12; Luke 20.)

When Peter had healed the lame man at the temple gate and was arrested for it, he thus discoursed to his judges, being filled with the Holy Ghost: "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him, doth this man stand before you whole. This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become

the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other ; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." (Acts 4 : 10—12.) In one of his epistles, Peter refers to this theme again, and adds : "To whom coming as to a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious, ye also as lively stones are built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore, also, it is written in the Scriptures, Behold I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, elect, precious, and whosoever believeth on him shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore that believe, he is precious : but unto them which are disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence." (1 Pet. 2 : 4—8.)

Paul adds the following two notable passages : " And ye are built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." " But Israel which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore ? Because they sought it not by faith, but, as it were, by the works of the law. For they stumbled at that stumbling stone, as it is written, Behold I lay in Zion a stumbling stone and rock of offence." (Eph. 2 : 20 ; Rom. 9 : 32, 33.)

In these passages, the stumbling stone, the offensive stone, the rejected stone, over which the children should fall and be broken, because of their unbelief ; the corner stone, the tried stone, the precious stone, the stone of salvation to all who should believe ; the God of the Psalmist and the prophet, is Christ the Saviour, than whom there is no other.

These inspired testimonies do far more than to apply the same distinctive appellations to God and Christ promiscuously. They show that precisely the same Being is intended, since the same passages which were originally spoken of God, by the prophets, who only declared, or professed to declare, the words which God put into their mouths, are afterwards quoted by the apostles, and applied to Christ, and are appropriated by the Saviour as prophecies of himself. The same homage and trust and faith

also which were originally demanded for the Rock, the Stone, Jehovah, are subsequently demanded for the Rock, the Stone, Jesus Christ.

“THE FIRST AND THE LAST.” The import of this title, as has been considered, renders it inapplicable to any but a self-existent Being. We refer to it here to show that it is so applied to God and to Christ as to prove that the first and the last, Jehovah, God of the Old Testament is the Christ of the New. “Who hath wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning? I the Lord, the first and the last; I am he.” “Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel and his Redeemer, the Lord of hosts; I am the first and I am the last, and besides me there is no God.” “I will not give my glory unto another. Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called; I am he; I am the first, I also am the last. My hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens.” (Isa. 41: 4; 44: 6; 48: 11, 12, 13.)

In these declarations of holy writ, God, the only God, the only Lord of hosts, the builder of the earth and the heaven, he who constructed them with his own hands, proclaims himself the first and the last. This he does with the evident intention of contrasting himself with all other beings, real or imaginary, to whom divine honors may be paid, and in whom Israel may be inclined to repose confidence, and of impressing the mind with the fact that no other being can be the true object of worship. To render this still more emphatic, he adds: “I will not give my glory to another,” as he previously declared in ch. 42: 8; that is: I will not concede that any other being is the creator of heaven and earth, or that any other is the first and the last. We have shown that the glory of having been the creator of the worlds and all in them, is given to Christ by inspiration itself. If, therefore, God will not give it to another than himself, then Christ is not another but the same God, than whom there is no other. If, now, it can be demonstrated that Christ is the first and the last, will not this prove beyond contradiction, that Christ is God? This question, of course, allows of an affirmative answer. We therefore invite careful attending passages:

“Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is and which was and which is to come, the Almighty.” “I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day, and heard behind me a great voice as of a trumpet saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last.” . . . “And I turned to see the voice that spake with me; and being turned I saw seven golden candlesticks, and in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man.” “And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last; I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive forevermore, Amen, and have the keys of hell and of death. Write the things which thou hast seen and the things which are and the things which shall be hereafter.” . . . “And unto the angel of the church in Smyrna write: These things saith the first and the last, which was dead and is alive.” . . . “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end.” . . . “Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.” . . . “I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches.” . . . “Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come Lord Jesus.” (Rev. 1:7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19; 2:8; 21:6; 22:12, 13, 16, 20.)

It cannot be difficult to decide who is the speaker in the foregoing quotations. It is impossible to make this the language of any other than Jesus Christ. Yet he takes the title of first and last, which God had appropriated to himself and denied to all others, and declares it to be his own name. He does more; he adds to this name another of precisely the same import, “The beginning and the ending;” and yet another, “the Alpha and Omega.” Thus has Jesus Christ triply fortified his claim to this divine appellation, which belongs to God only; therefore he is God.

The “Almighty.” This word signifies, “The omnipotent ruler of all things.” In Greek it is, Παντοκράτωρ, *pantokrator*;

in Hebrew עֶלְיוֹן, *shad-dah-y*, and is usually rendered Almighty, though sometimes, omnipotent. It occurs in Genesis, Exodus, Ruth, Job, Psalms, Isaiah, Ezekiel and Joel, and is a term by which the true God is designated. Thus no word in Scripture is less liable to misinterpretation, or less susceptible of application to any but the living God. In Rev. 4:8 ; 11:17; 16:14 ; 19:6 ; 21:22; also 2 Cor. 6:18, the same word is used as an unquestionable designation of the eternal God. Indeed, it is never applied to any being of limited power or existence, nor can it be so applied without totally destroying its signification. Yet the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, proclaims himself the Almighty. (Rev. 1:8.) He who makes this declaration is undoubtedly Jesus Christ. The whole structure of the sentence not only justifies but demands this conclusion. Besides, in the entire book of Revelation, the words Alpha and Omega, beginning and ending, are applied to none but Christ; yet they are here used as designations of him to whom this awful name of Almighty is applied.

Good critics also refer this name to Christ where it occurs in Rev. 15:3 : "And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying : Great and marvelous are thy works Lord God Almighty ; just and true are thy ways thou King of saints." The title, "King of saints," applies to the same Being, whoever he may be, who is called the "Lord God Almighty." And the import of this title is one of the appropriate designations of the Saviour. These considerations render it probable that Christ is here meant, as well as in Rev. 1:8. What language could show that Christ is God if this does not ?

The term "Lord," in the sense of supreme ruler, is interchangeable. We need not refer to any instances in which it is used as the title of God, as no one will call this in question. We shall only mention a few in which it is used as the designation of Christ.

"The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ ; he is Lord of all." (Acts 10:36.) In what way can this title be understood in this place except as applying to a supreme ruler ? "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." (Rom. 10:12, 13.) The entire paragraph from which this text is selected, is too long to be quoted. But what precedes and follows, shows plainly that Jesus is the person to whom this passage applies. He is, then, not only rich unto all that pray to him, but is Lord over all.

"But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world, unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world knew; for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." (1 Cor. 2:7, 8.) How can the Saviour be the Lord of glory unless he be God? "For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living." (Rom. 14:8, 9.) Paul speaks of Christ as being our Lord and owner, whose we are, whether dead or living. "The first man is of the earth earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven." (1 Cor. 15:47.) Can any one distinguish between the sense in which this word is here used and the sense which attaches to it when applied to the Father and ruler of all? In these and some hundreds of other instances in which this word Lord is applied to Christ, it is from the Greek *Κυριος*, (*Kurios*) of the signification of which we have spoken in the former article.

Lord of lords, God of gods, King of kings. These three titles constitute, virtually, one title. They signify a preëminence. They designate a ruler who is above all other rulers. This title is applied to God and to Christ in turn, and is used as though he alone to whom it is applied had a right to wear it.

"The Lord your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords; a great God, a mighty, and a terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward. Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God; him shalt thou serve, to him shalt thou cleave, and swear by his name." (Deut. 10:17, 20.) "The Lord God of gods, the Lord God of gods, he knoweth, and Israel he shall know, if it be in

rebellion, or if in transgression against the Lord." (Josh. 22:22.) "O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is good ; for his mercy endureth forever. O give thanks unto the God of gods ; for his mercy endureth forever. O give thanks to the Lord of lords ; for his mercy endureth forever : to him who alone doeth great wonders ; for his mercy," &c. (Psa. 136:1—4.) "The king answered unto Daniel, and said, Of a truth it is, that your God is a God of gods, and a Lord of kings, and a revealer of secrets, seeing thou couldst reveal this secret." (Dan. 2:47.) "And the king shall do according to his will ; and he shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods." (Dan. 11:36.)

We shall not argue that these titles, and these passages in which they occur, cannot be properly applied to more than one being in the universe, for we feel fully confident that no one can doubt it.

The word Lord, in capitals, in the foregoing quotations is from יהוה, *Y'hoh-vah*, or *Jehovah*, and God in capitals is either from אלה, *ehl*, or אלהים, *eloh-heem*, or אלה, *elah*, all of which are of similar import and most expressive of the idea of a God, of any words in the Hebrew ; so that our argument gains nothing by the translation.

Look now at another class of passages found in the New Testament. "I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Jesus Christ, 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 show, 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." (1 Tim. 6:13—17, and comp. 1:17.)

All Unitarians will, of course, contend that God, and not Christ, is here denominated the blessed and only Potentate, King of kings and Lord of lords. We accept this construction. The word translated "Lord" in the foregoing is, in the Greek, *Kyrios*, *Kurios*, and is the word by which Jehovah is rendered

into the Greek. In this and in other respects, the appellation appears to answer literally to those we have quoted from the Old Testament. Let us examine a few passages in which this title is clearly ascribed to Christ. "These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them : for he is Lord of lords and King of kings." (Rev. 17:14.) This language leaves no room for a doubt that Christ is here the subject of discourse, and that he is the "Lord of lords and King of kings." "And I saw heaven open and behold a white horse, and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True. . . . and he was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood : and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations ; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron ; and he treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of Kings and Lord of Lords." (Rev. 19:11—16.) He who is here called King of kings and Lord of lords is the Lamb. This is the name of Christ. He is "The Word of God;" Christ is "The Word of God ;" therefore, this is Christ. (See John. 1:1, and 1 John. 1:1, and 5:7.) "He was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood." Christ was so clothed. (Isa. 63:3.) He trod the wine-press of wrath ; so did Christ. They that followed him were clothed in pure white linen ; so was it with the chosen and faithful who followed Christ. (Rev. 7:9, 14.) Indeed it is too evident that this was Christ to admit of a successful cavil, much less of a serious doubt. And yet, in these two passages last quoted, we have precisely the same title,—“Lord of lords and King of kings,” applied to Christ as though he were the only one in all the universe to whom it belongs,—that is so often applied to God, as though it distinguished him from all others in the universe. Does not this prove the identity of Christ and God ?

“I AM” is another title of the same class as those already mentioned.

“And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The Lord God of

your fathers hath sent me unto you, and they shall say unto me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM, and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you. And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel: The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name forever." (Ex. 3:13—15.)

In this passage, God declares that this shall be his name forever.

Christ had a controversy with the Jews, in which he declared that Abraham had seen his day, and rejoiced therein. To settle the fact that he was an impostor, and confound him out of his own words, they tauntingly asked him, if he, who was not yet fifty years old, had seen Abraham. The reply was emphatic: "Before Abraham was, I am." This answer so exasperated the Jews, that they commenced immediately to stone him." (John 8:48—59.) Why did they stone him? Was this answer anything more than the insane jargon of a lunatic? If Christ did not intend by this answer to appropriate that title which God said should be his own forever, what meaning had the answer, and what should have so disturbed the Jews? They regarded him, no doubt, as having gone from bad to worse, in his blasphemous pretensions, till now he had arrogated the title of God himself, of which they were all witnesses. Forbearance now, in their estimation, ceased to be a virtue. So bold a blasphemy as this demanded summary punishment, according to the law, which they in their fury determined to execute, without waiting for a formal trial. The appropriation of the name I AM, by the Saviour, was parallel to the claiming of Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, the First and the Last; the import of these titles being similar. And unless Christ was the true God, we know not how these titles could have been claimed by him without blasphemy.

Another name by which God is known in the Old Testament, and which is often applied to Christ in the New Testament, is Jehovah, or Jehovah of hosts. The name Jehovah, like I AM, like Alpha and Omega, implies perpetual being. "And God

spake unto Moses and said unto him, I am the Lord ; and I appeared unto Abraham, and unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty. But by my name Jehovah, was I not known unto them." (Ex. 6:2, 3.)

The words Lord and Jehovah in the above quotation are the same word in Hebrew : *Y'hoh-vah*, or Jehovah. This quotation settles the fact that this is one of God's significant names. It is applied to him in the Hebrew Scriptures, between eight and nine thousand times, and appears to be, as intimated in the quotation above, one by which he chose to be known to Israel as well as by "I AM," there being no perceptible difference between the import of the one and the other.

If we read Isa. 6:3—10, we shall find a glowing description of Jehovah's glory, or the glory of "The Lord of hosts," which John applies to Christ. (John 12:37—41.) Isaiah says again : "Sanctify the Lord (Jehovah) of hosts himself, and let him be your fear and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offense to both the houses of Israel." (Isa. 8:13, 14.) The language of this text is applied by the Saviour and apostles to Christ, as is manifest by comparing it with Matt. 21:33—45 ; Luke 20:9—19, 1 Peter 2:7, 8. Here is no room for a doubt that Christ is the Jehovah of hosts, so often mentioned in the Old Testament.

Isaiah further says, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord (Jehovah), make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low ; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain, and the glory of the Lord (Jehovah) shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together ; for the mouth of the Lord (Jehovah) hath spoken it." (Isa. 40:3—5.) In Malachi we read : "Behold I will send my messenger and he shall prepare the way before me ; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in. Behold he shall come, saith the Lord (Jehovah) of hosts." (Mal. 3:1.)

There can be no mistaking these passages. They predict the coming of Jehovah of hosts, preceded by a herald who should

announce his coming. How are these fulfilled? John proclaimed himself to be the herald, of whom Isaiah had prophesied, and repeated the prophet's language, as he heralded the coming of Christ. (Matt. 3:3.) Christ also quoted the language of Malachi and applied it to John and his mission. (Matt. 11:10.) Mark quoted the language both of Isaiah and of Malachi, and applied them to John. Zachariah, the father of John, applied to him the word of Malachi; and Luke, the words of Isaiah. (Luke 1:76, and 3:4—6.) Now, as the Lord, whose way was being thus prepared, was he who was about to come to his temple, and as that Lord was Jehovah, it follows unavoidably that Christ is Jehovah.

As farther proof that Christ and Jehovah are identical, compare the language of Joel with that of the New Testament writers. "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions; and also upon the servants and handmaids, in those days will I pour out my Spirit. . . . The sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood before the great and the terrible day of the Lord come. And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord (Jehovah) shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call." (Joel 2:28—32.)

Some particular time is here prophesied by Joel, and minutely described, when those who should call upon the name of Jehovah should be saved. That time should be marked by various signs; and it should be when salvation should be in Zion and Jerusalem, and when a remnant should be saved. That description could apply to nothing else than to the gospel dispensation. So Peter proclaimed it on the day of Pentecost, and quoted the language of the prophet, which we have given above, and declared that it applied to the transactions of that day. (Acts 2:17—21.) Paul quotes the assurance, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord (Jehovah) shall be saved, and applies it to calling on the name of Christ. (Rom. 10 6—14.) It has been shown also, in proving that divine worship should be offered to

Christ, that Christians were known and designated in the apostolic age, as those who called on the name of Christ.

In very many instances Jehovah is called the Redeemer, by the inspired writers. As Redeemer is the name by which Christ is so often called, the inference is almost unavoidable that Jehovah, the Redeemer, refers to Christ. One sample of these passages may suffice: "Thus saith the Lord (Jehovah) the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, the Lord (Jehovah) of hosts, "I am the first and I am the last, and besides me there is no God." (Isa. 44:6.)

Jehovah also proclaims himself as the Saviour in instances too numerous to be quoted; as in the following passage: "Who hath declared this from the ancient time? Who hath told it from that time? Have not I, the Lord (Jehovah)? and there is no God beside me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me. Look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth; for I am God and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." (Isa. 45:21—24.)

This passage not only shows that Jehovah is the Saviour, but also that he is the only God; and, furthermore, proclaims that all shall bow to him. And, as shown in proving that Christ is to be the final judge, Paul applies this very passage to Christ. (Rom. 14:10—12; Phil. 2:10, 11.)

Can any argument or ingenious cavil evade the conclusion that these passages from Isaiah and Paul prove that Jehovah is the only God and Saviour, and that Christ is Jehovah? We rest this part of the argument here, reluctantly; leaving its ample resources still teeming with unappropriated evidence.

Christ declares that he and the Father are one, and that those who have seen him have seen the Father. (John 10:30, and 14:9.) On these texts Dr. P. remarks as follows: "I know of but two of his own sayings which are ever quoted as referring to his supreme divinity; and I doubt whether these would be quoted in a serious argument. One of these is, 'I and my Father are one;' which he sufficiently explains when he afterwards prays for his disciples, 'that they may be one even as we are one.'

(John 17:22.) The other is, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father ;' which in the next verse he explains by saying, 'Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me ?' I am astonished that this should ever have been regarded as a Trinitarian proof text. I know not a more decided anti-Trinitarian text in the Bible. For if there be three distinct persons in the Godhead, seeing one of them is surely not seeing the other. Seeing the Father is not seeing the Son. But if, as Unitarians believe, Christ dwelt in God and God in him, if Christ was the image, the representation of the Father, then he who had seen him had seen the Father; he who had been conversant with the image had become acquainted with the attributes of the original."

The oneness here spoken of by the Saviour is, from a Trinitarian point of view, at least, a oneness between the first and second persons in the Godhead, in plans, ends and aims, in the creation and redemption of the world ; there is no disagreement between justice and mercy, between the inflexible demands of the one and the full, free pardon of the other. Would the oneness of a "created and subordinate being" with the infinite God, be a fair illustration of the union between Christ's followers ? Would it be consistent for a Paul or a Peter to say, "I pray you to be as really one as God and I are one ?" But it must strike a Trinitarian as a novel idea that this saying of the Saviour is so much more consistent with Unitarian than with Trinitarian views. Can one see the Father, and the "attributes of the original," more 'clearly by seeing a mere creature, in whom dwells a great abundance of the Spirit, than by beholding one who possesses those attributes, and in whom dwells "all the fullness of divinity bodily"—one who is divinity itself, dwelling in humanity ? If almost any other writer had said this, we should have regarded it as special pleading. By what use of logic is it shown that one sees the Father clearly by seeing the Son, provided the Father and Son are not one, but cannot see the Father by seeing the Son, provided they are one ?

But it is amusing, in spite of the seriousness of the subject, to learn that Dr. P. does not know of a more decided anti-Trinitarian text in the whole Bible than the simple assertion that

he who hath seen the Son hath seen the Father ; or, "I and my Father are one." The Dr. has our thanks for this concession, for whether intentionally or not, it is certainly a tacit confession that anti-Trinitarian proof texts are scarce. But he only knows of two texts from the Saviour's lips which are ever quoted, as referring to his supreme divinity. Well, should his eye ever glance over the pages of this poor article, he would perchance find a few more.

Christ is often called God in the language of inspiration. He is called Immanuel, God with us. This name occurs in Isaiah, is quoted by Matthew and applied to Christ. Some Unitarian authors have taken unwearied pains to rob this name of its significance, and render its application to Christ, in some instances, doubtful. They would make it parallel with other Old Testament names, into which the name of God is compounded. But the other instances in which the "El" constitutes a part of the name of an individual, as Elias, Elnathan, Eliab, Nathaniel, Abiel, Jehiel, were the proper names given those persons at their birth ; or (as in the case of Israel) subsequently given for some special reason ; and they were names by which they were known everywhere. Not so with the name Immanuel. Christ was called Jesus at his birth, which name he retained through life. Immanuel was a prophetic name, designating his character, office, mission. It was a name by which he was not called during his earthly pilgrimage. If, therefore, the prophet intended to designate his proper name before his birth, as he did the name of Cyrus, the prophecy was a failure, since that was not the proper name of our Lord.

The application of this name to Hezekiah is impossible, since the prophecy concerning Immanuel (Isa. 7:10—16,) was delivered to King Ahaz who was then reigning, and Hezekiah was born before his father Ahaz ascended the throne. (Scott.) Besides this, Immanuel was to be the son of a virgin, which circumstance applies only to Christ. Some have attempted to confound the son of the prophet, which was named Maher-shalal-hash-baz, (Isa. 8:1—10,) with the child Immanuel, and thus mystify the whole subject. Maher-shalal-hash-baz may in some respects be a type of Christ, but their names bear no resem-

blance either in sense or sound, nor do any other circumstances, so far as we are able to discover, give any color of authority for confounding these two persons, or for regarding them as one and the same.

Some have understood the word translated virgin, to have here some other signification. The word in the Hebrew is עלמה (*gal-mah.*) It occurs seven times in the Hebrew scriptures. In Gen. 24:43, Cant. 1:3 and 6:8, and Isa. 7:14, it is translated virgin. In Ex. 2:8, it is maid, also in Prov. 30:19. In Psa. 68:25, it is rendered damsel; but the literal reading is virgin; (See Hebrew and English Psalter) and in every one of these instances such is its true meaning. If we attach any other meaning to this word, then what was the marvelous sign spoken of? Matthew's authority, however, ought to settle this question. After having narrated a list of facts, the object of which was to establish the virginity of Mary, he says: "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. (Matt. 1: 22, 23.) Here Matthew appropriates this entire sentence to prove that Jesus was the Emmanuel of prophecy, the main proof of which hinges upon the fact that his mother, Mary, was a virgin; for the word used by Matthew is, in the Greek, Παρθενος, *Parthenos*, and is susceptible of no other rendering consistent with its real import. If, therefore, we allow the testimony of Matthew, Jesus was the subject of this prophecy, and no one else could be unless born of a virgin.

Consider next the fact that in some of the passages already quoted from the prophecies, which evidently refer to Christ, he is called God, (Eloheem.) Christ is the Rock, yet who is a Rock save our God. (1 Sam. 2:2; 2 Sam. 22:2, 32; Psa. 62:2.) In Isa. 45:21, 22, where he declares himself the Lord (Jehovah) and the only Saviour, he also says: "I am God, and there is none else."—"I am God, and there is none beside me."—"A just God and a Saviour." The same thing also occurs in those instances where he proclaims himself the Redeemer and Jehovah, as in Isa. 44:6—8, as well as in many other similar in-

stances. In the prophecy of the coming of John the Baptist, to prepare the way of Jehovah, the same Jehovah is, in the same paragraph, called God. Now, as we have before shown that this Jehovah is Christ, it follows that this God (Eloheem) was also Christ. We have also quoted passages in which the Lord of lords and King of kings is called God, and the God of gods. He also calls himself the only God. "Thus saith the Lord (Jehovah,) the King of Israel and his Redeemer, the Lord (Jehovah) of hosts ; I am the first and I am the last, and besides me there is no God. . . . Is there a God besides me ? yea, there is no God, I know not any." (Isa. 44:6—8.) The word God in the above question, is from *eloh-ah*, the singular form of *eloheem*. In this passage, the Redeemer, the First and Last, the Jehovah, declares that he is the only God of whom he has any knowledge. Now, considering the proofs already furnished that Christ is Jehovah, the First and Last, the Redeemer, how is the conclusion to be avoided that Christ is the only God in the universe ?

Another prophecy in which Christ is called God, is as follows : "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder ; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." (Isa. 9 : 6, 7.)

This text seems nearly allied to the former. It gives a list of prophetic names for Christ, descriptive of his character and office. Strangely as these names must sound in the ears of those who deny the divinity of Christ, we know of none bold enough to deny that Christ is meant in this prophecy.

But note again what our author says on the subject. "In this text the Hebrew word rendered God, is not Eloheem, the word commonly so rendered, but El, of which God is only a secondary meaning. The Hebrew Lexicons give for its meaning, first, (as an adjective,) strong, mighty ; secondly, (as an abstract noun,) strength, power ; thirdly, and often, (by a natural transfer, from an abstract to a concrete sense,) God. Our translators chose the last of these three meanings. I am disposed to think the first the true signification here, and should render the passage : He shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, Strong, Mighty, Father of Eternity ; that is, author of eternal life [or perhaps Father,

or author of a new age or dispensation] Prince of Peace.”*

If this criticism be allowed its full force, we think there is still quite enough left in the text to prove the divinity of Christ. But our immediate business, at this stage of the argument, is with the word God, here translated from the Hebrew *El*. It is a part of the root of Eloheem, and is the word usually incorporated into the compounded proper names, such as have been mentioned elsewhere. It occurs in Emmanuel, and is quoted from the Septuagint by Matthew, *Μετὶ ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός*, “*God with us.*” Our best critics do not regard this name *El*, as of any less force because it originally signifies force, or power, or strength. If this fact be allowed to diminish its significance, then all other names of God would be subject to the same discount, Eloheem not excepted.

The Hebrew Concordance gives some 245 instances in which this word “*El*” or “*Ehl*” occurs in the Old Testament Scriptures. In 218 of these cases, it is rendered “*God*,” either in the text or marginal reading. In 17 instances it is translated “*god*” or “*idol*.” Only 9 times is it rendered “*power*,” “*might*,” &c. It occurs in the following sentences, and in others equally explicit: “*The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy-work.*” “*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*” “*I am God, and there is none else.*” “*I appeared unto Abraham, and unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty.*” “*The great and mighty God, the Lord (Jehovah) of hosts is his name.*” (Psa. 19: 1; 22: 1; Isa. 45: 22; 46: 9; Ex. 6: 3; Jer. 32: 18.)

On the whole, we are satisfied that no point can be successfully taken against the Trinitarian construction of this proof text from Isa. 9:6, 7.

The Alpha and Omega of Revelation, who was Christ, we think, beyond all dispute or cavil, is called God. “*He that overcometh shall inherit all things, and I will be his God, and he shall be my son.*” (Rev. 21: 6.) Does not Christ in this passage proclaim himself the God of all who overcome?

*For remarks on Dr. P’s translation of “*everlasting Father*,” &c., see the former article: Section on eternity of Christ.

Ananias called him: "The God of our fathers." "And he (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; For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard." (Acts 22: 14, 15.) In Acts 9, where the record of the transactions is made, it is stated that "The Lord said unto him (Ananias), Go thy way, for he is a chosen vessel unto me to bear my name before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the children of Israel; for I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake."

We think there can be no doubt that the name to be borne was the name of Jesus Christ, since that was the name which Paul preached; and it was for Christ's sake that he suffered. Therefore the Lord who chose and sent him, he whom Ananias calls "the God of our fathers," was Jesus. But to set the matter at rest Ananias says, "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me."

Paul also in narrating these facts before Agrippa says that Jesus said, "I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee: delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee." (Acts 9: 15—17; 22: 12—15; 26: 15—18.) By a comparison of these passages there is no evading the conclusion that the God of our fathers, who chose Saul and commissioned him, was Jesus of Nazareth.

Christ is called God in the following prophetic passage: "But unto the Son, he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And thou, Lord, in the beginning, hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same and thy years shall not fail." (Heb. 1: 8—12.)

On this passage our author asks: "If Christ was the supreme God who was his God; who were his fellows; and who anointed him?" We reply, that to a Trinitarian there seems no absolute inconsistency in this language, and scarcely any ambiguity. "The Son" was but one person in the Trinity, and as the redemption of man involved the incarnation, and required other special work and special conditions, it must be perfectly proper that Christ should be anointed thereto by the Godhead. His fellows were men; for Christ was a man as well as God. But to answer this query still more definitely we would refer to the Psalmist from whom Paul quotes. He says, "Therefore Eloheem, thy Eloheem hath anointed thee." (Psa. 45:7.) Eloheem, the same as "created heaven;" "moved upon the face of the deep;" said, "Let there be light," and "Let us make man;" for the word is plural.

But we have seen how Dr. P. attempts to parry the force of our quotation from Isa. 9: 6, 7, because the word "God" is not from "Eloheem." Now mark—"Thy throne, O God," &c. is, "Thy throne, O Eloheem, is forever and ever." Mark another fact: In the passage we have quoted from Isaiah, which reads, "Make straight in the desert a highway for our God," (Isa. 40: 3,) the word is Eloheem. Besides, in some of the instances already quoted and applied to Christ, in regard to the Rock, the Saviour, the Redeemer, both Jehovah and Eloheem are used, as, "I am Jehovah, and besides me there is no Eloheem." Christ is called God by the apostle in the following words: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen." (Rom. 9: 5.) One would think at a glance, that this text must defy criticism, and forever settle the fact that Christ was properly God over all, as taught directly and indirectly, in so many other instances. But here, too, our critics find a foot-hold; and Dr. P., in common with other Unitarian authors, decides that "There should be a full stop after the words 'over all,' and that the words, 'God blessed forever, Amen,' were added as a doxology by the apostle, in the way in which, in several instances, he has inserted a doxology in the midst of a paragraph." In reply to this we remark, 1. On the authority of Scott, there is no parallel in either the Old or New Testament for this case, if it is a doxology. We can appeal to every

Bible reader that this statement is correct. 2. As for the apostle's doxologies in the midst of paragraphs, and elsewhere, there seems in them all an appropriateness, as though suggested by the discourse. Scott says that such a method for evading the legitimate conclusions of this text, (as given above,) by the Arians and Socinians, "rests upon a harsh, unnatural and most unclassical construction, of which no example can be adduced, at the same time that it destroys the antithesis, without which the verse would be wholly destitute of propriety and animation." Doddridge adds, "This memorable text is a proof of Christ's proper Deity, which all the opposers of the doctrine have never been, nor ever will be, able to answer." With this opinion we fully agree.

We shall only add the testimony of Tertullian, a learned Christian father of the second century, as quoted by Dr. Stowe: "But I shall be able to call Christ alone God as the same apostle [Paul] says, Of whom Christ, who is God over all, blessed forever." In 1 Tim. 3 : 16, Paul speaks of Christ as God: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." No method as yet has been discovered, so far as we are informed, by which this text can be applied to any other than Christ. Then, in the person of Christ, God "was manifested [literal reading] in the flesh," or in human nature. But this must be a different manifestation from what we see in any mere piece of humanity, however full of God's Spirit; because such a manifestation is never called "in the flesh," but "to the destruction of the flesh." "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." "The Spirit warreth against the flesh and the flesh against the Spirit; and these are contrary one to the other." This is the only instance of which we have an account in which it is stated that the divine and human nature, or the flesh and Spirit, could work together in harmony; but this demanded no regeneration. In the last passage examined, we read; "of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came." In that case and in this it is clearly implied that he had both a human and a divine nature. God "was justified in the Spirit," though manifested in the flesh, and

though despised; rejected, and condemned of men. God "was seen of angels." Of course this must refer to the ministration of angels to the Saviour in the days of his flesh, for God in heaven is ever surrounded by angels. Angels foretold his advent, sang at his birth, ministered to him as he poured out his soul in strong crying and tears, attended him at his resurrection and ascension into heaven. God "was preached to the Gentiles." Glorious intelligence, that Gentiles as well Jews were his people. But all the preaching of God to the Gentiles was the preaching of Christ. This was the whole burden of the apostle's preaching. It was foolishness to many, but to others it was "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." (1 Cor. 1 :23, 24.) The proclaiming of Christ is here called preaching God to the Gentiles. God "was believed on in the world." The main object of the preaching of the apostles was to set forth Jesus Christ crucified, and to induce a belief in him. Christ is proclaimed as the author and finisher of our faith; yea, and the object of faith as well. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."—"This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." (Acts 16 :31; John 6 :29.) These utterances constituted the burden of the lesson taught by the apostles and their Master, both to Jews and to Greeks; and a belief in this proclamation is here called believing in God. "In Christ believing, we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, receiving the end of our faith, the salvation of our souls." "We know that the Son of God is come and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, even his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." "I determined not to know [or to teach] any thing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified." (Heb. 12 :2; 1 Pet. 1 :8, 9; 1 John 5 :20; 1 Cor. 2 :2.)

Let us now respectfully ask our Unitarian friends, Do not the foregoing Scriptures show what the apostle meant by saying that God was preached to the Gentiles and believed on in the world? If not, what does he mean?

God, "was received up into glory." Into the glory which he had with the Father before the world was. Having completed his manifestation among men, Christ, in the presence of his

disciples and the angels of God, ascended up on high. The gates lifted up their heads, and the everlasting doors were opened, and the Lord of hosts, who is the King of glory, was received up by rejoicing angels,—a cloud of angels,—he having led captivity captive. This ascension of Christ, the apostle denominates the receiving of God up into glory.

Dr. P. allows this text to stand as it is, except the last clause ; and if that were omitted altogether, we think the divinity of Christ abundantly proved by the remainder. But let us see his comment : “There is much discrepancy with regard to the reading of this passage, among the early manuscripts and versions ; but to my mind the balance of argument is in favor of the common reading, and the text conveys to my apprehension nothing that I do not gladly believe and embrace. Nay, I would adopt the passage as embodying my confession of faith with regard to Jesus Christ. I joyfully and thankfully acknowledge that in the person, in the moral attributes, in the unquenchable love of Jesus, God was manifest in the flesh ; that he was justified, that is, had false notions and sentiments concerning himself uprooted, and true ideas and feelings implanted among men, through the workings of his Spirit—that angels beheld with adoration this display of divine wisdom and love—that God thus manifest, was proclaimed to the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received in glory, (for such is the literal rendering of the words,) that is, gloriously received and welcomed in the hearts of Christ’s true disciples.” Is Dr. P. “in favor of the common reading” of the book, or of this very uncommon reading which he gives us as the literal one ? And when he says, “I would adopt the passage as embodying my confession of faith with regard to Jesus Christ,” which passage does he mean, the one in the book, or the substitute he supplies ? We say supplies, for whether the sense the Dr. expresses in the conclusion of his comment, is right or wrong, no such meaning is expressed in the “common reading,” which he professes to endorse. But observe that this new rendering, which he claims to be literal, excludes the preposition “up” entirely. The clause is *ανεληφθη εν δοξη*. The verb translated “received up” is *ανεληφθη*, *anelephthe*, from *αναλαμβανω*, *analambano*. The first definition of

this verb by Donnegan is, "To take up, as arms; hence, to take up," &c. Liddell and Scott's Lexicon gives—"To take up—take into one's hands." The Glossary of Greenfield's Greek Testament gives, "To take up, receive up, bear, carry," &c. This verb is composed of "*ana*" and "*lambano*." The authors before us make the prominent definitions of the latter word: "To take, seize, receive, grasp." The "*ana*" is defined by Liddell and Scott, "on, upon;" there "the common usage" is given as "implying motion upwards." The same authors say that "in composition" (precisely as in the case before us,) it signifies "up to, upwards, up." Donnegan also says: "In composition *ana* expresses ascension, elevation, movement upwards."

I do not say that Dr. P's reading is a perversion of the text, though we cannot find a parallel for it in the Scriptures. In Mark 16:19, and Acts 1:2, 11, 22, where Christ's ascension is mentioned, this verb is used and is translated "received up," and "taken up." Also in Acts 7:43, "Ye took up the tabernacle." In three cases our Scriptures have not used the preposition in translating this verb, but in those instances the Greek evidently implies it. If I have made any mistake in these criticisms, few men are better able to correct them than Dr. P. These same authors give other definitions, but none that conflict with those copied. Perhaps some authorities support Dr. P's reading, but we do not find them. Besides, all doctrines apart, does it not appear far more probable that the apostle, in this sentence, aimed at the sublime height to which we seem to be carried by our version, than that he should have stopped on the lower plain where the good Doctor's reading leaves us? On the whole, does not every reader, thus far, agree with Dr. P's first thought? "To my mind, the balance of argument is in favor of the common reading."

But if "Received in glory is the literal rendering of these words," by what authority does Dr. P. add, "That is, gloriously received and welcomed in the hearts of Christ's true disciples?" Perhaps the reader or the author can answer this question, but we cannot.

The beloved disciple calls the Master "God" in the following sentence: "And we are in him that is true, even in his Son Je-

sus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life. Little children, keep yourselves from idols." (John 5:20, 21.) Now unless the obvious meaning of this text can in some way be perverted, the expression, "This is the true God and eternal life," means, "Jesus Christ is the true God and eternal life."

"This" is from the demonstrative pronoun *houtos*, *houtos*. To what does this pronoun refer for its antecedent? The Lexicons say, "It is mostly used to refer to the latter of two objects, as being the nearer to the subject." Other definitions follow, but this is evidently to the point, as our quotation from John clearly falls under this rule, as "Jesus Christ" in the Greek as well as in the English, is the noun next preceding the pronoun.

Scott says of this 20th verse, "This Person is the true God and 'eternal life.' This language is peculiarly to be noted; it is not obvious to determine, in some of the clauses, whether the Father or the Son is intended. But where 'the Son of God, even Jesus Christ,' had been mentioned, the apostle made use of a personal pronoun, often improperly rendered 'This Man,' when applied to Christ, but commonly signifying this Person. This demonstrative pronoun has Jesus Christ for its immediate and evident antecedent; and having said, 'this Person is the true God' and 'eternal life,' the apostle concluded by solemnly cautioning his beloved children to 'keep themselves from idols.'" Doddridge says, "This is an argument for the Deity of Christ, which almost all those who have written in its defense have urged, and which I think none who have opposed it have so much as appeared to answer." Glassius says that "Athanasius in the council of Nice, disputing with Arius, called this text of John a written demonstration; adding, that as Christ said of the Father, John 17:3, 'This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God,' so John said of the Son, 'This is the true God and eternal life.' Arius then acquiesced and confessed the Son of God to be the true God." [Vide Commentary.] Bishop Burgess gives an exegesis of this text [Bloomfield] in which he shows conclusively that Jesus Christ is here declared to be the true God and eternal life. Paul, in Col. 3:4, and Heb. 5:9, ascribes the authorship of eternal life to Christ. Bloomfield says, "that Life, and eternal life, are, by the

sacred writers, perpetually ascribed to Christ as the author, is certain, and the words are nowhere applied to God the Father."

Of course the fertile genius of our opponent can devise some imaginary method for reading this text, which will furnish material for a cavil, however illusory. But any reading that does not make this text recognize the Deity of Jesus Christ, and pronounce him to be the true God and eternal life, will be limping English, and worse Greek; and to a candid scholar must be unsatisfactory.

"My Lord and my God!" (John 20:28.) Such was the exclamation of Thomas when first convinced that Christ had risen from the dead. Here, again, Dr. P. marvels that any should suppose they find any support for the doctrine of Christ's divinity; for was not Thomas astounded? and would not anybody who saw one alive whom he had thought was dead, exclaim "My God!" Such is the substance of a considerable portion of Dr. P's remarks. Does he intend to charge Thomas with profanity? why did not the Saviour rebuke him for taking God's name in vain?

But he farther says that "This sentence was not addressed to Christ, for it is not in the vocative case, which is used in the Greek when a person is spoken to." But the Dr. must have forgotten for the moment that it would not mend the grammar of this sentence to change the theology. If not addressed to Christ, but to the Father, it would require the vocative as well.

But Dr. P. adds, "The sentence is elliptical, and were we to supply the ellipsis, it would, as I suppose, read thus: It is my Lord and my God that has brought this glorious event to pass. But it was an abrupt, fragmentary exclamation, such as would naturally spring from overwhelming surprise." But does all this conjecture go one step toward proving that Christ was not the object of this ejaculation? And have we not the same right to supply this ellipsis as any one else? If so, we would prefer to leave off the last half of Dr. P's supplement, and read: "This is my Lord and my God." Such a reading would preserve the sense and the grammar, and the theology as we think; but "Thou art my Lord and my God!" would suit us still better. And when we consider the well-known rule of all

Greek grammars, that the nominative is often used for the vocative, this grammatical objection vanishes into thin air. The words *Kurios*, Lord, and *Theos*, God, may both be addressed to Christ by this rule, though in the nominative case. And one more fact is more disastrous to the argument than any we have yet mentioned. The record itself says that these words were addressed to Christ. "Then saith he to Thomas, reach hither thy finger and behold my hands ; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God. Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed." The Greek text, no less distinctly than the English, shows that these words were addressed to Christ. Literally rendered, it is, "Thomas answered and said unto him, *εἰπὼν αὐτῷ*, The Lord of me, and the God of me." Consider again, that, in this ejaculation, Thomas expressed his faith ; for Christ had just charged him, inferentially, with faithlessness ; and as soon as this exclamation was uttered he said : "Thou hast believed."

But our author thinks Thomas could never have believed in the divinity of Christ, or he would never have doubted his power to rise from the dead. We are happy to agree with the writer that a full confidence in Christ's proper divinity is a mighty protection against unbelief. Would God that all enjoyed it ! Would that all the Christian world could say as Thomas did, and hear the same answer from their Lord ! But even those whose creed is sound and orthodox may sometimes, like Thomas, find themselves floundering for a time in a 'quagmire of doubt. Thomas and the other disciples were ignorant of the fact that the death of Christ constituted a part of the plan of salvation ; and when they saw him, as they supposed, overpowered by his enemies and slain, confidence in his true divinity appears to have been shaken. They may have backslidden, perhaps, into another doctrine. But when, after his resurrection, the two on their way to Emmaus heard the scriptures expounded, their faith kindled anew, and their hearts burned within them. Similar was the effect on all the disciples, as they recognized him when he appeared to them. As soon as Thomas had seen

for himself, and felt for himself, he believed and rejoiced.

Bloomfield says, "On the sense of these remarkable words there has never been any real doubt, except such as has been raised by Arians and Socinians, who, to avoid this plain recognition of the Divinity of our Lord, have been compelled to resort to the miserable shift of taking the words as a mere formula of admiration, as we say 'Good Lord !' an idiom found in modern languages, but of which not a vestige is found in the ancient languages. Besides, that sense is not permitted by the words following, in which Christ commends the faith of Thomas." Had Unitarianism been true, would not Christ have rebuked Thomas for a belief so idolatrous, (at least, apparently,) instead of commending his faith, and tacitly appropriating the titles by which he was addressed ?

ART. IV.—THE UNITED NETHERLANDS.*

When the review of the preceding volumes of this valuable contribution to our historical treasures was confided to these pages, we were listening with exultant joy to the peals of the merry bells, that, all over England and Holland, were proclaiming the destruction of the Great Armada. Their sound broke in with cheer upon the gloom, uncertainty and fear that marked our national struggle in the year 1862. The pealing of the bells of liberty in the sixteenth century found an answering strain swelling up in patriot hearts in the nineteenth century, embattled in the same sacred cause with Netherlander and Englishman of three centuries ago.

The mind which exhibited with such vividness the light that

*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. Vols. III. and IV.

broke in upon almost rayless hearts in that ancient warfare, imbued with the very soul of freedom, as if he had fought by the side of Philip Sidney and walked in the serene presence of William the Silent, became, in the dark hours of our own struggle, our truest, noblest ambassador on that soil which the Armada coveted. His brave words in behalf of his own torn and sorely beset country will live in letters of golden radiance side by side with the pages which give to us the like heroic speech of the old-time patriots.

So heart responds to heart all along the centuries, and hand is joined to hand in the long-continued struggle that liberty confides to her sons. The battle-field of freedom may be to-day the Frisian swamps and the polders of Zealand, to-morrow amid the sunny slopes of France, anon it may be transferred to British shores, and again its cannon-roar may be echoed by the Alleghanies, but the struggle is one and the same.

Philip claimed that the vassal is never to differ from the opinion of his master. "Certainly it was worth an eighty years' war to drive such blasphemous madness as this out of human heads, whether crowned or shaven." The Netherlanders were conscious of the great principles at stake, and knew that to yield or temporize was to doom themselves to fearful ruin, and the cause of religious and political freedom to untold disaster. Neighboring States, weary with gazing upon the long contest, and, moreover, somewhat disturbed by some excesses and trespasses of the troops of the States, made severe complaints and talked of forcible intervention. They were met with the just and noble reply, that "The States were fighting the battle of Liberty against Slavery, in which the future generations of Germany, as well as of the Netherlands, were interested. They were combating that horrible institution, the Holy Inquisition. They were doing their best to strike down the universal monarchy of Spain, which they described as a blood-thirsty, insatiable, insolent, absolute dominion of Saracenic, Moorish Christians. They warred with a system which placed inquisitors on the seats of judges, which made it unlawful to read the Scriptures, which violated all oaths, suppressed all civic freedom, trampled on all laws and customs, raised inordinate taxes by

arbitrary decree, and subjected high and low to indiscriminate murder. Spain had sworn the destruction of the provinces and their subjugation to her absolute dominion, in order to carry out her scheme of universal empire."

"These were the deeds and designs against which the States were waging that war, concerning some inconvenient results of which their neighbors, now happily neutral, were complaining. But the cause of the States was the cause of humanity itself. This Saracenic, Moorish, universal monarchy had been seen by Germany to murder, despoil, and trample upon the Netherlands. It had murdered millions of innocent Indians and Grenadians, it had kept Naples and Milan in abject slavery. It had seized Portugal. It had deliberately planned and attempted an accursed invasion of England and Ireland. It had overrun and plundered many cities of the empire. . . . For all these reasons, men should not reproach the inhabitants of the Netherlands, because, seeing the aims of this accursed tyranny, they had set themselves to resist it. It was contrary to reason to consider them as disturbers of the general peace, or to hold them guilty of violating their oaths or their duty to the laws of the holy empire. The States-General were sure that they had been hitherto faithful and loyal, and they were resolved to continue in that path."*

They knew their foe too well to believe that intervention could accomplish anything in their behalf. Compromise was a word which to them meant, as it always means when valuable principles are at stake, the surrender of all that gives to life worth and power. Better bleed and die than yield, was the lesson taught from one generation to another. The splendor of king-craft was dispelled before their eyes; they could not believe it to be the special, divine right of a few weak mortals to dictate and rule the world. The sea raged around their dykes on the North, the Italian and Spanish musketeers hemmed them in upon the South; better to them were the fierce, devouring waters than the rule of the merciless tyrant of the Escorial. A pusillanimous peace would have been most gladly welcome to the neighboring powers who could not see that the tears and blood

*Vol. III. pp. 39, 40.

which flowed in the Netherlands were spent for themselves also. Had peace been sought upon the terms which only could have purchased it, ages to come had been witnesses of untold misery to all Europe. The home of liberty and her strong-hold rested then upon that narrow, meager soil.

Gradually a mighty realm was growing up behind those dykes and amid those sand-banks. A quarter of a century of bloody warfare found the Provinces prosperous and full of life. That career of vigor and power was even then entered on which brought at last a controlling part in the councils of nations and won large possessions in other parts of the world. There was the most marked contrast at this time between the struggling Netherlands and those provinces that had yielded to the Spanish power after brief resistance, or had readily declared for it at the outset.

The commerce and manufactures of the United Provinces, had, all this time, been immensely improved. The artisans from the provinces that owned Spanish rule, finding trade ruined there, sought the busy towns and flourishing cities of the North. "Amsterdam multiplied in wealth and population as fast as Antwerp shrank." Warehouses, palaces, docks, arsenals, fortifications, dykes, splendid streets and suburbs were constructed everywhere, making this the epoch of the greatest growth of municipal architecture. "It was in the provinces which had seceded from the union of Utrecht that there was silence as of the grave, destitution, slavery, abject submission to a foreign foe. . . . As for the mass of the people, it would be difficult to find a desolation more complete than that recorded of the 'obedient' provinces. Even as six years before, wolves littered their whelps in deserted farm-houses; cane-brake and thicket usurped the place of cornfield and orchard; robbers swarmed on the highways once thronged by a most thriving population, nobles begged their bread in the streets of cities whose merchants once entertained emperors and whose wealth and traffic were the wonder of the world."*

With this gloomy picture and striking contrasts continually

*Vol. III. p. 21.

before their eyes, it is no wonder that the States-General laughed at all the efforts of Philip to woo them to his embrace and tender mercies, and stoutly repelled all offers of mediation on the part of neutral powers. The king demanded three things, and from the first and second of these he would not abate a jot: they must adopt again the Catholic religion; they must submit to his rule as obedient subjects; they must pay the cost of the war. The heart and mind educated in the school of suffering, having tasted the sweets of freedom, looking daily upon thriving and prosperous towns, rejoicing in the blessings of religious liberty, peremptorily rejected such terrible terms.

That scheme of universal monarchy conceived by Philip, embraced the conquest of England, Scotland and France, as well as that of the Netherlands. That unhappy kingdom lying next his own, ruled by a succession of weak, dissolute kings, now claimed his special attention. Civil war for a generation had torn and distracted it. The "Holy Confederacy" and the Bearnese were now struggling for the mastery. To combat the latter, the Duke of Parma was commanded to withdraw his ill-paid and mutinous army from the Provinces. The favorite project of Parma was the conquest of the Netherlands, and he yielded with vexation to this distracting policy which he was sure would enable the Provinces to recover all he had wrested from them. He had sent a portion of his troops to aid Mayenne in opposing Henry of Navarre, but they had melted away in defeat on the famous field of Ivry. After this battle Henry besieged Paris; Parma was ordered to aid Mayenne a second time and raise the siege. But the Spanish forces were nearly starved, payment had not been made them for many months; some regiments became mutinous; the famous ancient legion, the *terzo viejo*, was disbanded for its unruly and obstinate conduct. Still the most imperative commands came from Philip to Parma to conquer France, or by all means to save Paris, while he surpassed the parsimony displayed by Elizabeth in support of her armies in the Netherlands, in his failure to keep his armies in cheerful obedience and healthful activity by providing for their rightful pay.

"Alexander did not of course inform his master that he was a mischievous lunatic, who upon any healthy principle of human

government, ought long ago to have been shut up from all communion with his species. It was very plain, however, from his letters, that such was his innermost thought."* The country around him was eaten bare, and was trembling in expectation of greater horrors. Every day added stronger remonstrances on the part of his garrisons. In the midst of all these trials, Philip wrote him to talk no more of difficulties but to conquer them ; "a noble phrase on the battle-field, but comparatively easy of utterance at the writing-desk."

After a small remittance from his sovereign, Parma addressed himself to his work with a heavy heart, and marched to the relief of Paris, which had already witnessed the death of thirty thousand of her citizens by famine, and now lay at its last gasp. The two great captains at last met before the city walls. Upon Parma were centered the most ardent hopes of the distressed citizens, for it was fondly believed that with him lay the way of peace and all hope for the future. He was the representative of the Catholic faith, and they had been taught to look upon the Bearnese with horror as a heretic. He brought deliverance from the rule of the Huguenot and subjection to the enemies of the most holy faith ; from this most fearful disaster they had prayed to be delivered, and to avert it thousands had proudly resisted to the last the approach of death in the form of gaunt famine.

These representatives of the two faiths were now in the prime of life. "Both had passed their lives in the field. . . . Both were born with that invaluable gift which no human being can acquire, authority ; and both were adored and willingly obeyed by their soldiers, so long as those soldiers were paid and fed. The prize now to be contended for was a high one. Alexander's complete success would tear from Henry's grasp the first city of Christendom, now sinking exhausted into his hands, and would place France in the power of the Holy League, and at the feet of Philip. Another Ivry would shatter the confederacy, and carry the king in triumph to his capital and his ancestral throne."†

*Vol. III. p. 71. †Vol. III. pp. 79, 80.

For seven days the armies confronted each other. Farnese was the first to move from his intrenchments. While Henry was looking on to discover the disposition of his foes and plan of attack, he found himself completely outgeneraled. Lagny, the key to the river Marne, was seized before his eyes; the bridges of Charenton and St. Maur fell from his grasp without a contest. Two thousand boat loads of provisions speeded on the now unencumbered way to Paris and relieved the starving city. The Bearnese was foiled and his army fell to pieces. The League was triumphant. But the Bearnese "met disaster with so cheerful a smile as almost to perplex disaster herself."

For two weeks Farnese rested his army, and then, to the dismay of the Leaguers, marched back to the Netherlands, followed closely by Henry who wrested back all the strongholds Farnese had won, and harassed his foe at every step.

The absence of Farnese was marked by greater ruin in the obedient Netherlands, while in the Republic greater preparations were made for successful resistance. Prince Maurice, meanwhile, matured his projects more fully, and began to put his theories and studies into practice on an extensive scale. He made important reforms in the matters of payment and discipline of the army, introduced new methods of warfare, and by his skill and foresight actually founded the great school of modern military science. It was apparent that the son of William the Silent was no unworthy successor of so revered a sire. "*Tandem fit surculus arbor*," his motto adopted just after his father's death, for his coat of arms, was now verified. "The twig becomes a tree" of glory and strength, the pride of that people who had rested so implicitly in the guidance of the father.

"At that moment when a thorough, practical soldier was most needed by the struggling little commonwealth, to enable it to preserve liberties partially secured by its unparalleled sacrifice of blood and treasure during a quarter of a century, and to expel the foreign invader from the soil which he had so long profaned, it was destined that a soldier should appear." "To bring to utmost perfection the machinery already in existence, to encourage invention, to ponder the past with a practical application to the present, to court fatigue, to scorn pleasure, to concen-

trate the energies on the work in hand, to cultivate quickness of eye and calmness of nerve in the midst of danger, to accelerate movements, to economize blood even at the expense of time, to strive after ubiquity and omniscience in the details of person and place, these were the characteristics of Maurice.”*

The most brilliant success attended his movements at the outset. Zutphen and Deventer—betrayed to the Spaniard by the treason of the English captains, York and Stanley,—Hulst—of great importance from its situation, the possession of which by the enemy was a perpetual thorn in the side of the States,—Delfzyl, and the strong city of Nymegen were the fruits of his first campaign of a few months duration. The deepest exultation and most heartfelt homage greeted the son of William the Silent from all classes of his countrymen. Steenwyck and Coewarden, the key to all Friesland, fell into Maurice’s hands in the following year, in spite of great efforts made by the enemy to relieve the garrisons.

A second time Farnese was recalled from the Netherlands to France. But during his absence his enemies, numbering many nobles, in the Spanish service, were busy in writing malicious letters concerning him to the king. The mind of the latter was at length so affected by these misrepresentations, added to some previous uneasiness, that he determined to remove his nephew,—to who had served him with all his strength of body and soul,—from his office and bring him by stratagem or else by force Spain. “His project, once resolved upon, the king proceeded to execute with that elaborate attention to detail, and with that feline stealth which distinguished him above all kings or chiefs of police that have ever existed.” An envoy was despatched with the special mission of removing Farnese, by fair means if possible, but if these failed he was to be deposed and sent home by force. This was to be the end of that long service which had broken his health and made him old and gray before his time.

Thus with minute and artistic treachery Philip strove to destroy his most successful general. Meanwhile, “Alexander, having, as he supposed, somewhat recruited his failing strength,

*Vol. III. pp. 99, 101.

prepared, according to his master's orders, for a new campaign in France. For with almost preterhuman malice Philip was employing the man whom he had devoted to disgrace, perhaps to death, and whom he kept under constant secret supervision, in those laborious efforts to conquer without an army and to purchase a kingdom with an empty purse, in which, as it was destined, the very last sands of Parma's life were to run away."

"Suffering from a badly healed wound, dropsical, enfeebled, broken down into an old man before his time, Alexander still confronted disease and death with as heroic a front as he had ever manifested in the field to embattled Hollanders and Englishmen. . . . This wreck of a man was still fitter to lead armies and guide councils than any soldier or statesman that Philip could call into his service, yet the king's cruel hand was ready to stab the dying man in the dark. . . . To the last moment, lifted into the saddle, he attended personally as usual to the details of his new campaign, and was dead before he would confess himself mortal. On the 3d of December, 1592, he fainted after retiring at his usual hour to bed, and thus breathed his last."

"The first soldier and most unscrupulous diplomatist of his age, he died when scarcely past his prime, a wearied, broken-hearted old man. . . . Were it possible to conceive of an Italian or Spaniard of illustrious birth in the sixteenth century, educated in the school of Machiavelli, at the feet of Philip, as anything but the supple slave of a master and the blind instrument of a Church, one might for a moment regret that so many gifts of genius and valor had been thrown away, or at least lost to mankind. Could the light of truth ever pierce the atmosphere in which such men have their being; could the sad music of humanity ever penetrate to their ears; could visions of a world—on this earth or beyond it—not exclusively the property of kings and high-priests be revealed to them, one might lament that one so eminent among the sons of women had not been a great man. But it is a weakness to hanker for any possible connection between truth and Italian or Spanish statecraft of that day. The truth was not in it nor in him, and high above his heroic achievements, his fortitude, his sagacity, his chivalrous

self-sacrifice, shines forth the baleful light of his perpetual falsehood.”*

Parma's successor, the Arch-duke Ernest, died after a year's administration that was remarkable for nothing save weakness and inefficiency. In the early days of the year 1596, the Arch-duke Cardinal Albert, Archbishop of Toledo, laid off his episcopal robes and entered Brussels as governor-general of the obedient provinces. As the triumphal procession entered the city, all eyes were fixed with intensest interest upon one who rode at its head in company with two grandees, “whose grave, melancholy features,—although wearing a painful expression of habitual restraint and distrust,—suggested, more than did those of the rest of his family, the physiognomy of William the Silent to all who remembered that illustrious rebel.”

“It was the eldest son of the great founder of the Dutch republic. Philip William, Prince of Orange, had at last, after twenty-eight years of captivity in Spain, returned to the Netherlands, whence he had been kidnaped while a school-boy at Louvain, by order of the Duke of Alva.” The Jesuit had done his work with wonderful success. The bodily confinement had not been close and severe, but a fearful change had been wrought in the moral nature of the Prince. His soul was still in bonds to the tyrant of the Escorial, and he was sent, when Catholic control was deemed perfect, to further the secret purposes of the Spaniard on the soil that drank his father's blood. He had kissed the hand of the king and listened fondly to the promise that his paternal and maternal estate should be restored to him. The change was complete. “All that was left of his youthful self was a passionate reverence for his father's memory, strangely combined with a total indifference to all that his father held dear, all for which his father had labored his whole lifetime, and for which his heart's blood had been shed.”

It was supposed that the name and presence of the prince of Orange might further Spanish interests by developing toward him such reverence and devotion as should cause his countrymen to forget something of the ends they struggled for, while

*Vol. III. pp. 223—225.

they listened to his appeals. But the name of their great leader had little value to them except as it was linked with patriotism. That it should be worn by one so changed might produce sorrow, but it was robbed of any power to seduce Hollander and Frisian from the living ways of freedom, from the moment it shone forth on the side of their foes. A correspondence actually took place between the Prince of Orange and the States-General, in which he was addressed with great propriety and affectionate respect, but in which he was "plainly given to understand that his presence at that time in the United Provinces would neither be desirable, nor, without their passports, possible." They well knew the uses designed to be made of his presence, and determined, at the outset, to prevent them.

Henry IV. had steadily made progress along that path which he knew could alone lead him to his ancestral throne, for many months before his formal conversion to the Catholic faith. That which Philip and Elizabeth alike feared, that which Huguenot and Leaguer dreaded, formally took place on the 23d of July, 1593. After six long hours of expoundings and exhortations, the monarch arose from his knees fully convinced and converted. On the next morning Henry went to church, clad in satin of the purest white, to be received into the tender bosom of the Romish church. Protestantism was appalled at the sight of her favorite chieftain making reconciliation with her mortal enemy, and apprehended the most disastrous results. "Every honest Protestant in Europe shrank into himself for shame," over this fearful comedy. Soon after, under cover of night, he crept into his capital and ancestral seat. Twenty-one years before, he had entered the city as the champion and idol of the Huguenots; the same year witnessed his first Catholic conversion and the slaughter of those who had rested in him as chief, in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. But this was no "triumphal entrance; nor did Henry come as the victorious standard-bearer of a great principle. He had defeated the League on many battle-fields, but the League still hissed defiance at him from the very hearthstone of his ancestral palace. He had now crept, in order to conquer, even lower than the League itself; and casting off his

Huguenot skin at last, he had soared over the heads of all men, the presiding genius of the holy Catholic Church.”*

This was the man with whom Barneveld and Maurice of Nassau were to treat for aid in their struggle for freedom, and, excepting Elizabeth, the only sovereign from whom any help could be expected. How much aid was likely to come from so fickle a prince bound in the shackles of Rome, with little appreciation of the principles at stake in the struggle of a commonwealth that had helped to assist him, more than any other nation save England, to the throne of his ancestors, it is easy to foresee.

Henry was secretly preparing the way for peace with Spain through his secret envoy, after his conversion was duly accomplished, at the same time that he assured England and the States of his most cordial coöperation in their efforts against the Spanish power. To avoid the alliance which seemed imminent between Henry and Philip against England and Holland, it was necessary to force Henry into actual hostilities with Spain. To accomplish this the Dutch envoys labored unceasingly. Meanwhile, Henry's envoy to the States was protesting, in the choicest rhetoric, the strong friendship of his master. “Nothing,” said he, “was farther from the king's thoughts than to injure those noble spirits with whom his soul had lived so long, and whom he so much loved and honored.” “The envoy was instructed to say that his master never expected to be in amity with one who had ruined his house, confiscated his property, and caused so much misery to France.” At that very moment the king was proposing for the hand of the Infanta and preparing to publish the Council of Trent! The envoy then modestly asked the States to manifest their generosity by sending troops to prevent disaster to the king and France. So, in good faith, it was agreed that a force of three thousand foot and five hundred horse should be sent for Henry's use.

Thus we repeatedly find this rising Republic, filled with the consciousness that the battle of freedom was the same, whether fought upon French soil or upon their own, readily sending reinforcements to Henry in Hainault and Artois; to the relief of

*Vol. III. p. 245.

Calais whither Maurice accompanies them in person; and to Cadiz to help Howard and Essex give the beard of the Spaniard another singeing.

The old attraction toward France had not grown less since those days of William the Silent, when the Provinces went about seeking some power to assume the sovereignty. The bonds of alliance were now becoming closer, notwithstanding the change in the religion of the king and the severe disappointments it had caused to the leading spirits in the Netherlands. Henry decided to renew hostilities with Spain, largely through the efficient diplomacy of the States, and formally declared war.

But Elizabeth, although her person had been repeatedly in danger from the assassins of Philip, although her shores had been invaded by the Armada, and although she had just burned a third part of the king's fleet at Cadiz and destroyed that rich and important city, declared, with utmost coolness, that she and Philip were not formally at war with each other. "It seemed, therefore, desirable to the States-General that this very practical warfare should be, as it were, reduced to a theorem;" that a formal alliance offensive, and defensive, should be formed with France and England against Spain.

Such was the jealousy of England toward this new power that, when the alliance was actually to be formed, she was not willing that the States-General should be invited to join the league, because, being under her protection, it was urged they were supposed to have no will but hers. The sovereignty had been offered her ten years before and was refused. The republic was now a power, and was its own sovereign, and could no longer be made a dependency of the English crown. The attempt failed, and the States received an honorable recognition.

As it was impossible to ignore the presence and the power of the United Provinces among the nations, it was resolved that they should be defrauded in the treaty into which they were invited to enter. Two contracts were made, one of which was public, pledging the most active support on the part of the three powers; the other was secret, signed only by the ministers of England and France, reducing the first to a mere decoy for the Dutch Republic. The secret contract really destroyed, as far as

the English and French were concerned, the effects and promises of the one which had been made public and accepted in good faith by the States. With such fearful trifling were the Netherlands met, while struggling to overthrow the most cruel despotism and fighting the battles of France and England, as well as their own, for generation after generation.

As a further exhibition of the treatment on the part of England toward the States, we give the manner and language of the Queen at the time when the States' envoys, after having failed to prevent Henry from forming a treaty of peace with Spain, arrived in England to secure the assistance of that power.

"When the two envoys fell on their knees—as the custom was—before the great Queen, and had been raised by her to their feet again, they found her Majesty in marvelously ill-humor. Olden-Barneveld recounted to her the results of their mission to France, and said that from beginning to end it had been obvious that there could be no other issue. The king was indifferent, he said, whether the States preferred peace or war, but in making his treaty he knew that he had secured a profit for himself, inflicted damage on his enemy, and done no harm to his friends."

"Her Majesty then interrupted the speaker by violent invectives against the French king for his treachery. . . . Then she became very abusive to the Dutch envoys, telling them that they were quite unjustifiable in not engaging at once in peace negotiations."

"Barneveld replied that such an accommodation was of course impossible, unless they accepted their ancient sovereign as prince. . . . The Queen here broke forth with mighty oaths, interrupting the envoy's discourse, protesting over and over again by the living God that she would not and could not give the States any further assistance; that she would leave them to their fate; swearing that she had been a fool to help them and the king of France as she had done, for it was nothing but evil passions that kept the States so obstinate."

It was cruel trifling, therefore, it was inhuman insolence on her part, to suggest anything like a return of the States to the dominion of Spain. But her desire for peace and her determin-

nation to get back her money overpowered at that time all other considerations.

“By the living God ! by the living God ! by the living God ! she swore over and over again as her anger rose, she would never more have anything to do with such people ; and she deeply regretted having thrown away her money and the lives of her subjects in so stupid a manner.”*

It was no wonder that Barneveld and his colleague turned homeward with heavy hearts, notwithstanding the recent assurance of Henry’s ambassador at the Hague, that, “after the king’s death, his affection and gratitude towards the States would be found deeply engraved upon his heart.”

No measure seemed unscrupulous or vicious to Philip that contributed to his own pleasure, or to the establishment of the Catholic faith. The massacre of so many millions of Protestants, the efforts to conquer France, England and the Provinces, had made more serious drains upon the royal treasury than he had anticipated. By all means he must extirpate heresy, and make himself the sovereign of one world-wide Catholic monarchy. He therefore resolved upon a general repudiation of his debts and publicly revoked all assignments, mortgages and other deeds which had been given to merchants, bankers and other individuals, and formally took them again into his own possession, calling God to witness that it was to serve his divine will. He had, so he urged, been impoverished in his efforts to save Christianity from destruction, while those who held his notes, the money-lenders and merchants, had grown rich.†

The effect of this vast fraud gave a terrible shock to all Europe. The chief merchants and bankers suspended payment. There were more failures in Frankfort in one day than had occurred in all the history of the city. “There was a general howl of indignation and despair upon every exchange, in every counting-room, in every palace, in every cottage in Christendom.”

At length the death of the hideous monster, who had sat at his writing-desk so busily employed in making and remaking

*Vol. III. pp. 487—490. †Vol. III. pp. 441—443.

kings, in destroying princes and empires, was about to relieve the nations of his hated presence. He had always been of delicate constitution. In mid-summer of 1598, a low fever rapidly reduced his strength. Disintegration of his whole physical constitution began. Swarms of vermin, impossible to extirpate, were generated and reproduced in the sores that gathered and broke on his body. "No torture ever invented by Torquemada or Peter Titelman to serve the vengeance of Philip and his ancestors or the pope against the heretics of Italy or Flanders, could exceed in acuteness the agonies which the most Catholic king was now called upon to endure."

He early ascertained that his malady was mortal and began to prepare for his final departure. A special courier was despatched to Rome for the pope's benediction. He then prepared to make a general confession. "In all his life," he said, "he had never consciously done wrong to any one. If he had ever committed an act of injustice, it was unwittingly, or because he had been deceived in the circumstances." The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered to him frequently during his illness. Special consolation was derived by him in viewing the many relics of saints which he had collected during his long reign. With perfect composure and with minute detail, he gave directions for his funeral obsequies, causing them to be written down and read aloud, that his children and officers of state might thoroughly learn their lesson before the time came for the ceremony.

After receiving extreme unction twice during his sickness, and having reached such an exaltation of piety as caused his confessor to hope that he might soon pass away, as it would be a misfortune by temporary convalescence to fall from it, it became apparent that death was at hand. "His father's crucifix was placed in his hands and he said distinctly: 'I die like a good Catholic, in faith and obedience to the holy Roman church.' Soon after these last words had been spoken, a paroxysm, followed by faintness, came over him and he lay entirely still. They had covered his face with a cloth, thinking he had already expired, when he suddenly started with great energy, opened

his eyes, seized the crucifix from the hand of Fernando de Toledo, kissed it, and fell back again into agony.”*

The bystanders believed he must have seen a celestial vision which caused him to arouse himself so vigorously at such a crisis. He expired some hours after, Sept. 13th, 1598.

Protestantism breathed freer, as the dreaded form, was borne out of sight to disturb its peace no more. Men could hardly believe that relief had really come from the terrible vengeance and ubiquitous schemes that had pursued them or pressed heavily upon them, unweariedly on land and sea, so long had they felt and acted in reference to that one hated presence at the Escorial.

It will be of no small profit to follow our author's estimate of this important reign and his summary of its leading characteristics.

The Spanish monarchy in the reign of Philip II. was the most powerful and extensive empire that had ever been known. It was owing to a series of accidents—in the common acceptance of that term—that Philip came to the government of such a number of distinct and separate sovereignties.

“Thus the dozen kingdoms of Spain, the seventeen provinces of the Netherlands, the kingdoms of the two Sicilies, the duchy of Milan, and certain fortresses and districts of Tuscany, in Europe; the kingdom of Barbary, the coast of Guinea, and an indefinite and unmeasured expanse of other territory in Africa; the controlling outposts and cities all along the coast of the two Indian peninsulas, with as much of the country as it seemed good to occupy, the straits and the great archipelagoes, so far as they had been visited by Europeans, in Asia; Peru, Brazil, Mexico, the Antilles,—the whole recently discovered fourth quarter of the world in short, from the ‘Land of Fire’ in the south to the frozen regions of the north—as much territory as the Spanish and Portuguese sea-captains could circumnavigate and the pope in the plenitude of his power and his generosity could bestow on his fortunate son, in America; all this enormous proportion of the habitable globe was the private property of Philip,

*Vol. III. pp. 510, 511.

who was the son of Charles, who was the son of Joanna, who was the daughter of Isabella, whose husband was Ferdinand.”

“The sea, too, was his as well as the dry land. From Borneo to California the great ocean was but a Spanish lake, as much the king’s private property as his fish-ponds at the Escorial with their carp and perch. No subjects but his dared to navigate those sacred waters. Not a common highway of the world’s commerce, but a private path for the gratification of one human being’s vanity, had thus been laid out by the bold navigators of the sixteenth century.”*

These countries were continually pouring out at his feet immense wealth. His armies were composed of the best troops from Italy, Germany, Sicily and Milan. The most varied products of the richest lands were brought to his doors. All these were employed most assiduously to scatter desolation on the plains of France, the shores of England and the rich meadows of Holland ; they fed the dream of Philip of a world-empire of which he was to be chief and over which the Holy Inquisition was to triumph.

What was Spain herself under this reign of nearly half a century ? She was populous and highly favored in soil and climate, for commerce and agriculture. But it is a high moral sentiment that makes even a rich soil valuable and gives to sunshine and cloud the power to bless in any glorious measure. In Spain the foundation of all wealth was sapped by a strangely perverted moral sentiment.

Labor was esteemed dishonorable. The Spaniard, from highest to lowest, was proud, ignorant and lazy. The Moors and Jews were the industrial classes, and when these, through Spanish hate, had been exiled, massacred, or subjugated, productive energy ceased, and the highest intellectual culture disappeared. Then, because industry in letters and art was the mark of a crushed, degraded people, the Spaniard esteemed all labor, whether of head or of hand, degrading.

Self-esteem protruded itself in the most ludicrous forms. The most wretched beggar, the half-starved brigand, the lowest

*Vol. III. pp. 515, 516.

swineherd boasted in their ignorance and rags, of the purity of their descent, of their freedom from the taint of Moorish blood ; in their own eyes they were noblemen, and for a nobleman to labor was, of course, to bring a stain upon his honor. So the higher classes amused themselves with pompous exhibitions of equipage, furniture and dress, with love-making, brilliant festivities, bull-baiting, and the burning of Protestants. The lower masses were idle, begging, dice-playing, filching vagabonds.

It was impossible to supply the places of the exiled Jews and Moors with native workmen. Small farms, moderate possessions of land, were unknown. The peasant could not gain a title to the least amount of landed property. "The great nobles—and of real grandees of Spain there were but forty-nine, although the number of titled families was much larger—owned all the country, except that vast portion of it which had reposed for ages in the dead hand of the Church. . . . The millions of the needy never dreamed of the possibility of deriving benefit from the capital of the rich, nor would have condescended to employ it, nor known how to employ it, had its use in any form been vouchsafed to them. The surface of Spain, save only around the few royal residences, exhibited no splendor of architecture, whether in town or country, no wonders of agricultural or horticultural skill, no monuments of engineering and constructive genius in roads, bridges, docks, warehouses, and other ornamental and useful fabrics, or in any of the thousand ways in which man facilitates intercourse among his kind and subdues nature to his will."*

One third of the whole annual income of Spain and Portugal belonged to the dignitaries of the Church, whose incomes ranged from the enormous annual revenue of the archbishop of Toledo of three hundred thousand dollars, down to six thousand dollars. In return for this heavy income they fed their flocks with neither bread from wheat nor bread from heaven. They cared only to gain larger riches for themselves and their families from the crushed and ignorant populace. While free from the

*Vol. III. p. 526.

gross crimes and loathsome immoralities of the Roman priesthood, they were characterized by avarice, greediness and laziness.

With quick, unsparing hand, Philip hastened to set the death-seal upon whatever was remaining of the free institutions of the peninsula at the time of his accession to the throne. The last time in that age that even the ghost of extinct liberty revisited the soil of Spain was in Arragon, where, in the person of Antonio Perez, the ancient privileges seemed, for an instant, to defy the absolute authority of the monarch. The whole trial and sentence of this advocate of the constitution and defender of the law of his country, the Chief Justice of Arragon, was condensed into the terrible epigram : "You will take John of Lanuza, and you will have his head cut off." The last vestige of law and freedom was obliterated.

The land was governed by an established terrorism. The Grand Inquisitor had his agents in every village. No fireside could be secure against his fangs. Rebellion was impossible. The restive Spaniard knew that swift destruction by fire or halter would follow the slightest movement toward rejection of kingly despotism or Romish oppression. Every spark of liberty was extinguished by the combined efforts of the crown, nobility and clergy, aided by the potent, all-pervasive Inquisition.

The supreme director of this terrorism, the administrator of this perfect despotism, was Philip. This was the nation over which he ruled with supreme delight. His murders were innumerable, his robberies of the most gigantic kind. Falsehood was the great basis of his character. "He was false, most of all, to those to whom he gave what he called his heart. . . . Could the great schoolmaster of iniquity for the sovereigns and politicians of the south have lived to witness the practice of the monarch who had laid most to heart the precepts of the "Prince," he would have felt that he had not written in vain, and that his great paragon of successful falsehood, Ferdinand of Arragon, had been surpassed by the great grandson. For the ideal perfection of perfidy, foreshadowed by the philosopher who died in the year of Philip's birth, was thoroughly embodied at last by this potentate. Certainly Nicholas Machiavelli could have

hoped for no more docile pupil. That all men are vile, that they are liars, scoundrels, poltroons, and idiots alike—ever ready to deceive and yet easily to be duped—and that he only is fit to be king who excels his kind in the arts of deception; by this great maxim of the Florentine, Philip was ever guided. And those well-known texts of hypocrisy, strewn by the same hand, had surely not fallen on stony ground when received into Philip's royal soul.”*

His career came to an ignominious close; and that reign which opened with such brilliant prospects ended in thorough and disgraceful failure. In vain had he striven to exclude the Bearnese from the throne of France; his Armadas were shattered hopelessly in their attempts upon England, whose queen, notwithstanding his repeated efforts to assassinate her, outlived him; his ablest generals strove to reduce the Netherlands to slavery and to papacy, but at his death the once abject provinces had become an independent republic with security to their civil and religious rights. His vast treasures, laid before him at the opening of his reign, had disappeared, leaving a paltry income at his death. His armies, once the admiration of the world for courage and efficiency, became in the course of that strange reign a horde of starving, rebellious brigands. The power of Spain was broken by the hands and in the lifetime of its greatest sovereign.

During a great portion of Philip's reign the Netherlanders had been permitted to trade with Spain. The war fed their commerce and commerce fed their war. The great maritime discoveries had resulted in an immense traffic by Spanish merchants with the new discovered lands. But all other nations were shut out from this direct trade by the delusion that the ocean was the exclusive property of Spain. The products brought to Spanish ports were reshipped for Holland in the way of trade. Toward the close of Philip's reign this carrying trade was stopped. The commerce of the Netherlands suffered severely; many vessels and thousands of seamen were unemployed. At length that enterprise which soon gave the Repub-

*Vol. III. pp. 540, 541.

lic large and rich traffic with India and the islands of the Pacific and the Indian Oceans, began to show itself in expeditions of discovery.

Linschoten published a book of his travels in India, of the route thither, and of the most favored places for trade. The Spanish monopoly of the oceans was effectually disposed of. Most vigorous efforts, attended with much suffering and danger, were made to discover a shorter road to Cathay and China across the polar seas. With rude and defective instruments of navigation, with small, unwieldy, awkward vessels, these indomitable Dutchmen braved Arctic terrors to within less than ten degrees of the North pole, and circumnavigated the globe,—giving continual proofs of the most perfect discipline and unbroken cheerfulness amid toil, suffering and danger. The fortitude and endurance of our favorite voyager in frozen regions, as depicted in those wonderful volumes by Kane himself, were surpassed by William Barendz, who, unsupplied with the aids and comforts which modern science provides, penetrated far beyond the utmost stretch of previous explorations, and for seventeen months braved the fearful exposure and sufferings of the regions of ice and darkness.

The harbor of Nieuport, but a few miles distant from Ostend, swarmed with the privateers of the enemy who inflicted great damage upon Netherland commerce and made the possession of Ostend of little value to the States. Maurice was commanded, much against his opinion, to capture Nieuport by surprise or assault before the enemy could make any adequate efforts to relieve it. Indeed, any activity on the part of the archduke seemed at this time impossible. His army was dissolved in mutiny, and his exchequer was empty.

When the States' army was ready to sail from Flushing a head wind detained it for several days with little prospect of a speedy change, and it was decided to disembark the troops and reach Nieuport by land. The intervening distance of forty miles was accomplished in thirteen days.

The hope of surprise fled long before the walls of the city met the eye of the stadtholder. But meanwhile the enemy, who had been supposed incapable of any movement for many weeks, was

not idle in the presence of the rumors of this advance of the States' army. His mutineers, at his most vehement appeals, returned to his standard. Before the republican forces had sat down before the city, he was on his way with equal numbers to attempt their overthrow.

Just at dusk on the first evening after his arrival, Maurice was met by a terrified, almost exhausted messenger bringing the astounding intelligence that the archduke was only a few hours distant. He saw at once that, with his communications thus cut off, with no hope of a successful assault upon the city, there was, instead of the intended surprise, to be a great battle before another sun should set. That battle proved one of the decisive battles of the world. A defeat would bring terrible disaster to the Republic and triumph to the Inquisition. The power of the States, transferred far from home, was gathered upon those narrow sands of Nieuport, shut in by the ocean on one side and the marshes upon the other.

With heroic resolution Maurice commanded his transports, which at last had arrived and were at anchor in the harbor, to sail away for Ostend, that his troops might know that all escape was impossible, that upon those sands the battle must be waged with hope or disaster for the great cause. The fate of the Republic never before seemed suspended upon so slender a thread as upon that July morning when the trumpet blew the signal for the fray between these champions of the Papacy and Protestantism. "The arena of the conflict seemed elaborately prepared by the hand of nature. The hard, level, sandy beach, swept clean and smooth by the ceaseless action of the tides, stretched out as far as the eye could reach in one long, bold, monotonous line. . . . On the right, just beyond high-water mark, the downs, fantastically heaped together like a mimic mountain chain, or like tempestuous ocean-waves suddenly changed to sand, rolled wild and confused. . . . Beyond the downs, which were seven hundred yards in width, extended a level tract of those green fertile meadows, artificially drained, which are so characteristic a feature of the Netherland landscape. . . . It was a bright, warm, mid-summer day. The waves of the German ocean came lazily rolling in upon the crisp yellow sand, the surf breaking with its

monotonous music at the very feet of the armies. It was an atmosphere better befitting a tranquil holiday than the scene of carnage which seemed approaching.”*

In the contest victory seemed to perch now upon the standards of the Netherlanders, then upon those of the Spaniard, as repulse and rally succeeded on either side. Half-leg deep in sand, without opportunity to make any extensive military evolutions, face to face these long-time foes met in a vast series of individual encounters. Briton, Hollander, Spaniard, Frisian, Frenchman, Walloon, Italian, fought and fell together, hotly contesting every inch of those barren sands. “It seemed, said one who fought there, as if the last day of the world had come.” “Political and religious hatred, pride of race, remembrance of a half century of wrongs, hope, fury, and despair; these were the real elements contending with each other that summer’s day.”

At length the whole line of the enemy broke and fled wildly in every direction before determined republican valor. For a long time the mad chase continued along the beach and through the downs. “Never was rout more absolute than that of Albert’s army. Never had so brilliant a victory been achieved by Hollander or Spaniard upon that great battle-ground of Europe—the Netherlands.”

We pass reluctantly the graphic account of the siege of Ostend, which lasted more than three years, involving the loss on both sides, by pestilence and arms, of a hundred thousand victims; nor can we rehearse the brave encounters at sea, in the East Indies and around Gibraltar, where Dutch valor wrung rich triumphs from superstitious might; prolonged reference to other battles bringing hope or discouragement to the republic must be omitted.

Until 1609 the war was waged with glory, for the most part, to the States; with disaster, now and then relieved by momentary triumphs, to the enemy. In that year there was a lull between two mighty storms. The whole world was at peace. Butchery in the name of Christ was suspended. The Turk had

*Vol. IV. pp. 31, 32.

just concluded a twenty years truce with the Roman empire ; "The Cross and the Crescent, Santiago and the Orange banner, were for a season in repose." The twelve years' truce, concluded that year between the Republic and Spain, separated the forty years' war now past, from the thirty years' war in which all Germany as well as the Netherlands were engaged.

Up to the time of the truce, the progress of Republican arms and enterprise had been most signal. The liberty of the people had not been dissipated as a dream. Humanity had taken vast strides forward in those outlying provinces. The Inquisition was foiled, and a self-governing, intelligent commonwealth had risen to the first rank among the nations. No army in Europe could compare with that of the States. It was nearly impossible to compel a war-vessel of the Republic to surrender. In physical science, in every department of the fine arts, in enterprise of discovery, the Netherlands took a leading part in the development of the nations.

To the noble band of heroes and martyrs, of discoverers and navigators, of inventors and statesmen, the world will ever owe a large debt, as it marches on to heights yet beyond.

"The Netherlanders had wrung their original fatherland out of the grasp of the ocean. They had confronted for centuries the wrath of that ancient tyrant, ever ready to seize the prey of which he had been defrauded.

"They had waged fiercer and more perpetual battle with a tyranny more cruel than the tempest, with an ancient superstition more hungry than the sea. It was inevitable that a race, thus invigorated by the ocean, cradled to freedom by their conflicts with its power, and hardened almost to invincibility by their struggle against human despotism, should be foremost among the nations in the development of political, religious and commercial freedom."*

We most ardently hope the writer of these most valuable contributions to our historical treasures may be permitted to complete his proposed task, upon which he is now engaged, of writing a history of the thirty year's war.

*Close of Vol. IV.

ART. V.—METHOD IN STUDY.

BY REV. JAMES A. HOWE, OLNEYVILLE, R. I.

The Country Parson, in a work entitled "Leisure Hours in Town," has a spicy paper "concerning people of whom more might have been made," in which he says: "Wise and diligent training on the part of others, self-denial, industry, tact, decision, promptitude on the part of the man himself, might have made something far better than he now is of every man that breathes;" a remark transparently truthful, and capable of quickening our efforts for improvement. Unlimited possibilities are open to all men. Therefore neither the heroic mastery of obstacles to self-culture, nor any expressions of discontent with the best attainments in scholarship, excite surprise. The marvel is, that minds set down before such fertile fields of opportunity, can cheerfully accept life on the barren moor of ignorance. The goal of perfection always recedes before pursuing steps, it is true, but not to discourage efforts to gain it. For it is not in the attainment of, but in the reaching after, a complete manhood that existence is crowned with value. It is certainly idle to expect a success not striven for. The waves of fortune, however strongly and rapidly they may strike the beach, will lay no argosies at the feet of him who sits and watches their play. Lives affluent in time, talent, and invitations to exalted seats are frequently fore-doomed to failure, because the abundant richness of their privileges is asked to spontaneously germinate a harvest for which there has been no sowing. It is enough with many, that God is supposed to have given them genius. Of all classes of men aiming at an object, those proposing to do nothing, it must be confessed, come nearest to their mark.

Injudicious means are scarcely more fatal to a symmetrical growth of manhood, than judicious means unskillfully employed. Earnest attempts to reach a high standard, and "with no middle flight to soar above the Aonian mount," have often resembled the effort of an eagle, whose wings are clipped, to reach his native skies. Neither the recognition of excellence nor of the appli-

ances by which it is gained fulfill the conditions of success. It is unquestionably true of many men that a more generous supply of instrumentalities, for the awakening and guidance of latent ability, would have worked out for them a far more brilliant career. Books, schools, teachers, and time for study, would have converted left arms of weakness into right arms of power. It is not altogether from an inadequate supply of forces that lives fall short of their legitimate bounds, and brooks run gurgling in the deep channels of rivers. For lack of knowledge, it is true, "Hands that the rod of empire might have swayed," have wielded only the axe and hoe, and "mute, inglorious Miltons" have gone down into obscure graves in country churchyards. On the other hand, it is unfortunately true, that men of varied but ill-sorted learning have, sometimes, failed of scepters, and "inglorious Miltons," who were not 'mute,' have been borne to their 'narrow cell.' There is a class of minds whose limited quality of culture stands neither to the charge of idleness nor ignorance, but to infidelity and disconnected methods. Too many eyes fail to see that as much depends on the careful following up, as on the discovery, of the vein struck by the student. An acknowledgment of the utility of study is not sufficient for wisdom. The development of processes, not the emphasizing of their worth, is the vocation of the teacher. Application may only spin threads; judicious, healthful application weaves the Gobelin tapestry of life. The art of study means nothing more to the mass, and not unfrequently to the student himself, than diligent reading of books. It is by no means sure that our higher schools are always prepared to correct this unworthy interpretation, or that the faculty of every celebrated seminary would be free from embarrassment, if asked to clearly define the end and value of study.

"In order to the successful investigation of any subject, it is necessary, first of all," says Dr. Shedd, "to form a comprehensive and clear conception of its essential nature. Without such an antecedent, general apprehension, the mind is at a loss where to begin, and which way to proceed. The true idea of any object is a species of preparatory knowledge, which throws light over the whole field of inquiry and introduces an orderly

method into the whole course of examination. It is the clue which leads through the labyrinth; the key to the problem to be solved." If these words are the fitting introduction to any special branch of study, they deserve the thoughtful consideration of him, the main part of whose life is to be spent in the pursuit of knowledge. For only by a definite and correct apprehension of the office of study, does the student derive from it strength for the edification of his mind. If study is merely the ally of a sordid world, and all its best uses are subserved in qualifying men for trade; if it be the servant of pleasure, answering the ends of its existence as it trains and refines the æsthetic tastes, and raises men to a better appreciation of the beautiful; if the storing of memory with naked facts of history and science, as a warehouse with bales, boxes and barrels of freight, is the essential office of study, and its value is best displayed in filling the great human library with census reports;—or, if, on the other hand, study has for its calling the work which Sir William Hamilton has assigned to it, of strengthening and disciplining our powers, so that men may rejoice in the kingly attribute of mind, and only hears from God "well done," when it has taught them how to think, to judge, to reason, and to do the wisest things in the best way,—then this should be recognized by the student, that he may control his mental habits in view of it; for not until he has set before him the mastery of his native powers, as the goal of intellectual industry, is he prepared to make subsidiary to it his use of books.

The discipline of the mind requires systematic efforts. In literary labors, looking ulteriorly to the exercise, strength, expansion, fertility, harmony, celerity and refinement of the intellectual faculties, there is no substitute for wise method. Study grows beneficial as it is prosecuted by a plan. Until the student has traced out the process by which reading is to bring him to the desired result, he will not grow up to his possible, if he outgrows at all his present, stature. Some conception of the process of making literary labors productive is always necessary for profitable husbandry, and when the investigation of any specific subject is taken in hand, that conception must be definite enough to mark out the mode of procedure.

Method may be carried in study, as in manners, to the verge of prudery, and, instead of healing the infirmities of the student, render him mechanical, ritualistic, spiritless; a fault as fatal to an intellectual harvest as unsystematized toil. Minute and unyielding regulations for conducting intellectual pursuits, often become cumbersome, both exhausting on themselves strength that should be employed in attaining the ends they were designed to promote, and cramping the elastic mind. But this is only an incidental evil, and no more a necessary accompaniment of systematic habits in study, than a retinue of camp followers to the army of the Republic. It is difficult to choose between an excess or the utter absence of method in study. Demand for such a choice, however, from the nature of the question under consideration, does not arise. That the productiveness of the mind, by systematizing its studies and habits of study, in view of aims to be reached and the easiest way of reaching them will be increased, cannot admit of a doubt. It is as evident as that order is preferable to disorder. The evils attendant on a judicious method of study, in comparison with its benefits, are insignificant.

In earlier years, while the taste is uncultivated, the judgment inexperienced, and the student exposed to imposition from pretentious works, a course of study prescribed by skillful and well informed minds will do far more to secure a healthful growth of the intellect, than the random guesses, by which, otherwise, self-culture must be carried forward. Later in life, when the powers are matured, and a knowledge of the standard works of literature and science is acquired, and the tastes incline to any special subjects of investigation, the student, relying on his own understanding, may safely free himself from tutors and governors, and determine for himself what intellectual labors to undertake, and the best way of prosecuting them. To relax, at that time, the stringency of previous methods somewhat, provided it be rather to the abandonment of details, than of essential principles, will prevent narrowness of thought, while it avoids the equally dangerous rock of unqualified license. Human plans of every character, if it be remembered that they are made for the man, and not man for them, will be sufficiently pliable. Right methods

of study allow the widest expansion, consistent with perfect symmetry of mind.

Whatever eminence in knowledge our countrymen who do not adopt literature as a profession may reach, they will be indebted to a careful husbandry of moments, for only fragments of days can be appropriated by them, either to special studies, or general reading. The avocations of life withdraw the attention, as well of professional as of non-professional men from literary pursuits, and consume the main part of their time. Only by a prudent economy of the bits and ends of busy hours can they enter, at all, the field of letters.

Side by side with this obvious fact should be arrayed the incredible number of valuable books,—books “rich with the spoils of time,” books of every name, on every topic, books of science, art, law, poetry, history, philosophy and religion, tempting, by their wealth, the student to master their contents; then the importance of possessing some magician’s wand, at sway of which this host of alluring volumes shall, according to their value to the student, range themselves in order, is seen to be great. Interesting themes of study, from between their covers, piteously appeal for readers; but to those inclined to respond, time is wanting; and the little allotted is in danger of being squandered on works unsuited to their wants.

A curious, popular demand, unequal in absurdity, it is true, to that which once charged the sermons of old English divines with untranslated Greek and Latin, and, indeed, a demand,—were we possessed of an instinct, or an art, on which we could rely, to divide the true from the false,—quite harmless is made in this age, on men of liberal education. It is worse ignominy, and surer oblivion, now-a-days, not to publish a book, than to die the author of books without merit. The pressure on the student, urging him to appear in print, is almost irresistible. He is deserving of a statue who resists it. His bravery should become famous in song.

Next to the heroism that grapples with this peculiarity of modern times, stands that which curbs the desire for omnivorous reading. Without settled principles of study and settled aims which it subserves, from this irruption of books, books,

books, there is no protection. Under the directing and restraining influence of a sound intellectual policy alone, can libraries and book-stores be entered, and such and only such volumes as answer the wants of mental discipline and culture be selected? Armed and armored with a wise scheme of study, the danger of substituting superficial reading for patient thought is safely passed.

An inquiry into the habits of distinguished literary men, generally reveals an appreciation and employment, by them, of method in study. When other reasons have failed, they have been forced, for economy of time, to reduce to a system their attempts at intellectual labor. "But I was sensible," wrote Dr. Emmons, "that both time and books might be detrimental to the real improvement of the mind, unless they were properly used. And in order to make the best use of these two great advantages, I determined to govern myself, in the prosecution of my studies, by particular rules.

1. I made a practice of paying my principal attention to but one subject at a time.

2. I accustomed myself to attend to all subjects which appeared to be naturally connected with divinity, and calculated to qualify me for the work of the ministry.

3. Though I read a variety of books, yet I always meant, if I could, to read the proper books at the proper time; that is, when I was investigating the subject upon which they treated. I gained but little advantage from reading any author, without a particular object in view.

4. Though I was fond of reading, yet I was still more desirous of examining and digesting what I read.

5. In the course of my studies I have endeavored to obtain certainty upon all points which would admit of it."

Dr. Channing read with pen in hand, filling the leaves of his book with slips of paper containing the suggestions awakened in his mind, as he read. When he had completed the volume, he assorted and labeled these notes, and carefully preserved them for future use. The interior of his secretary was filled with papers of this kind, and when he treated any subject at length, he drew upon these deposits for aid.

Nearly all the orthodox divines of note in New England, three quarters of a century ago, made a virtue of method, governing their movements out of, as well as in the study, by rigid rules, and so securing for reading, writing, and thinking, from twelve to eighteen hours in a day.

The disposition to protracted study often grows indolent. In order to maintain energy and interest in it the student needs just the gentle pressure to be found in a well chosen system. John Foster wrote: "I have the most extreme and invariable repugnance to all literary labors of any kind, and almost all mental labor." The same feeling has frequently betrayed minds of the highest ability into the power of their foes. As in the college and seminary some students, capable of advanced standing as scholars, from a reigning distaste for application, are sure to adorn the foot of the class, so from similar causes, in the competition of life, able men rank low.

Many causes conspire to beget this repugnance to study, among which is such attention to study as neutralizes its benefits. For vigor of mind is not less inspiring and agreeable than vigor of body; when the intellectual faculties are wrought up to a state of productive activity in which the mind is consciously strengthened and gratified, study ceases to be drudgery. The pleasure of intense application, as the faculties of the soul are run at their highest speed, doubtless first led to the discovery that "pleasure is a reflex of the spontaneous, and unimpeded exertion of a power, of whose energy we are conscious." What the enjoyment of life is, he knows best who is most alive. Existence undoubtedly has the greatest value to the happy possessor of a healthful body, and an active mind; but the grosser pleasure of animal existence, when every heart-beat is in tune, is quite overshadowed and forgotten by the more exhilarating delight of a harmonious intellectual vigor. Even physical infirmity and pain, beneath the delicious experience of mental energy, may be temporarily buried.

The consciousness of gaining from study valuable success is always essential to its pleasurable prosecution. Industry alone is incapable of awakening the faculties of the soul to earnestness. The plodding are laborious. An industrious mind failing to see

any decided benefits accruing from its efforts for self-culture, will grow averse to application. In study, as in manual labor, hope must inspire feelings of friendship for work, and stimulate the faculties to that degree of ardor in which enjoyment is begotten; otherwise work will be tiresome. Actual or seeming approach to a goal sustains, without fatigue, protracted and severe thought, and enables the student to return to his books as to a pastime. A definite purpose to be achieved, a purpose voluntarily chosen, and chosen for its merits, goes far to relieve study of tediousness. Misled and bewildered by false mental habits, with aims indistinct and processes blind, the scholar scatters and wastes the products of really hard exertions, and closes a period of literary toil like one wearied with the pursuit of the *ignis fatuus*.

This is not the only cause of distaste for study. At the outset of an educational career, the student, either by the unlimited extent of all or any one department of learning, or by the acquisitions of a few great scholars, may be appalled, and enter on the pursuit of knowledge discouraged. Equally fatal to the love of application is frequent interruption, breaking up trains of thoughts, and causing a waste of time and energy for their repair. The student who plays with himself as a player with a favorite organ, as well as the unfortunate man whom shattered nerves have made a victim of torture, easily falls a prey to mental indolence and its attendant evils.

“The prudent man foreseeth the evil and hideth himself.” It is well to carefully notice the way in which aversion to study springs up, and so be enabled to escape the evil. Against the tendency to recoil from mental work, which leads many, like John Foster, to postpone their tasks to the last moment, a remedy is provided in a judicious method of conducting study. Not that any system we can adopt will always be a defense against this fatal dislike. It may be doubted, with good reason, whether any plan of study should be so comprehensive as to regulate our bill of fare, or prescribe for weak nerves or dyspepsia, yet, so long as these interfere with mental habits, they logically fall within the province of the plan. Whatever form these pernicious tendencies may take, no remedy is so gentle and effective, so sim-

ple and far-reaching, as a wise arrangement for study, fitted to cover our weaknesses and guide our strength. In the silent education and discipline of self necessary to conform to an inflexible plan of labor, the reins are shortened on mental indolence and the wreck of the intellectual life is escaped.

Method in study will have respect to the retention, as well as to the acquisition of knowledge. It is prepared to render learning of service to the world. The student in attendance on the college and seminary, is often more intimately acquainted with the branches taught, than the graduate. The lower classes are usually more familiar than the higher classes with the early part of the course of study; the freshman is able to surpass, in his sphere, the senior. To hold knowledge, gained at the expense of hard efforts, under the sway of memory, so that, on demand, it can be made of instant service to the man, is an important item in the process of education, worthy of more attention than it receives. A defect in the course of study adopted by many of our higher academies, by colleges and seminaries, consists in the neglect to provide adequately for the retention of what they prescribe. At graduation it is surely possible for the student, without over-taxing his memory, to have at his command, all the branches mastered in the school. Haste should be sacrificed for thoroughness; quantity for quality, *multum, non multa* is the only correct principle of study. By a judicious system of reviews and counter-reviews, the graduate might be kept conversant with all the field over which he has gone. The influence of such an arrangement on the habits of the student would be to abrogate "ponies," and to secure at every step attention and certainty; and thus the mind, which always grows strong in meeting the demand for strength, would attain to the highest degree of power.

Retention of present knowledge is the ground of higher and more scholarly acquisitions. From the knowledge gained in the schools the student should rise as far above his present, as his present is above his past attainments; and he can only go up as he plants his feet firmly on what has already been gained. By a familiar acquaintance with branches of study pursued, the student may hope to unlock stores of richer knowledge, and gain

a richer culture. The habit of dropping studies that bear directly on our future needs, too prevalent in our schools, is sure to be expensive, both to attainments and time. It requires more effort, after years of inattention to any subject of study, to recall it, than its retention would have cost; and what compensation does the mind receive from knowledge retired from active duty, like a professor *emeritus*? Familiar knowledge does not hang, like a sword on the wall, well burnished but useless. Through all the year it must serve a purpose both disciplinary and practical. No knowledge is unserviceable to a scholar. An acquaintance with farming or a mechanical trade, gives him an advantage over a competitor unskilled in these respects. All knowledge is not of equal value, but it is to be supposed that only a minor part, at least, of that derived from the college and seminary course is without its use, in the symmetrical culture of mind.

Confusion on this topic sometimes arises from conceiving of the intellect as a room, and of the retention of things learned by protracted study, as needless matter scattered over it. On the contrary, the intellect strengthens by use, its faculties grow limber, its discernment grows keener, hidden powers rise into notice and efficiency, thoughts deepen and judgments augment their worth. The effort to hold in hand the result of past study is, indeed, masculine, but what effeminate use of the intellect will do a man's work? The exercise of the power necessary to keep the whole realm of knowledge loyal, and subject to our control, is rather beneficial than hurtful to our mental grasp. The constant drill of the memory sympathetically arouses other associated faculties, and employs them in studying the subjects which memory presents to their view. In retaining acquired knowledge the exertion of the mind is, in no sense, therefore, like the dragging of a continually increasing load, but is like the harnessing of fresh steeds, from time to time, to the chariot, and the guiding of them in their course. The student will always find thoroughness the faithful ally of scholarship; and has any man a thorough knowledge of that with which he is not familiar? Only by a right system of study can past be also present knowledge, and the results of earnest thought and patient application be kept, not to the overflowing, but to the enlargement

of the intellectual capacities. A wide scholarship is thus brought within the reach of every student of ordinary talent. By using what he knows as the means for knowing more, he may, with a good general knowledge of the ordinary branches of science, proceed to investigate, with the eye of a master and to the extent of intimacy, any special department for which he has a preference. Adopting such a system of study as secures to him familiarity with the varied topics investigated in the college and professional school, he is prepared to become eminent in his acquaintance with some favorite theme. This has been the key with which distinguished thinkers of every age have opened the treasured secrets of nature, and made their names known to fame, and no hand that throws it away can win a rival renown.

Correct habits of study will do for many what genius does for a few. There is far more genius in the world than the world has credit for ; and a healthful, natural education of the mind, would oftener bring it to light. That process of thought which animates, trains and strengthens the latent, native endowments, gives all the advantage of extraordinary talent to men. Minds vary in respect to natural capacity ; but, frequently, early maturity is mistaken for genius, and ability is considered stupid, because it is not precocious. Some are at their zenith before, and some behind their time, and the custom is to look at the former and exclaim, with Milton :

“ These are thy glorious works, Parent of good, Almighty !”

while of the latter, only the inquiry of David is made : “ Lord, what is man that thou art mindful of him.”

Any well organized mind has sufficient genius, if properly educated, to answer the demands of his generation upon him. For the error is as wide-spread as the opinion that the remarkable works of famous men are born not of hard labor, but by strokes of playfulness. More strenuous efforts to excel than theirs, were never made. Celebrated men of every age have been endowed, most abundantly, with the genius of hard work. Their hours of patient study mock at the rules of hygiene. By holding their minds to the aim before them, and exercising their

faculties to the utmost, they have risen to their high position, and drawn the eyes of the world to them. They have frequently denied the possession of superior parts, and declared that whatever success they have enjoyed, has been won by protracted application.

The disposition to labor in study is the ground of intellectual success ; and since all things bow to the human will, why should any aspiration of ordinary minds for the higher realms of knowledge remain unmet? A purpose that secures continued, close and hearty attention to subjects of thought wisely taken, does nearly as much for culture and learning as a superior order of talents. It is within the power of mind to form, and by systematic habits and processes to advance to the fulfillment of, such a determination. Application of the powers of which we are now conscious, under the guidance of favorable rules, will not only intensify their productiveness, but awaken and call into service unrecognized faculties of real worth. Study alone can not multiply and enlarge mental capabilities, but study, well chosen and well conducted, has this desirable power. Under its influence fertility and fruitfulness adorn the mind.

In this happy age and land, in which opportunities for intellectual training are within the reach of the humblest, and intelligence among all classes is widely diffused, high degrees of knowledge in every general department, and extensive and thorough knowledge in special departments of learning, are required of every public teacher. The spirit of the age demands of the educators and leaders of the people disciplined, scholarly minds. The farmer can no longer be ignorant of agricultural science ; the mechanic must know the philosophy of forces and motive powers ; the merchant is expected to govern his investments by his knowledge of winds, climates, and soil ; bankers are required to explain all questions of finance, and dictate to a great government prudent measures of political economy. Knowledge abounds. Science supersedes chance. The graduates of the schools and men in professional life, in order to be in advance of the masses and properly represent, in the world of letters, the best types of American learning, must be disciplined scholars. Such they can be, not by irregular fits of earnest toil, not by

reliance on the flashes of untrained and indolent genius, not by severe but misdirected application, but by taking worthy aims in study and prosecuting them in a wise way.

ART. V.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THE LAW OF LOVE AND LOVE AS A LAW; or Moral Science, Theoretical and Practical. By Mark Hopkins, D. D., LL. D., President of Williams College. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1869. 12mo. pp. 342.

The very title given to this new contribution to moral science suggests at once the special aim of the author, and the fine discrimination which marks his discussion of questions that call for accuracy in thought and speech. His vigorous reasoning, his clear discernment, his rigid and exhaustive analysis, his robust and manly style, and his comprehensiveness of survey are all exhibited in this fresh treatise upon his favorite branch of study. No mere notice can convey any adequate idea of its contents. But it goes to the bottom of moral science. The nature and foundation of moral obligation is discussed with great vigor in the Introduction, and the various systems which have been propounded and adopted are briefly, plainly and fairly stated, and then subjected to close and searching examination. This *resume* and review will be highly prized, and it prepares the reader for what follows, when Dr. Hopkins states his own view and then proceeds to apply it. He divides his work into two parts. Under the head of Theoretical Morals, he seeks to unfold the Law of Love; then, under the head of Practical Morals, he expounds Love as a Law. Whether all his positions are assented to or not, no one can question the clearness with which they are stated, the vigor with which they are maintained, or the directness with which they are made to connect themselves with practical life and conduct. The work is a product of much thought exercised during many years; and it is also one that will compel the reader's entire attention. It is solid meat that is here served up—the very pemmican of logic and philosophy. It is the aliment of thinkers, and it will tone up even their intellects by its stimulus while it taxes them with its problems

and challenges. It is the ripened product of a rare mind, and a genuine contribution to a science that has enlisted the ablest thinkers of every century and land.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE; comprising representative master-pieces in poetry and prose, marking the successive stages of its growth, and a methodical exposition of the governing principles and general forms, both of the Language and Literature; with copious Notes on the selections, Glossary and Chronology, designed for systematic study. By Henry N. Day, author of "Logic," "Art of Composition," etc. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co. 1869. 12mo. pp. 539.

This very full title-page pretty accurately sets forth the features of a book which can hardly fail of arresting attention and making the study of the English language and literature more general, more interesting and more successful. Keeping free from the dry details and the great number of specimens from the authors which have made many of our manuals at once cumbrous, unsatisfactory and bewildering, he gives us a brief history of language in general and of the English language in particular, and then, by means of selections from leading authors who represent different periods and stages of development, sets us to study the peculiarities of each period. The notes which follow each selection are judicious and valuable, pointing out what is peculiar and significant, and giving just the information that an ordinary reader would desire. The representative and illustrative selections consist of specimens from several different versions of the fourteenth chapter of John's gospel;—an extract from the Vision of Piers Ploughman, written about 1360,—some paragraphs from Sir John Mandeville, a contemporary,—The Clerke's Tale from Chaucer, of a little later date, selections from Spenser's Faerie Queene, belonging to the latter part of the sixteenth century,—portions of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, of the sixteenth century,—a reproduction of Shakspeare's Julius Cæsar,—then Milton's Samson Agonistes;—and finally passages from Addison's Spectator,—from Pope's Rape of the Lock,—from Cowper's Task,—from Tennyson's Elaine,—and from Longfellow's Hiawatha. This method is natural and the plan is well carried out, the selections being fully adequate to exhibit the steps of progress by which the English language as an instrument of thought has reached its present eminence, and sufficiently set forth its large and varied capacities. The brief discussions devoted to the nature of language as an expression of thought, and to the topics that specially belong to the domain of Grammar and Rhetoric, are not without interest, though they are neither thorough nor

original. Taken as a whole, the volume is one which will add to the enviable reputation of the author, and lay the literary public under a new debt of obligation. An abridgment of the work for the use of pupils in the ordinary Academy and High School would render the author's labors still more serviceable.

PASSAGES FROM THE AMERICAN NOTE-BOOKS OF NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE. In two volumes. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1868. 12mo. pp. 222, 228.

Hawthorne's place among American authors is eminent and yet peculiar. His mind was unique, and the products of it are not less so. He was a man of moods, and so his different works exhibit a great variety. He cared little for the ordinary bays wherewith the public crowns its favorites. His feeling toward the conventionalisms even of literary society fell but little short of contempt. There was something almost weird in his fancies, and his tastes and sympathies came very near being morbid. But he had a robust intellect which forever kept him clear of literary foppishness and dilettantism. And as a delineator of character he exhibits a skill in laying on the colors equal to the boldness and originality which marked his conceptions. He was a slave to no one sphere or style. He was a master of romance, analysis, description and satire. His *Celestial Railroad*, his *Scarlet Letter*, and his *Marble Faun*, representing as they do such dissimilar mental moods, are sure of a long life. He was brilliant at will, but rarely warm with a human and sensuous sympathy. He glittered like the Alpine glaciers when they are kindled by the sun, and won admiration like the Milan Cathedral when flooded with moonlight. His page fascinates by its magnetic quality rather than wins by the tender and humane sympathies which pulsate quietly in the paragraphs of Irving or voice themselves in the sweet music of Longfellow. But Hawthorne has marked merits, and whatever gives us an insight into the real mental workings of the man is richly worth study.

These volumes are admirable for the clearness with which they bring out the workings of a mind that was more or less an enigma to many who partially knew him. They are full of fragments,—of crude but striking suggestions, of pithy observations upon common events, of sudden hints that might be used in the development of a treatise or a story, of pithy aphorisms, of quaint conceits, of keen observations, of extracts from private letters wherein he has voiced the deeper as well as the sweeter experiences of his heart, of chaste and touching bits of description ;—and now and then there are para-

graphs that bring out the full measure of his mental and literary power. The volumes will be especially welcome to all who have learned to admire Hawthorne's rare genius, and have longed to come closer to the personality of the man. The reader has here a ticket of admission to his mental laboratory, and the face of the alchemist relaxes almost into a smile of welcome.

THE GATES AJAR. By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 1869. 12mo.

One should write of Miss Phelps's volume after having slept a night upon it. Otherwise a notice is likely to be written in superlatives saturated with grateful tears. She is a most graceful writer, deep-hearted, having a soul as devout as it is humanely sympathetic. Her style is picturesque and cultivated; her appeal to the religious sensibility of her reader is so deferential as to disarm opposition, and so effective that the response is sure to be prompt and unresisting. Her dedication is unique, beautiful, sincere and winning. It is in these few words:

To my father, whose life, like a perfume from beyond the Gates, penetrates every life which nears it, the readers of this little book will owe whatever pleasant thing they may find within its pages.

The book is an attempt to set forth the features of the better land and life in a manner consonant with reason and Scripture, and yet in such a way as to render its influence healing to the spirits that are wounded by bereavements, and attractive to those whose hearts are in real sympathy with what is noble and beautiful and pure. We have no doubt that many will at first feel both surprise and resistance at the presentation of some of these views, like what were experienced by Deacon Quirk and Dr. Bland, and most readers will perhaps think that the representations are more beautiful than true, and sprang rather from imagination than grew naturally out of the New Testament. But the truly sorrowful and smitten, the aspiring and baffled, the misguided and lonely, the hampered and defeated souls that are to be found among us, will read these pages with the eagerness of hunger, look up from them with the intense yearning of prayer and the strong purpose of hope, and find the irrepressible moisture in the eyes frequently blurring the paragraphs. Such an appeal to what is deepest, tenderest and holiest in the human heart has been rarely made. Only a woman who has known sorrow and been sanctified by it could have conceived such a book as this; only a woman of the rarest mental gifts and of eminent symmetry and wholeness of

being could have wrought out the conception as it is embodied in this volume.

RECOLLECTIONS OF A BUSY LIFE: Including Reminiscences of American politics and politicians, from the opening of the Missouri contest to the downfall of Slavery; to which are added, Miscellanies: "Literature as a Vocation," "Reforms and Reformers," etc., etc.; also a Discussion with Robert Dale Owen on the Law of Divorce. By Horace Greeley. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. Boston: H. A. Brown & Co. 1868. Royal Octavo. pp. 624.

Mr. Greeley is one of the noted men of the country. He is a peculiarly American product. In no other country in the world, perhaps, could a man who began life amid such disadvantages and hindrances have risen up to the distinction and influence which he has attained. His record is instructive and stimulating. He is no copyist. He took no man for model, and he has probably gone forward at the call of circumstances rather than in accordance with any definite plan. No other man could imitate him or seek to reproduce his characteristics without running into many follies.

In this volume he has made a frank revelation of his own inward and personal life. His toils and hopes, his plans and triumphs, his ludicrous and trying experiences, his service in support of great principles and his contests with leading public men, his methods of reaching his political conclusions and his paths to success as a journalist, his views of national measures and of the leading men who have figured in our civil history for the last twenty-five years,—all these and many more features of interest enter into this goodly and unique volume of autobiography. He speaks of it as containing really more of himself than anything else which he has written or is likely to write. There is no offensive egotism in the constant reference to what he said and did. The use of the pronoun of the first person singular is full of *naivete*. He simply takes the public into his confidence and tells them whatever he supposes they would like to know. And though it is very likely that most readers will feel that he might very well have omitted more or less of the items and details and peculiar opinions that are wrought into his desultory narrative, yet he is so genial and self-interested, and for the most part so thoroughly entertaining, that he is listened to with an interest that often rises almost into enthusiasm and admiration. The portrait which faces the title-page is an admirable one,—a credit to the artist and a most perfect representation of the man in his most natural mood. The volume is a real contribution to the literature of the period, and will be widely sought, enthusiastically read, leniently criticised, frequently

referred to, and carefully preserved in libraries both public and private. The mechanical features of the work are of a high order, and not the least among its attractions is the page covered with a specimen of his notorious and enigmatical chirography.

THE BOOK OF GENESIS. The Common Version revised for the American Bible Union. With Explanatory Notes. By Thomas J. Conant. New York: Am. Bible Union. 1868. Octavo. pp. 209.

This translation of Genesis by Dr. Conant, with the notes attached, is a real contribution to the philological and exegetical literature which the scholarship of two hemispheres is seeking to give us. Dr. Conant's name is a sufficient guarantee that the work of translation is most critically, conscientiously and ably done. And an examination of the volume not only justifies the expectation, but has afforded ample and grateful evidence that his studies and labors have here found a fitting field in which to operate. Many passages part with their obscurity in the light of this fresh rendering, which is at once faithful, vigorous and chaste; and the Notes, even when brief, indicate that the author has distinctly perceived the office of the expounder and given his help just where and just as it is needed. We most heartily commend this volume as one of the choicest fragments among many choice things, which the Bible Union has been instrumental in giving to the public.

HER MAJESTY'S TOWER. By William Hepworth Dixon. New York: Harper & Bros. 1869. 12mo. pp. 263.

Mr. Dixon cannot write in a dull or stupid way, even if he tries, and whatever may be the topic chosen; and it may be added that he is too much in love with authorship to treat it with disrespect, and his tastes do not allow him to choose any other than living and captivating themes. He has found an admirable field for his peculiar genius in the Tower of London;—that extensive and unique pile of architecture, which has possessed such a tragic interest ever since English history emerged from chaos into anything like order, and took the form of trustworthy chronicles rather than weird traditions and extravagant legends. The Tower is as fully exhibited in these pages as it can well be. Its history is in part buried, and is not likely to be exhumed. It abides partly in shadow, and it will not come fully into the light, however eagerly it may be beckoned. It is half a sphinx,—returning no clear answer to the questions with which

curiosity has often plied it. Its origin is involved in obscurity. William the Norman commenced the present buildings ; but the spot was famous for fortifications and political discipline before his day. It has been a prison, a court and a palace. Indeed, it has been all these things at once. Many of the most famous names in English history are associated with it. It figures in the highest literature of the kingdom. Kings and queens have been captives in its cells. Royalty has been beheaded there. The most eminent prelates and the first names in the circles of literature and aristocracy are mentioned as the occupants of its dungeons. The life within it has been such as to sweep all the chords of human experience. The sublimest virtues and the meanest passions have dwelt within the vast enclosure. Martyrdoms that glorify an empire and make heaven richer, have been repeatedly witnessed there, and lives have ended in those apartments whose terrible offenses were rank and "smelled to heaven." And as the visitor walks through its extensive courts and halls, and climbs its staircases, and paces its dungeons, and inspects the suggestive and often terrible mementoes of eight centuries that are crowded together in this huge pile of buildings, the heart is now stirred with aspiration and then half chilled with horror, as the dead and fearful past seems everywhere coming out of the grave and staring audaciously into one's half-averted eyes. And it is of this Tower, of its early history, of the life that was lived within its walls, of the historic deeds and personages that lend it so deep a meaning, that Mr. Dixon tells in this his latest volume. He has had access to whatever records would enable him to render his account full and reliable, he has been prosecuting his inquiries more or less for twenty years; and he has brought to his work the ripe experience and the eminent ability of a literary annalist and artist. As a result, he has given us a book of rare and curious interest, and which is likely to be a standard authority for many years to come. Either its subject or authorship, standing alone, would make it popular ; taking them together, there are likely to be many buyers and much enthusiastic reading.

THE DAY-DAWN AND THE RAIN, and other Sermons, by the Rev. John Ker, Glasgow, Scotland. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1869. 12mo. pp. 450.

These sermons are saturated with the evangelical spirit ; they are vigorous both in thought and expression ; the style is fresh, chaste, flowing and pure ; logic and imagination blend happily in the presentation and enforcement of truth, while a well-balanced and well-

stored mind at once holds everything else subordinate to the preacher's great purpose and steadily aids it. His metaphors and similes and illustrations are often striking, impressive and admirable. Thus, in his sermon upon "Work and Watching," he forcibly says: "What is the crust of a few centuries or millenniums, if the great ocean of eternity be felt heaving underneath, surging up through the chasms which death reveals, and admonishing us of the time when it shall sweep away all barriers and leave nothing but its own infinite bosom?" And in another sermon, where he is speaking of the power of the human mind to invest the objects around us with meaning and unity, he says: "The forms of beauty and grandeur which nature puts on are only the clothing furnished by the mind. The Alps and Andes are but millions of atoms till thought combines them, and stamps on them the conception of the everlasting hills. Niagara is a gush of water-drops till the soul puts into it that sweep of resistless power which the beholder sees." Many such gems as these sparkle on the pages of this goodly volume, never obscuring the thought but always setting it into the clearer light; never interfering with the preacher's spiritual object, straightening his road and adding to the force with which he presses on. The discourses must have been peculiarly effective in their delivery; but their appeal from the silent page is one that can hardly fail to awaken a decisive response.

PRE-HISTORIC NATIONS; or Inquiries concerning some of the great peoples and civilizations of antiquity, and their probable relation to a still older civilization of the Ethiopians or Cushites of Arabia. By John D. Baldwin, A. M. 1869. New York: Harper & Bros. 12mo. pp. 414.

Archeology is an interesting study, and it has yielded some valuable fruits. When scientific minds and methods are brought to bear upon the relics of ancient time, whether appearing in heaps of rubbish or fragments of literature, the search for definite traces of a bygone life is not wholly unrewarded. But there is ample room for speculation and theorizing in this vast field of the past. Some minds find a sort of fascination in this exploration among the graveyards of the remoter periods, and they who are doubters and skeptics elsewhere, now and then exhibit a singular credulity here. Not a few who quarrel with the evidences for the genuineness of one of Paul's epistles, seem to have no difficulty in giving the faith to a vague tradition that strikes against a host of facts and is opposed by a score of substantial reasons. The plain record of the Bible they cannot accept according to its obvious meaning, but they translate the

hieroglyphics on a prostrate pillar with glib tongue and confident air, and draw inferences from a pile of tilted strata or a fossilized fish with the most thorough impatience over every one who hesitates to accept their rendering of the puzzling record.

Mr. Baldwin does not exhibit such extreme inconsistencies as these in his learned and interesting volume, though he is somewhat in danger of being criticised for substituting fancies for facts. He has somehow found time, in spite of the demands of public life, to become familiar with most of the literature that has an important bearing upon the life of the ancient nations. And he thinks as well as reads; though it is plain enough that he goes freely to his authorities for opinions as well as for facts. He holds to a view of the antiquity of man that sets aside summarily and altogether the generally received chronology. He does not even condescend to argue respecting that chronology. He rejects it with ill-concealed contempt, and goes repeatedly out of his way to sneer at those who hold to it. His language on this point is very strong, and his tone little less than bitter. He says: "There is *nothing* to require, indicate, or suggest that the current chronologies should be treated with the smallest degree of respect, while, on the other hand, there is *much* that demands for the pre-historic ages the largest measure intelligent inquiry has ever proposed." He wonders that there was ever granted a "toleration for some of the absurdities it has originated." He calls it "a stupidity that is well-nigh matchless." And because Mr. Grote, the eminent Greek historian, cannot find proofs of a very great antiquity in the myths and legends of Hellenic literature, he charges that the part of his work devoted to the "Legendary and Heroic Age of Greece" is proof of imperfect insight, and "chiefly remarkable as an elaborate display of unphilosophical skepticism." There is much of this sort of writing in the early chapters of Mr. Baldwin's book,—quite too much for charity, or modesty, or for the counter evidence contained in what follows. It may possibly be proved at some future time, that the origin of the human race dates back far beyond the six thousand years of Archbishop Usher; but we must say that the evidence which has so thoroughly convinced Mr. Baldwin is either very imperfectly exhibited in this book, or it is quite insufficient to justify his dogmatic tone, or to master a skepticism in his readers that is both philosophical and teachable.

But while we cannot sympathize with Mr. Baldwin's dogmatism,—while we think his sneers would have been better dealt with if they had been choked down instead of being put into rhetoric and type,—while we find his style somewhat cumbrous, turgid and heavy,—and

discover far less that is new and satisfactory than is promised ;—still we may say that he has condensed a good deal of rare learning and ingenious speculation upon an interesting and important topic within these 400 well-printed pages. The ancient Ethiopia may be Arabia, as he thinks it is ; there may have been a high and vigorous civilization that antedated by some thousand of years the civilizations that ancient history describes, as he peremptorily declares there was ; but we must frankly add that he has neither portrayed nor proved it. At the end of this effort the pre-historic nations are still without a historian, for Mr. Baldwin's rhetorical incantations have quite failed to bring them out from the mist into the sunlight. The book is well worth reading, though more for the lack of knowledge it discloses than for the amount it supplies,—for the inquiries which it raises than for those which it satisfies and settles.

SERMONS BY HENRY WARD BEECHER, Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. Selected from published and unpublished discourses, and revised by their author. In two volumes. New York ; Harper & Bros. 1868. Octavo. pp. 484, 486.

We have at length a collection of Mr. Beecher's discourses that are fairly representative. They are selected with a view of presenting the various sides of the man and the real quality of his teaching from the pulpit of Plymouth church. They are gathered from a broad field. Some of them date back about half a score of years, while others embody his recent utterances. A discriminating Christian man has mainly attended to the work of selection and arrangement, while Mr. Beecher himself has more or less revised the entire work. Whatever, therefore, is characteristic in the substance or the form of his teaching is almost sure to appear in these volumes, and they express the theological views by which the author thus announces his willingness to stand. The work seems to us well done throughout. Mr. Beecher is here presented as the Christian teacher. His views of what is vital in the Christian revelation find a clear utterance, and the applications of these views to personal experience and practical life are not allowed to fall into any subordinate place. The discourses in which Christianity is applied to the public questions of the day are reserved for another volume.

Of Mr. Beecher as a preacher, orator, philosopher or theologian, we do not stop to speak. That he is a man of remarkable power, his history and influence assure even those who affect to sneer at him. That he has done and is doing a high work in quickening the minds and hearts of men and aiding to develop nobleness in charac-

ter and beneficence in life, only the blindest bigot and the most prejudiced cynic can deny. With excesses that are to be regretted, and tangential movements that make timid and conservative men fearful of his influence, he is yet a believer whose faith has the vigor of a martyr's confession and the beauty of a child's trust, and a preacher of the gospel of Christ whose power in portraying his Lord might well wake the ambition of nine-tenths of the pulpits of Christendom. Whoever reads these discourses in a teachable spirit can hardly fail to perceive so much at least to be true. And the publishers have given the volumes a solidity and a beauty that make reading a joy.

UNDER THE WILLOWS, and other Poems. By James Russell Lowell. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 1869. 16mo. pp 2 86.

The poetic flowers of Mr. Lowell deserve a choice vase in which they may blend their beauties and intensify their fragrance, and they find it in this rich volume that so well embodies the highest art and the purest taste that are concerned in book-making. Rich but not showy, finished but not finical, artistic but not in the least meretricious,—we have a book in which the eye may luxuriate while the spirit is refreshed and kindled by the strength of thought which he has here truly married to the sweetness of expression. The opening poem, first published in the *Atlantic*, is worth the full price of the volume; but it is followed by not a few choice things that are scarcely inferior. Lowell always sings to some purpose, and the briefest of these strains is the voice of the soul that is sure to wake echoes and set the air trembling with melody.

RURAL POEMS. By William Barnes. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1869. Square 18mo. pp. 158.

No title could have been more fitting than this. Almost every theme smacks of the country, and half the lines are radiant with the tints and fragrant with the breath of forest, field or garden. Mr. Barnes knows rural scenery, influences and life as only one who has dwelt among and drunk into the spirit of the homes of the country can know them, and he can picture them as only an artist knows how. Simple in style, elevated in tone, pure in suggestion, with strains as ringingly jubilant as the lark's morning hymn, and others as sweetly tender as the nightingale's vesper melody, the poems in this volume deserve to be favorites with all who can appreciate the beauty of the country and its free glad life, or have an ear for the music which a tuneful bard knows how to put into his rhythmic speech.

CLOSE COMMUNION, OR OPEN COMMUNION? An Experience and an Argument. By Crammond Kennedy. New York: American News Co. 16mo. pp. 175.

If the affirmations and denials and protests of Baptist Associations on the subject of Communion, and the abounding columns of definition and criticism which the papers have exhibited, have seemed to induce timidity and silence in some quarters where frank avowals and brave words had been found, they are only bringing to expression the latent convictions that might have slept still longer but for this sonorous challenge and attempt to coerce uniformity. Mr. Kennedy is of Scotch parentage, and was somewhat noted years ago for the vigor of thought and expression which he carried into the pulpit while he was only "the boy preacher." He has maturity enough to be a manly writer now, and he has dealt with the communion with freshness, fairness, force and fidelity. He is a thorough Baptist, and took the theology and polity of that body to himself without much inquiry or any mental reservations years ago, as he himself tells us, and clung to them tenaciously long after his heart and head began to rebel, and even after his experiences had made him blush again and again over his position. The portions of his book which exhibit the workings of his own mind as it found the way out from its perplexing bondage into a grateful freedom, are of special interest, and the emphasis put upon more or less points in the argument which follows, indicates the peculiar mental experiences of the author, while they set forth clearly the real logical and Scriptural grounds upon which the ordinance is made to rest. Without possessing much that is absolutely new, the volume is timely, valuable, and deserves a wide circulation, which it is almost certain to secure. It is a word fitly spoken, both in its character and in the hour chosen for its utterance.

REMINISCENCES OF EUROPEAN TRAVEL. By Andrew P. Peabody. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1868. 12mo. pp. 316.

No book of travels that confines the reader's attention to Europe can be really new in the facts which it communicates or in the general pictures which it paints. It will differ from others chiefly in the special setting and relations of the facts that have been so often narrated, and in the subjective value and significance that they may have to the new observer. It is not so much Europe which an intelligent reader will seek to find in these pages, as it is to find Dr. Peabody as he is with Europe speaking to him through its myriad symbols, impressing him with its wonders of nature and art, and unfold-

ing to him the products of its life. This book is a very unpretending one; no attempt is made to find novelties in old and familiar objects; there is not much of philosophy and generalization; and none of the tricks of rhetoricians are employed to tickle the fancy or exalt the audience. He tells plainly and pleasantly what was seen and what impression was made, and his calmness, cultivation and receptivity are indicated on every page. There are some choice bits of description; now and then one finds a paragraph of criticism that richly deserves the name; and the Christian lessons which are suggested by what is seen are occasionally drawn out in a manner that shows the royalty of the observer's spiritual nature, and tells how everything is truly great and useful in proportion as it ministers to the progress of truth and the advancement of the human race in the knowledge of God and the practice of righteousness. It is a volume of real worth to those who can sympathize with the author's wholesome tastes and elevated type of thought and life. Its aim is not to amuse but to instruct. It will not excite the passions but broaden the mind. It may not captivate by novelty and brilliance, but, what is far better, it will give genuine stimulus and tend to secure a true elevation of spirit in the reader.

ANNUAL OF SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERY: or, Year-Book of facts in Science and Art for 1869, exhibiting the most important discoveries and improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Biology, Botany, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Geography, Antiquities, etc., together with Notes on the progress of Science during the year 1868; a list of recent Scientific Publications; obituaries of eminent scientific men, etc. Edited by Samuel Kneeland, A. M., M. D., Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Secretary of and Instructor in Zoology and Physiology in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1869. 12mo, pp. 377.

This is a long and full title, but it represents, in every one of its numerous items, something of significance in the book to which it introduces us. It has been so many years since this annual began to be published, it has acquired such a standing among scientific men as well as among all classes of intelligent readers, and it is compiled with so much pains-taking, ability and skill, that praise is a waste of ink, breath and time. It follows out carefully the plan adopted by Mr. Welles who edited it for a number of years, and its high character is fully maintained the present year. A fine portrait of Prof. Dana, engraved on steel, fronts the title-page, the extended introductory notes by the editor on the progress of Science during the year are admirable, and the full index at the end of the volume puts the whole contents at once into the available possession of the reader. To announce the issue of the work is sufficient to awaken a large demand for it.

THE
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

No. LXVI. APRIL, 1869.

ART. 1.—TRUE MANHOOD.

To the question, What are the highest symbols of human dignity and power? there are returned many and varied answers. One estimates a man's value by what he has inherited in the form of titles, heirlooms and estates; another, by what the current of passing events has deposited at his feet; another, by what he has accumulated through his skill and industry and persistence; another, by the rank he holds in society. We have some vicious habits of speech which induce these estimates. We say a man is "good for half a million;"—by which we mean that the banks will discount that amount of his paper. Of another we say that he is "worth" \$50,000;—meaning that his house and furniture, his farm and utensils, his stocks and mortgages, are taxed as representing so much capital. Of another we say that he is "worth" \$20 per month;—meaning, then, that it would be a good bargain to pay him that amount in return for the labor he can perform. And of another man, somewhat dark in complexion, athletic, docile, healthy, thirty years of age, having sound teeth, flexible muscles, a firm constitution, a moderate amount of brain and not too much conscience, we were wont to say before secession was inaugurated, that he was "worth" \$1400;—by which we intended that some Simon Legree would have given

his check for that amount, on condition of having the said Tom deeded over to him, body and soul, by the Richmond trader, who displayed him under the head of "property."

Now there is a sort and a degree of justice in estimating a human being by what he exhibits and does, provided that three things are taken into account,—that he has a fair and adequate opportunity to represent himself,—that the inventory be fair and full,—and that it be not made out too soon. For, the faculties of body and mind are meant for development and use. Thought is given for the sake of its constructive activity, and the muscles are loaned that they may bring out executive power. The uses to which a force or a life is put determine its real value. Accomplishment is, after all, the test of ability. What we do tells what we are. Forces that cannot be made to work are generally myths. When we let down buckets day after day into natures around us, and they continue to come up as dry as they went down, the explanation probably is, not that the rope is too short, but that the well is wanting in a moist bottom. A rose-bush that never yields foliage or flowers, manifestly lacks life, and is only a cumberer of the ground. When a tree in the orchard refuses fruit, year after year, to the call of the owner, he does not explain its barrenness by saying that it is of a peculiar and choice variety, showing its merits through its modesty. Forty bushels of golden apples would satisfy him far better than the repetition of half a dozen long botanical names, or a philosophical treatise upon the laws of its growth. And a human being who never bears fruit, or develops a blossom, or presses a bud to the point of bursting, but, instead, stands stiff like a shrub in winter, or rises precise and regular like a conical evergreen, is manifestly wanting in the vital forces that work in the production of a genuine man and the accomplishment of a true-life-work.

And yet it must not be taken for granted that only those who figure conspicuously in society, or get a niche in the temple of history, carried living souls with them, or held capacities, or had the spirit of true workers. Some men inherit burdens which time refuses to lift off, and which are so bound on by circumstances, that they cling to the spirit in spite of struggles and plunges, and only press the harder in answer to every defiance. And,

hence, they get no opportunity to reveal the interior forces in the performance of any great outward work. There are patriots, whom tyrants consign to the dungeon; heroes, who are hunted down by malice and hounded into concealment by the people who are too selfish to appreciate or tolerate them in society; martyrs, who bear their testimony in quietude and perish at last without an *Auto da fe* which illuminates saintship till its light is thrown across continents and centuries; silent scatterers of seed, which by and by fills the desert with blossoms and matures into beneficent institutions; hidden prophets, who whisper their great thoughts into the ear of the world,—thoughts which, in time, are swelled by the voices of a great nation that knows nothing of the seer.

Sometimes, too, we only imperfectly catalogue the qualities of men over whom we render our verdicts. We listen only to half the witnesses who come forward to testify. We only know and see the surface of their natures, and that appears like common earth,—we fail to quarry to the golden depths far, far below. Like some rare pictures of the old masters, hung in shadow and dim with dust, we glance at them carelessly and see little value; we describe them, and our words do not even hint at the essential glory they incarnate.

And then we are frequently too much in haste to render our judgment. We classify characters before they are fairly formed, write lives before they are half finished, pronounce upon men before they have assumed either fixedness or position. It is hardly fair to judge a grape-vine by what it offers in July, or describe an eagle in view of what appears in the egg, or pronounce upon the value of a paper-mill when we have seen only the pulp into which the rags have been tortured. The human brain is said to resemble at first the spinal cord of a fish, next, the nervous center of a bird, afterward, it takes on the appearance presented in the cavity of a mammal's skull; it would be neither wise nor fair to decide what purposes that wondrous instrument was meant to serve by simply inspecting it during these earlier metamorphoses. When Newton has commenced to climb up among the constellations by the aid of that brain, as Jacob's angels climbed over the ladder at Bethel, then it is only time to

decide for what it has been organized. Any man might have ridiculed Michael Angelo as he looked over the heaps of stone, the half-formed statues, the rough mosaics and mammoth frescoes, which lay in chaos in the galleries and studios and causeways of Rome; but when St. Peter's had at length grown up into an oratorio of architecture, and poured the music of its hallowed memories over all lands, the great genius was crowned by the veneration of the world. So, till a life is finished, we may not always set ourselves to classify it nor decide that it lacks the highest qualities and sends abroad no wide-spread power. Plans that seem drawn from Utopia when they are planted, afterwards mature into a majesty like the cedars of Lebanon, and grow fruit like the vines of Eshcol; and so men, ignored for their supposed weakness, or hissed for their imagined follies, or cursed for their anticipated mischiefs, at length blossom out into glory before the clearer eyes of observation, and their names stand as symbols of royal deeds in the presence of generations.

In life, we work in many fields, and seek to grow various sorts of fruit. We are content with no single product. We plant coppers, hoping to harvest eagles; we plant study, and hope to reap scholarship; we plant industry, and look for whole sheaves of days that may be properly indolent; we plant ventures, and look for fortunes to grow suddenly like Jonah's gourd without being liable to wither; we plant enterprise, and hope to gather eminence; penitence, and look for peace; pretension, and expect admiration; sycophancy, and hope to get an office; speeches full of blarney, and look for a salary full of fatness. We multiply inventions which we propose to use as instruments for abridging the hours of labor, for saving our muscles or brains, for increasing our power, for enlarging and multiplying acquisitions. We build locomotives, which may jerk us across a state while we are running over the morning paper; sewing-machines, that clutch the fabric as it drops from the loom, never saying, "It is enough," and pile up whole wardrobes full of garments; steam-presses that repeat our words thousands of times in an hour, and tell our story in all the homes of a city on the same evening. Those are the results we seek, as representing our real good, and these are the instruments we employ for their attainment, as most likely to compass our

end. And such gains are not to be contemned, either through ignorance of their value, or through disappointment at our effort in trying to get them. Wealth is, in itself, better than poverty; though a competence with contentment is better than either. Knowledge is to be preferred to ignorance; and power and place do not deserve half the curses that are sometimes thoughtlessly flung at them by disappointed seekers. To aspire is the instinct of a live soul, when stirred into action by the impulses of necessity or by the beckonings of God.

But the great thing for which we may most fittingly dig and delve, plan and struggle, is true manhood, in character and conduct, in spirit and life. That is the real ultimate aim and crowning achievement. All other things are good in proportion as we can turn them into food for the growth of this product;—they work mischief so far as they are bought by the barter of manhood, or seem proper substitutes for it, or stand in the way of its coming. And as an instrument, by which we are to work in the field of life for the accomplishment of the largest and best and highest ends, it stands above every other. Ingenuity can do something, shrewdness is not wholly impotent, policy may enter on a promising career, money may buy alliance and coöperation, a regal will may command the deference of timid men and purchase a sort of captainship;—but, after all, it is manhood that carries the real scepter, and, in the long run, breaks down opposition and wins its way where it will. Pio Nino wears both the tiara and the coronet in a narrow realm in Italy; his succession is regular and the prestige of his office is almost unbounded; but let the traitor Garibaldi appear in his red shirt after having laid down his commission and put up his sword, and an eruption of enthusiasm from the Italian heart tells whom the people are crowning as King. One is a dignitary, decked out in titles; the other is a man, with no mask over his face and carrying no screen before his heart.

The notions which have been entertained of human dignity are various. The great man of one period or people has been promptly discrowned or hissed into obscurity when he has appealed to a fresh generation or gone abroad into a new land. The same qualities are praised or cursed in proportion as they stand

in the right place or the wrong. One people puts a given trait or quality into the palace, while another leads it to the pillory. Greece crowns the artist; Rome puts the purple upon energy. Homer's hero, Achilles, is composed of egotism, audacity, muscles and hot blood. The glory of life in India is a dreamer whose luxurious sleep is broken by none of the strifes and struggles of the world groping and fighting its way to peace and brightness. In the middle ages manhood had two types,—one was the knight, chivalric and gentle, desperate and yet shrewd, terrible at the tournament and yet hospitable and generous at his castle, saying grace over the fruits of a fresh robbery, and making love on horseback with his visor down and his lance in rest; the other was the monk, studying Aristotle, poring over the theological discussions of Augustine and Arius, walking barefoot over broken glass, and trying to scare his passions by whipping his shoulders.

The modern notions of manhood are not a unit. The catalogue of items is sometimes longer and sometimes shorter. The nineteenth century has more than one Diogenes, searching by the aid of both natural and artificial light for a man, and at last giving up in despair; while others, seeming to accept Plato's definition, when he says that a man is "a two-legged animal, without feathers," will readily marshal a battalion. Some find manhood wherever there is a strong intellect; others look only for quick sympathies; and still others for the strong and inflexible will. Manhood on the exchange is apt to signify a bold and successful and wealthy speculator or stock-broker; in politics it is likely to stand for a skillful demagogue who always manages to keep on the winning side; in the saloons and bowling-alleys manhood is made up of brawny arms, flexible muscles, a jolly temperament among friends, and fists like beetles, coupled with a pride in using them which would sail the Atlantic in order to find a public opportunity; in the drawing room the hero is too pitiable a specimen of his race to be asked to sit for his portrait.

The common and the radical fault in our estimates of men is found in our reverence for, or contempt of their, accidents and appendages. It is not very easy to see a hero in a ragged coat, nor to detect the knave beneath the flaunting titles and gold

lace which tell us that the owner belongs to the nobility. A pigmy, stuffed out with padding and strutting on concealed stilts, seems quite a personage. A great human fungus, thoroughly shaped like a man, and looking very much like one, keeps us at such a distance even by his awkward courtliness, that we are not allowed to press him, and so discover of what spongy material he is made. We are all more or less caught by show. We find it imposing, and, besides, we are inclined to accept it as the symbol and measure of substance. We have to learn by experience that the balloon rises from its very lightness, and expands only by being filled with gas; and that the prostrate log phosphoresces only because it is rotten. The baron's castle gives him prominence, as we survey his estate; the porter at the lodge does not impress us as being a greater thing than all the possessions of his chief. The planter's wealth and crops used to overawe us; the slave who picked the cotton or cut the cane, and in whose reverent and aspiring soul the fires of immortality were burning, stood before us as only an appendage of the estate.

And even when we go down deep enough to find the spirit under the flesh, we are apt to be caught by the superficial and showy qualities. A strong impulse is apt to impress us more than a carefully matured conviction. A brilliant word affects us more than a solid thought. Like children in a potato-field, we clutch and praise the blossoms, but leave the fruit under ground undiscovered and unsought. We worship intellect, and flatter skill, and smile at humor, and laugh at wit, and court geniality, and accept the captainship of resolution; but the manhood lying beneath all these is not inquired after. We ask what impression men make on society, rather than what they really are in character. Beholding them in the seat of eminence, we are too apt to glorify or envy them, without stopping to ask whether they won their position or inherited it, whether they married a fortune or earned it, whether they sold their conscience for the place they occupy or ascended to it over the steps of industry and honor.

What is manhood in character, and what is manhood in life? The old Latin word is significant of the leading qualities which

distinguish it, determine its sphere and service, and set forth its relations to human influence and work. Man in Latin, is *vir*; and *vir* is the root of *virtus*, or, in English, *virtue*, which signifies honor, bravery, spirit, vigor of soul, and energy in service. Manhood is not the product of a single faculty, but the result of the harmonious balance and normal action of many faculties. No phrenological manipulator finds a bump on the skull where he locates the fountain of manhood. It is not the special function of any one of the convolutions of the brain to produce this great and high quality. It may ally itself with all mental operations, and tinge all outward action. It shows itself present in the simpler and the grander movements of the soul, and comes out into view in every sphere where human energy operates. It sends thought into proper channels; it makes conscience quick in discriminating and strong in its impulses; it sets affection to twine only about proper objects; it elevates aim; it sanctifies pursuit; it dignifies methods; it lends nobleness to common intercourse; it imparts dignity to the simplest courtesies and amenities of society; it forbids wit to be malicious and renders humor fertilizing; it turns the mart of trade into a temple of honor; and it imparts a cheerful sanctity to the familiarities of the fireside. It is an encompassing presence, a perpetual attendant, an angel over the right shoulder, a perennial fountain in the heart, the refreshment of whose streams is spread over all the domain of character, and the fruits of which grow abundantly in all the fields of activity.

A genuine manhood saturates the soul, vitalizing all the faculties, and appearing in all its functions. Its sphere is as wide as life, its action as constant as the will; it walks as the attendant of effort, and keeps watch over the repose of the spirit. It regulates desire; it attends the steps of love; it takes the arm of duty on all its errands; it hallows the adoration of piety, and lifts the prayer of penitence and meekness with a strong hand and a steady pressure toward heaven. It is both gentle and resolute,—never ashamed of tears when grief asks sympathy or misfortune is telling its sad story; and yet it is defiant of the dangers which attend fidelity, and holds out alone against all the bribes offered by selfishness and all the terrors

which opposition can marshal. It is loyal to conviction, but a perpetual rebel against mere authority. It bends its knee before duty, even though a child interpret the behest; but it stands stiff before prestige and a vicious majority, refusing to uncover its head or own the validity of the decree. It carries no mercenary sword, and fights without asking for pay wherever Right leads the battle and sacred interests are put in jeopardy.

Such is manhood. Does it merit so much reverence? In the catalogue of human qualities does it rightfully hold this leading rank, and really deserve this high commendation? We need not go very far for the answer.

First of all, let it be said, that the things represented by manhood, and which it sets itself to promote and guard, are *realities*, and the very highest realities in all the world. These outward things that relate to life are not life itself, nor the things most essential to it. They are only imperfect symbols of what is vital within. Money only represents the efficient energy of labor performed by muscles under the direction of thought. Social position is at best only the index of the power belonging to the inward ambition of the occupant. Luxuries are nothing save as they can be made to minister to the sources of gratification in the soul. Truth is more real than bank-stock; Right is mightier than any walls of defense which wickedness may rear; the sense of justice is strong enough to overturn the throne of the mightiest monarch; the idea of liberty has shown itself ready to fly in the face of a Congressional statute even though it stretch its arms from ocean to ocean, to baffle the bloodhounds of the plantation, to chase the polar star through the most dreary midnight, and sing a jubilee hymn amid Canadian snows.

Nothing helps or blesses us save as it ministers to the soul. What are all outward gifts and possessions when there is no inward capacity to enjoy them? What are tropical luxuries to a dyspeptic; palaces and galleries of art to a man whose sightless orbs roll in vain to find the day; an oratorio to him who dwells in perpetual silence through his deafness; or gold to a millionaire clinging to a sinking wreck; or a title to a man perishing of hunger; or an office to a functionary whom all the people are cursing? A child of genius in his obscurity, gazing

over a landscape, has more and higher sources of joy; a contented peasant, sharing his single loaf at night with his family, is more to be envied; a pious beggar in his rags holds far higher wealth; and the patient priestess of home, who walks lovingly among her children by day and soothes them to slumber at evening with a sacred psalm, wears far richer dignities. Manhood is itself a crown descending to every station; the soul where it tarries is a tent of peace to which angels pay their visits as they did to the home of the old patriarch, and the movement of life is like a strain of flowing music. The largest outward possessions may leave the owner poor and his experience mean; manhood is a mine of wealth which time may not exhaust, and he who carries it sings spontaneously on his longest and severest marches. And what a wreck is a human being who lacks it! Muscles there may be, but no wise energy to employ them; faculties, but they work toward no high ends; a soul, but it is the home of passions; affections, but they go out readily after forbidden objects and come back cheated and wounded; principles, but they are offered in the market to the highest bidder; a conscience, but its owner makes it follow like a dog at the heels of interest, cuffing it whenever it growls,—it was cured of barking and biting long ago; the idea of a noble and independent life, but he blurs and distorts it till it is despoiled of beauty and has almost ceased to beckon him upward. We cannot make such a being command respect when once his real character is seen. Dress him up, and he is a puppet; set him on high, and he is only a doleful looking beacon; hang him with titles, and he is but a burlesque at which satire shoots its arrows and before which laughter shakes its sides; assign him leadership, and only cowards will enter the army. He disgraces the humblest spheres, and honor and justice and philanthropy and religion blush at his companionship and are weakened by his alliance. All that is needed in order to the discovery of these radical defects, where manhood is wanting, is an eye sharp enough to see below the surface gilding of men; all that is needed in order to the sense of sickness as we gaze on these human shams, is a heart with moral nerves in it.

And when genuine manhood really exists, the stripping off

of appendages and the clearing away of the rubbish of circumstance often serve to bring out the hidden splendor and transfigure the soul. It is sometimes difficult to see many men as they really are, for their vast estates stand between them and the observer; or their robes dazzle the eye; or their eminence removes them to a distance; or their reputation puts them in a shadow. What we call misfortune is often only an experience that brings them out into plain view, and lets us see themselves instead of their gay clothing and their imperfect symbols. A calamity deals with a true man very much as one would deal with Powers's Greek Slave, who should strip off the flounced silk and spreading crinoline in which fashion had arrayed her, and let us see the life-like symmetry of the marble underneath. If these glittering appendages frequently beget reverence, and render observers satisfied, and procure praise, it is also true that they sometimes hide the solid substance of character which is buried beneath them. And wherever there is a true manhood, it will live and glow without depending on surroundings or borrowing light from abroad. A diamond reveals its value, not so much when glittering among the tresses of a city belle in the gas-light, as when it receives without marring the fierce smitings of the lapidary. Fireworks may light up the square of a city for an hour, with their sparks and spangles, their blue-balls crackling as they ascend, and their crimson serpents wriggling and hissing through the windows; but after they have spent themselves, the stars seem to shine out more lustroously overhead, and with more than its usual glory the sun comes through the gates of the east, bringing morning to the continents.

There is a partial truth in the statement that manhood is not very popular in the world while it is walking incarnate, unless, in the popular sense of the word, it is successful. We do often crucify before we canonize it. The real saints in our calendars were not generally suffocated with praise, and many of them were buried without drum-beat or lamentation. Afterwards, when the sepulchered virtues have decomposed, and reappear in beautiful and fragrant blossoms that decorate the sod and make the air balmy,—then we rear monuments on the spot and cover them with panegyric.

“Ten ancient towns contend for Homer, dead,
Through which the living Homer begged his bread.”

And when manhood, winning a prompt and an unequivocal success, is recognized and applauded and crowned, it may be often the success that wins the plaudits, rather than the high qualities which work underneath. Knees may be supple before a crown, when they would be stiff as stubbornness before the truly royal qualities that keep their kingliness in a cottage.

That is a partial truth, and a truth that even charity may tell as well as cynicism. But it is sometimes the case that even real manhood is disfigured by a sort of grim sternness on its visage, and is repulsive by severity of manner. It sometimes lacks saccharine juices, being both dry and sour. It secretes an excess of bile, and has too little of the play of genial sympathies, and is deficient in gentleness and suavity of manners. It deals with the false life about it as Cromwell's soldiers dealt with the English cathedrals,—beating down even the most costly ornaments with their savage battle-axes. It smiles, when it smiles at all, like a flash of brightness along the edges of a thunder-cloud. It prays with its hand on its weapon. It leans on its trust only when it has primed its musket with dry powder. It sings the psalms whose chief burden is “the sword of the Lord and of Gideon.”

Now manhood is not of necessity struck in bronze, nor made as if of wrought iron. It is alive and glowing with warm blood. A complete manhood is beautiful as well as noble. It has patience as well as principle. It sets the tender heart over against the tough heroism. It clings to honor, but it does not let go of humility. It will not be a sycophant, but no more will it be a bigot or a pharisee. It keeps tears for sorrow, pity for suffering even when it is guilty, and pardon for offenses though they are multiplied and personal. It loves fair play and will defend the very rights which are most freely abused. And when manhood thus comes out in the bud and blossom and fruit of a complete character and a rounded life, it will not be always misinterpreted, nor long ignored, nor universally villified. When it lies like the kernel in a chestnut-burr, the prickly surroundings may

for a time keep men ignorant of the precious fruit within, and so it may be compelled to wait till some sharp frost of experience sets it free and offers its nutriment to the world.

It is to such a manhood that history points, as marking its great epochs, and filling its portrait-galleries with enduring interest and fadeless glory. To commemorate such a manhood the highways of time have been lined with monuments. The wealth of the past is at length confessed to lie in the great human qualities which were too strong for interest to conquer, and too valuable for gold to buy. We glory in art now chiefly as the embodiment of great and manly souls. Periods are becoming significant in proportion as they were fruitful in real men. Places at length are hallowed because the feet of heroism have there left clear footprints. Wherever a saint has wrestled mightily with temptation and come out victor; wherever honor has flung back a bribe at the tempter's feet; wherever a good conscience has been kept through the loss of dazzling prospects and great preferments; wherever power has resigned its seat to justice; wherever faith has kept on its steady way through long nights that were starless, and over wide deserts that offered no islands of green, content to know only that it walked where God was pointing; wherever a martyr has ended the testimony of a loyal and loving life with the pathetic prayer of Stephen or the exultant shout of Paul;—there is a Mecca for reverent pilgrims, and a luminous mount of transfiguration over whose summit we seem to see earth and heaven clasping hands. And thus does time exalt manhood before the face of generations.

There is another way in which there comes a testimony to the worth of manhood, and that is in the multiplied imitations of it wherewith men cloak themselves when they ask for confidence and go out in search of praise. Spurious coin affords the highest evidence that there is a genuine solid currency behind it. That is always a solvent bank whose bills are counterfeited. Attractive imitations are the shadows of magnificent realities. And the fact that cowards talk bravery for effect, only shows that there are heroes who live courage. Knaves parade the semblance of honor as the means of gaining respect, knowing that the reality is venerated. So long as fops make etiquette a

study, and villains affect generosity, and politicians shout for principles, and demagogues print speeches about the duty of sacrificing every thing for the country, and trimmers prate about conscience, and sycophants eulogize self-respect, and plotters against the weak expatiate about the sanctities of the heart,—they are only showing that courtesy is beautiful, that sympathy is humane, that right is of priceless value, that patriotism is sublime, that a just spirit is a sacred dignity, and an inflexible adherence to moral duty is the very soul of heroism. And every time men are imposed on by these professions, and deceived by these imitations, it only shows how high is the honor which they put upon the real manhood whose semblances win them. The reverence paid by the beasts to the jackass decked out in the lion's skin, was only an act of homage to the royalty which they had often seen walking the forest under the same shaggy mantle. The highest praise which a mean spirit can give a noble one, is to attempt to appear noble whenever it seeks respect from society.

Manhood measures the vital power of a people, and the amount of it determines the value of any nation's life. We linger now in reverence where true men flourished, and study the social and civil agriculture which produced them. A soil may grow gigantic trees, but they may overshadow a dwarfed people, and all such countries may be written down bankrupt. Over broad table-lands and spreading prairies narrow souls may walk in the procession of life. Granite and marble may abound in a state, but character may lack solidity and be incapable of all high polish. Exports and revenues, standing armies and palaces of trade, aristocratic prestige and democratic egotism, do not make up the real greatness of a people, nor insure it a historic prominence. Not to exalt mammon but to ennoble man is the mission of a state. Its institutions are legitimate and precious in proportion as they serve this end. Be it monarchy or republic,—let its realm be wide as the Russian Czar's or narrow as the ancient commonwealth of Greece,—one Peter the Great shall diffuse his prestige from the Crimea to the Siberian snows, and one Socrates shall render Athens the study and the wonder of two thousand years. There was hope for our presumptuous and turbulent people, so long as the great literary artist of New

England was summoned to paint Washington's character with his vivid words before all the gazing cities of the land; and New York is something more and better than a Sodom so long as it has mercantile houses which openly refuse to box up their principles with their merchandise. We can endure the weevil in the wheat, if the honor of the people rounds up plump and nutritious. We can bear irregularities in the current of trade, if our moral life keeps up its steady and healthful flow. Droughts may smite broad fields into barrenness, and blanch ten thousand faces with apprehension; but if honor grows steadily on, and integrity does not wilt, and the best affections keep green, the very saddest years are fruitful, and the great harvest of the continent is steadily ripening.

Manhood was never needed more than now, nor deserved higher appreciation. Our lack of it is sad enough, and our reverence for it sufficiently small, but it is not necessary to believe that it is dying out of character or life. The complaints over its absence show our discovery that it is essential; our stern demand for more does but indicate the severity of the tests to which we subject it. We do need it to adorn the highest spheres and dignify the lowest; to render ruling minds true schoolmasters of society, and to put a real glory upon the commonest laborer toiling for his daily bread. It is needed in pulpits, that they may nurture stalwart faith rather than sickly sentiment; in the marts of trade, so that they be stimulants to justice and not its sepulchers; in the intercourse of capital and labor, so that sympathy and fidelity shall flourish wherever they meet; in literature, so that plagiarism and pandering to passion may come to an end; in education, so that instruction may be practical, and diplomas never be made an atonement for dullness; in politics, so that the old veneration for the magistrate may come back and abide, and the people may no longer feel prompted to ask what each new office-holder paid for his place, or by what sort of back-stairs maneuvering he mounted to it before his competitors.

Such a manhood as this, secured and exercised, and our career cannot be ignoble, and all our great interests will be taken care of. In the long run, a true-hearted people will draw all

the best elements of life around them. Honor, fidelity, respect for rights everywhere, generosity, energy, faith,—these are the qualities that conquer opposition, and fill life with value, and lead in higher forms of civilization. They may go out into a strange land alone like Abraham, but they become the parent of many nations in the place where they first pitched the solitary tent; or they may sail the sea like the group crowded into the cabin of the *Mayflower*, and lift up their hymns in the forest of a new world, yet they shall seem to thrive on misfortune, and draw faith out of every new-made grave, until the wilderness blossoms like a garden, commerce whitens all the waters, and a procession of forces from all lands comes marching in to fashion an empire for freedom. No fruitfulness of soil, or extent of sea-coast, or abundant water-power, or vast mineral deposits, or extent of territory, or liberal constitutions, or national alliances, can bring a large or a true prosperity. A servile, or heedless or vicious population will leave the resources undeveloped, the forces unemployed, and walk over the deposited wealth as if it were blind. Give us a true manhood, and even barren regions will yield a large bounty, the very rock and ice will change into gold, and every passing cloud will seem to drop a blessing from its bosom. Such a people will plant a splendid civilization in a desert, and cover over the flintiest rocks with fresh-grown ivy till all the landscapes are beautiful. For, both the order and the faith of Providence are pledged to add all needful good to righteousness in character and manliness in life, and history is but the fulfillment of the promise.

The application of these facts and principles to public as well as private life is natural and easy. New England, at least, grew from the seed of principle, and her early spirit traverses the country. The chief freight of the *Mayflower* was moral conviction. The Pilgrims chose manhood with exile, rather than servility with great preferments. The real thrift of two hundred years, so far as it is realized, is the outgrowth of personal courage and fidelity, of social honor and respect, of national justice and dignity. Our chief strength has come from our lifting up of the weak, from our giving the despondent courage, from our teaching the lowliest and humblest of our race to aspire to the

functions and honors of a man, from our putting every child on the highway of education, and from our flinging off as an incubus that hideous system which grew up in the midnight of barbarism, and yet to which, strange to say, many men are yet clinging in their hearts, as though it were a desirable luxury of modern civilization.

But though we have too often forgotten how serious a thing it is to put manhood in peril, our recent national struggle proved that honor could not be bought for a mere outward price. The nation chose to risk its life in battle rather than crucify its convictions; and it chose wisely. For it is better to sink for a time, if we must even come to that, with truth and honor under our feet, than ascend to such a royalty as a monstrous falsehood can reach. Since the crucified Messiah has risen to be the ever-living Redeemer of the world, and turned the malefactor's cross into the grandest and holiest symbol of time, he who stands with God and for righteousness need not lose his faith amid disasters, nor fear that the sun has gone out because there are clouds hanging over heaven. Out of such blackness there is seen to burst a divine splendor. Our tested faith has been grandly rewarded; but other tests await us; and a rounded national manhood will come only as we are steadily and permanently true to our highest lessons. Men without principles may change as often as the daily tidings; men who glory in the thrift that comes of injustice may clamor against a right policy because it lessens their gains; men without faith may be worried into the basest compliances by prolonged calamity or anticipate the return of Chaos and old Night in every collision of the elements; but the genuine manhood of the country will read history and be instructed, listen to God's promise and grow calm, see the banner of eternal justice waving and march wherever it leads the way.

“His hand the good man fastens on the skies,
And bids earth roll, nor feels her idle whirl.”

A true manhood in the national spirit and life was never more needed, it had never before a grander opportunity, nor was the

future ever brighter with the glow of promise that tells of speedy fulfillment.

ART. II.—STRUGGLES FOR SOUL-LIBERTY.

BY REV. CHARLES HOWARD MALCOM, NEWPORT, R. I.

“The Dippers Dipped, or the Ana-baptists Ducked and Plunged Head over Ears,” was the title of a book written two hundred years ago, by Dr. Featley, against the Baptists. Not only were sneering books, with such titles, published in regard to Baptists, but the stocks, whipping post, and prison were considered admirable places for their reformation. Yet it is remarkable to one who studies church history, to notice how the religious world now generally admits the very principles for which the Baptists were formerly persecuted.

Careful reading shows that there are certain principles of which the Baptists have ever been the uniform and determined advocates; principles which are of the utmost importance to vital religion, and which have now become established points in the grand creed of American Christianity. The greatest of these principles, and the one which we now desire to illustrate by a rapid survey of history, is the Freedom of Conscience.

Classic nations, though tolerating in subdued provinces the form of religion previously existing in them, had their own state established religions; and, therefore, did not allow freedom of conscience to a Roman, or Grecian, citizen. Hence, Socrates was destroyed by poison, because he dared to teach young men to think of God as better than a revengeful Jupiter; and Pliny wrote to Trajan, with infinite zest, that he fed lions with Christian women, and made Christian men fight with bulls because they presumed to exercise their conscience in singing hymns to Jesus. At length, however, under the reign of Constantine the Great, Christianity itself became the established religion; and the party dissenting from such a union of civil and ecclesiastical

affairs, who happened to be Baptists, under the name of Donatists, began at once to suffer persecution. Thus, in the year 324, according to Mosheim, laws were passed for pulling down pagan temples; and, according to Neander, the liberty of conscience began to be disputed in the state itself. Thus first did vandalism and tyranny join hands under the name of Christian friendship, in spite of Christ's declaration that his kingdom needed not the defense of carnal weapons; and thus since, *par nobile fratrum*, have they desolated some of the fairest portions of the earth, and endeavored to crush freedom of conscience in some of God's best disciples. The Donatists, so named from Donatus, bishop of Casæ Nigræ, their chief defender, argued: "Christ in dying for men has given Christians the example to die, but not to kill;" but Augustine, in behalf of the Catholics, replied, "Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in;" and, accordingly, by way of compelling their free conscience, the Catholic emperor, in the year 316, ordered the churches of the Donatists in Africa to be taken from them, and some members to be banished. Thus, in the fourth century, we see that contest between spiritual despotism and spiritual liberty fairly begun which has continued to this day, and on the right side of which we find the Baptists.

The Donatists, thus maintaining the right of conscience to worship God according to its own dictates, were joined by other sects, till they became nearly as numerous as the Catholics.

Neander traces to them the historical origin of the Waldenses, and states that their distinct existence was maintained from the time of pope Sylvester, when a reactionary spirit took place against the corruptions of the state church. Then the Donatists separated from the Catholic church, and were so opposed to its corruptions that they re-baptized all who joined them from the Romish party, and hence were by some termed Ana-baptists, which in modern years has been modified into Baptists. The final separation between the Catholics and Baptists took place about 330; and for one hundred and fifty years after, says Neander, "infant baptism entered with difficulty into the life of the church." At that time, therefore, infant baptism had not by any means become universal even in the Catholic church,

while the Baptists denied the validity of Romish baptism on account of the corruptions of that church, according to Hase.

At this point we see, therefore, that the Baptists added to their determined defense of the freedom of conscience, their protest against infant baptism; and, says Neander, were afterwards aided in opposing these corruptions, about the year 1110, by the Petrobussians and the Henricans. About the year 1136, Arnold of Brescia began with great vigor to defend sacred liberty. He was an Italian of great learning and piety, and wished to reform the church of its worldly character; for which daring exercise of freedom of conscience he was banished by pope Innocent 2d, and afterwards crucified and his body burned. Yet he produced an immense effect on his times, and planted some germs of those reforming movements in the church of Rome which 400 years afterwards sprang up into the grand reformation. "He maintained," says Dr. Brewster, "that the temporal power of the church was an unprincipled usurpation." The same brave piety which for ten years made him contend for freedom of conscience at Rome in face of death, made him also wish to purify the church by purging it of infant baptism. Giesler says he also opposed the doctrine of transubstantiation. After his ashes had been strewn upon the waters of the Tiber, his followers continued for centuries the friends of freedom of conscience.

Next, about the year 1300, we see the Baptist principle still struggling for spiritual liberty, under the names of Albigenes, and Waldenses. Limborch, whose account Wall endorses, says the Waldenses, of all modern sects, most resembled the Mennonites, or Baptists of Holland. Peter Antem, one of their most distinguished teachers, preached that baptism was of no avail to children; and M. de Potter says they never baptized "children of a tender age."

In 1458, pope Pius II. wrote against these advocates of spiritual liberty; but as this did not silence them, stronger arguments became necessary, the pen was laid aside for the sword; and, in 1540, a law was passed that the Waldenses residing in Provence "should be destroyed;" and in five years every field was made rich with the blood of martyrs.

We now come to the period of the great reformation, and here the Baptists stand prominent as defenders of freedom of conscience. The Mennonites who sprung from the Waldenses in 1536, named from Simon Menno their chief preacher, who was once a Romish priest but in the above year joined the Baptists, contended for perfect liberty of conscience, while other denominations were seeking an alliance with the state; and afterwards they refused, according to Dr. Dermont, support from the king of the Netherlands. Thus they stood vastly superior to the Reformers, in their ideas of religious liberty; for Luther advised that the synagogues of the Jews should be destroyed; Calvin consented to the burning of Servetus; Beza wrote a defense of persecution; Henry VIII. of England burned Catholics and Baptists at the same stake, and so did Queen Elizabeth; archbishop Laud cut off the ears of stubborn spirits; the Presbyterians of Scotland in 1642 did their full share of persecuting, forbidding printers to publish any confession of faith, and putting many Papists into prison; and on the restoration of Charles II., 2000 nonconformist ministers had to resign their places on account of spiritual despotism.

While Papists were persecuting Protestants in the south of Europe, and Protestants were persecuting Papists and each other in northern Europe, the Baptists were still bravely pleading for spiritual freedom. Thus, in 1560, the Baptists of Great Britain published their condemnation of persecution for conscience sake. So far, then, we see the Baptists claiming and defending the right to liberty of conscience. Yet this noble principle was destined to gain a fresh triumph.

About 1615, Sir Edward Coke noticed a Welsh boy listening to cases argued in the Star Chamber; and, taking an interest in the gifted lad, became his patron and procured him a place in the University of Oxford. In that boy's heart burned the fire of religious liberty, which afterwards was to beam so brightly upon our continent. That boy, whose name is now endeared to every Baptist, was Roger Williams. He was ordained an Episcopalian minister in 1628; becoming a Puritan, he sailed for America in 1630. He was banished from Massachusetts on account of his love of liberty, by the very men who had fled to New Eng-

land for refuge from religious oppression, and after fourteen weeks' wandering in the wilderness, settled the town of Providence, Rhode Island, where, for the first time in the history of the Christian church, a civil government was organized which granted freedom to the conscience of every man.

Bancroft admits that Williams was the first legislator who formally recognized the principle of perfect religious liberty in the establishment of any government. Even Cromwell, not disposed to persecute, as Carlyle says, pitched sundry Papists into the sea, and worried the life out of a few Episcopalians; but upon the soil of America, bright harbinger of civil freedom, Williams lifted the standard of religious freedom. The blessings which we now enjoy, of perfect religious and civil liberty, we largely owe to the noble principles of the Baptists, contended for amidst blood and death, from the third century till they became triumphant in the colony of Rhode Island.

The Catholics alone have ventured to dispute the claim of the Baptists of having first proclaimed religious freedom to the world by law. Archbishop Hughes asserts that it was first done by Lord Baltimore, in his colony of Maryland. This is simply a historical mistake, for it was not till 1649, according to Hildreth, that religious toleration was duly enacted in Maryland; while in 1636, thirteen years previous, Roger Williams bought his territory from the Indians, and commenced his colony on the express principle of perfect religious liberty.

The bond of union among Baptists is not an ecclesiastical uniformity, but a oneness of faith in Christ. Tradition is without binding authority and ever has been, among Baptists. It has never been of the Baptist spirit to require every man to be of the same pattern before he can be recognized as a fellow laborer and brother in the same communion. It is an agreement essentially in cardinal points upon which we insist. In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, charity. We are firm believers in a principle that lies at the basis of Baptist faith: that the Bible is the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice. From this fundamental principle springs another, specially dear to Baptists; the right of every man to judge for himself what the Bible reveals.

These principles have a history; a history of labors and sufferings, of struggles and triumphs; a history full of instruction to the whole church of Christ upon earth, abounding in lessons which should be sacredly cherished by every Baptist, and which should continually prompt to justice and generosity toward every individual conscience.

ART. III.—RATIONALISM.

The forms of assault upon the Christian faith vary from age to age, but skepticism has a continuous history and a consecutive development. From Celsus to Parker, from Julian to Strauss the connecting links are clearly discernible.

The form in which the strongest and most dangerous attack is made to-day upon Christianity is that of rationalism. It is not the less formidable because its mode of assault is subtle, capturing the heart by insidious approaches in unsuspected garb. The tone of skeptical writers of the present century differs from that of the last century. It is not coarsely ribald like Paine's *Age of Reason*, but assumes the refined diction and the show of fairness of Renan's *life of Jesus*. A deep earnestness seems sometimes to prevail, combined with something of appreciation of that which is assailed. But though, in general, a more respectful demeanor is preserved, yet we find in writers of the most refined school expressions of bitterness and recklessness that bring vividly to mind the spirit and language of the *Encyclopædists* and their contemporaries.

On account of this respectful attitude and the hidden character of the systems of doubt, we are liable to underestimate their strength and to close our eyes to the perils they bring. When the word skepticism is pronounced many minds revert at once to Voltaire and Paine, and as none in precisely such garb and spirit as those defiant, blasphemous champions appear upon the field, no particular danger is apprehended. The opposition to the

name of Christ no longer frightens and disgusts with obscene violence but makes its way through the literature of the hour unsuspected into polite homes, its shafts reach unsuspected the study of the pastor and modify the effectual presentation of truth.

WHAT IS RATIONALISM ?

We might at first suppose that it was the wise and legitimate use of reason on religious subjects. Rather it is the claim of reason to a supreme right of judging the things of faith ; it constitutes itself the supreme judge of Christianity. It declares of the Bible : we will not accept anything contained in it which our reason cannot fathom.

“The clearest notion,” says Dr. Arnold, “which can be given of rationalism would, I think, be this : that it is the abuse of the understanding in subjects where the divine and human, so to speak, are intermingled. Of human things the understanding can judge, of divine things it cannot ; and thus where the two are mixed together, its inability to judge of the one part makes it derange the proportions of both, and the judgment of the whole is vitiated. For example, the understanding examines a miraculous history : it judges truly of what I may call the human part of the case ; that is to say, of the rarity of miracles, of the fallibility of human testimony, of the proneness of most minds to exaggeration, and of the critical arguments affecting the genuineness or date of the narrative itself. But it forgets the divine part, namely, the power and providence of God, that he is really ever present amongst us, and that the spiritual world, which exists invisibly all around us, may conceivably and by no means impossibly exist, at some times and to some persons, even visibly.

But there may not be an absolute disbelief in the realities of a higher world, and yet the soul be wholly invisible to their influence. The view which different men take of the proofs of divine revelation depends largely upon the general habit of feeling in respect to supernatural things. The whole mode of thought and feeling concerning God, and his Providence, and his character, concerning human sin and human need, has a de-

cisive influence in determining the judgment to give or refuse credit to the historical proof. Possibly God has so arranged it, that while this proof is sufficient to satisfy one whose spiritual eye is open to these realities, it is yet endued with no power to create conviction where such is not the fact. He who magnifies the presumption against supernatural interposition, not allowing for the moral emergency that calls for it, and hardly recognizing the power from whom it must come, puts on a coat-of-mail which is proof against all the arguments for Revelation. He is shut up to unbelief by a logical necessity."* When men begin, as Hume, with ignoring the existence and character of God, it is easy to deny miracles and every thing else of revelation. When the skeptic once states, with Strauss, at the outset of his argument upon supernatural things, that a miracle is simply and utterly impossible, all argument is at once ended. It is wholly vain to argue with him who, at the opening of dispute, thus begs the question. The same land that gave rise to the Reformation, the triumph of grace over superstition and spiritual despotism, has been the scene of the fiercest conflicts between belief and skepticism and has suffered most deeply from the wounds inflicted by the most skillful and the most daring opponents of faith. With the cessation of the great religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Europe, greater attention was given to industrial and political affairs. The prestige of the Catholic church had faded away in the hands of its most brilliant son, Louis XIV., and the system which he strove to make supreme had become at his death the object of contempt, the target for ridicule. Toleration marked the religious spirit of the eighteenth century, but toleration was accompanied by a feeling of indifference to all religion; with the increase of light arose in new measure the skeptical spirit.

When the witty, sarcastic Voltaire returned from England, where he had sat at the feet of the reckless, frivolous Bolingbroke, France, too well prepared by the death-dealing influences

*Dr. G. P. Fisher's "*Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity*"—a highly valuable work to one who would gain a discriminating view of the real questions at issue between faith and unbelief.

of the ecclesiastics, gave a glad, full welcome to his poisonous blasphemy.

Voltaire hastened to Prussia, where he became the intimate companion of the king. Infidelity was thenceforth fashionable at court and made rapid progress throughout all Germany. But the earnest, thoughtful German could not be satisfied with this superficial deism. "Slowly, step by step, and almost entirely independent of foreign influences, the German thinkers, with Leibnitz and Wolf at their head, began to evolve a philosophical theology out of the clouds, as a sculptor would fashion a statue out of rough marble."* Religion and morality were sacred things in their eyes; they would have shrunk with horror from the speculations of the godless philosophy of fifty years later. Their aim was to compel their philosophy to render service to religion. They exalted reason; they supposed it capable of lifting the mind from the seen to the unseen, and, of itself, giving new grounds for faith. But it was not intended that reason should dispute divine revelation. They established a natural theology entirely separate from revealed religion, endeavoring to prove by scientific demonstration the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the Trinity.

A disposition soon manifested itself on the part of many to advocate this religion of nature as the new and shining light for the soul, and to regard revealed religion as an antiquated, useless encumbrance. The abstract philosophy, the deep speculations of Wolf, were succeeded by a popular philosophy which made a life of honorable dealing, of strict morality, a substitute for a life of faith. The pulpit began to abound in discussions of questions of morality rather than in the themes of the gospel; the welfare of the body was sought, but that of the soul was neglected. Preaching became more like an exercise in logic; little of edification and inspiration was imparted, while the preachers attempted by tedious methods the bare instruction of the flock. The Scriptures were made to rest on philosophy. Intellectual speculation concerning revelation called the mind away from spiritual religion more and more.

Baumgarten succeeded Wolf in the university-chair of Halle.

*Hagenbach's Germ. Rationalism.

Under his training arose Semler, the father of the destructive school of rationalists; in him the reign of pietism ended and the reign of neology began. He was possessed of a devout spirit; in all his attacks upon the prevalent views concerning the Bible there was no exhibition of levity or scorn. He lived in a frame of constant dependence upon God, even though he regarded Christianity as only a valuable system of practical ethics. His heart became more simple and childlike as years passed on, but his theology grew more bold and his criticism more trenchant. Trained as a pietist, his heart remained true to the faith of his eminently pious parents, while his writings placed him as the leader and real founder of the rationalistic school.

In his examination of the books of the Bible, he decided that the inward conviction of the mind that what is conveyed is truth, is the proof of inspiration. Reason being umpire, he rejected the books of Chronicles, Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and the Song of Solomon; Joshua, Judges, the books of Samuel, Kings, and Daniel were considered doubtful; the Pentateuch was merely a collection of legendary fragments; the New Testament was possessed of some good qualities, which are lacking in the Old Testament, but with some parts positively injurious to the church. The authenticity and integrity of the gospels he pronounced doubtful. He declared that Christ and his apostles adapted themselves to the state of feeling, the prejudices and ignorance of their times, and so we can reconcile much that they taught by their desire to cater to the prevailing corruption of taste; Christ did not unwisely attempt to destroy the current notions of the Jews but re-clothed them; as, for instance, the utterances concerning angels, the second advent, the final judgment, the resurrection, were only accommodations to prevailing errors. A large portion of the Bible was merely of temporary value and now had no application to men. Did any point seem to defy criticism it was assigned a place in this, so called, Accommodation Theory, or it was accounted merely as of local and temporary value. The Scriptures were robbed of spiritual significance, the accounts of miracles were stamped as fabrications. The coming of our Lord was reduced to merely

the dawn of a temporal kingdom; "Christ is a stumbling block to the Jews," because he would not throw off the Roman yoke as his countrymen had hoped; "the creature which is made subject to vanity" is the Roman world still in idolatry. He himself had overthrown what Wolf had left of the popular faith in inspiration, but his followers attempted the overthrow of revelation itself. The publications of the professors of theology at Göttingen, Jena, and elsewhere, were filled with blasphemous utterances against the Scriptures.

We find in Lessing "a man who wrought confusion both in the dramatic and the theological worlds (using these words in the largest sense); who, with his powerful understanding, struck into them both with great effect, and called into being polemics in art as well as in religion, without bringing to us a system in either; who, in the closest sense of the word, was neither a poet nor a theologian. He was always and everywhere a critic."* In 1774 he published the so-called *Wolfenbütten Fragments*, which raised a commotion among all classes like that excited in our day by the appearance of Strauss's life of Jesus. These Fragments,—which Reimarus, their author, had not seen fit to give to the world himself,—were sent forth annotated by Lessing.

The Fragments represent the Bible as the real and purposed narrative of history, but it is profane history. The writers were skillful, designing men, who conceived a secret plot to impose upon the world. Christ aimed to reform his countrymen and to establish an earthly Messiahship. But these plans ignominiously failed and their author perished on a cross. Then the disciples gave the whole history a spiritual signification, and added to the account the story of the Resurrection.

On the publication of these views, a kind of amazement ensued, "even with many politicians; dissatisfaction, with many men in prominent position; with some a light and trifling levity, and a deliberate working out, in the same line, the heresies stated in the Fragments; and the latter method, first gaining ground with young scholars, widened its sphere, and at last

*Hagenbach.

got abroad among citizens and plain people, on whom the Fragmentist had not counted for support. Many serious youths, who had devoted themselves to the work of preparation for the ministry, found themselves in great perplexity in consequence of this shattering of the foundations of their faith; others resolved to change their calling, and not to enter upon a sphere of labor where there would be so little stable ground left them to work upon.”*

Many prominent scholars predicted that the Fragments could not be answered. But some noble spirits still came to the rescue of the faith, and there ensued “a strife for the very life or death of Christianity, although the battle was fought with various weapons.”

Truth rises above everything, and for it even the quietness and peace of individuals must be sacrificed, is the doctrine of Lessing, while he goes on to say: “Always must the few who never were Christians, who never will be Christians, who, merely under the name of Christians, breathe out their thoughtless lives, always must this despicable class be pushed aside from the place through which the better class is to pass to the light.” In reference to these statements we cannot forbear quoting the profound and pious remark of Dr. Hagenbach: “A hard expression, and one that chimes with that view which claims that the mere enlightenment of the understanding is the highest good; and according to which the *individual*, with his devout feeling, his struggles and doubts, his longings and his scruples, counts for nothing, if only the *race* advance in power of thought; a view which, if we follow it to the end, conducts us to a pantheistic conception of the world, into which no consideration of the individual enters, and the sparing of the weak counts as weakness. The truth does rise above all things; but what truth? Not that alone which satisfies the mind and gives mere knowledge, but that which makes us free, which betters us, which sanctifies us, and ennobles our whole nature; the truth, which, like a common good for all, raises even the lowliest above the limited domain of their own cares and troubles, and which enjoins humility upon the wisest, and bids them be silent and

*Hagenbach.

learn where the frontiers of the understanding lie. That the unthinking Christians, as Lessing calls them, are therefore no Christians, or the most despicable class,—who may say that? How long has mere thought been the measure of Christianity? The distinction which Christianity makes between men is not between the thinking and the unthinking, but between believers and unbelievers. Sensibility of spirit, longing after divine qualities, hunger and thirst after righteousness, it demands at the outset, and then it turns to give itself alike to learned and unlearned, to the deepest thinkers and to the simple minded.”

Campe, Basedow, Vestalozzi and Becker, inaugurated and carried on important reforms in the education of youth, but the schools were turned against evangelical religion, the Bible was supplanted by the popular literature which sprang up on all sides for the use of children. The youth were instructed to regard the Scriptures as mere antiquated productions without special value, to look upon Christ as a mere man, and the church as the home of superstition and bigotry. From such sowing it could hardly be otherwise than that they should become thorough rationalists on reaching maturity.

Frederick Nicolai became in 1765 the publisher of the “General German Library,” the avowed organ of infidelity. The creations of fancy, the offspring of spirituality, as well as the outgrowths of superstition and prejudice, were unsparingly attacked. A heartless wit, and merciless criticism, attacked both the rigidity of the orthodox and the warmth of the pietist; even the productions of Goethe and other poets were robbed of their delicate fancies and only their prosaic effusion tolerated. Everything was subjected to this literary inquisition and thrown ruthlessly aside if it did not contribute to practical utility. Philosophy, education, theology were required to speak the language of the people and aim for popular favor. It was something for the better when the preacher was made to feel that a stiff, pedantic presentation of truth would not be tolerated, and that he must make himself understood by the people, but it was disastrous to the truth when he confined his ministrations only to that which would make them useful citizens, and displaced the gospel with the preaching of good morals.

This barren utility pronounced all heart-life fanaticism and superstition. The supernatural and the unseen were carefully crowded out of mind; no word of peace broke in upon the restless heart from a living Saviour. The necessity of preserving the health, the disadvantages of lawsuits, the best modes of tillage usurped, in the pulpit, the place of the atonement and salvation. So religion became only a system of selfish morality; all began and ended in the selfish advantages of the earthly life. "The old-fashioned system of religious service had to be modified and adjusted to this new style of preaching, which was as clear as water, and as thin as water too."

Then the old and precious hymns of the church, in which the heart had rested for ages, were overtaken by this cold, reckless criticism. Every rhymester stretched forth an unsparing hand upon the sweet productions of Bach and Gellert, or despoiled the hymns of Luther of their soul-inspiring power. Secular music entered with unblushing mein into the sanctuary and welcomed or dismissed the people with an operatic overture or a waltz. The hymns being thus robbed of their sacredness, the people gradually ceased to sing, and "the children sang least and most drowsily" the productions which appealed to no element of the child-nature.

"The last step of all was to emasculate the strong and vigorous language of Luther's version of the Bible, substituting a weak, modern, over-fine style, and making Moses, David, Isaiah, Paul, and even Jesus, speak in the same language they would use if they were writing a trial sermon before entering the ministry. The brief and pregnant sentence: 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,' became, in the new version, 'God, external to whom nothing existed, made a commencement of all things, by calling into being the primitive constituent materials thereof.'"*

We now find infidelity carried to its farthest issues. Its chief apostle Bahrett lectures upon morality, while a frequenter of the brothel; becomes the dispenser of wine and beer at a tavern in Halle, and, hating and lampooning every sacred thing, dies

*Hagenbach.

a miserable death. Everything had seemingly fallen before this spiritual vandalism. Spiritual petrification was well nigh complete. Each change in politics, in theology, literature, music, had been prolific of ruin to evangelical faith.

We turn now most gladly to the work of recovery from this fearful eclipse of faith, and follow the steps by which the light was brought in once more upon this gross spiritual darkness.

We must not suppose, however, that the desolation, even in the darkest periods of unbelief, was utter and rayless.

Reinhard, Storr and Knapp still defended the necessity of a supernatural revelation and the divine authority of the Bible. "Klopstock, the German Milton, although inferior to the genius that inspired the 'Paradise Lost,' sung the glory of the Messiah. In Herder's enchanting paradise of all the flowers of humanity, Christianity bloomed after all with the brightest colors and sweetest fragrance. His eccentric friend, Hamann, 'the Magus of the North,' uttered hieroglyphic oracles, which sounded like prophecies of a new creation. Jacobi maintained, in the name of philosophy, the insufficiency of reason and the necessity of faith. The romantic school of Schlegel, Tieck, Novalis, revived a taste for the poetry of religion and chastised with withering irony the conceited folly of a Nicolai. John von Müller, the German Tacitus, found at last in Jesus Christ the center of the history of the world, and the only key to the solution of its mysteries. Schelling and Hegel dug out a deeper channel of speculation, which was far remote, indeed, from the simplicity of the gospel, but promised at least to show the beautiful harmony of the highest truths of philosophy with the leading doctrines of Christianity, and to dethrone the rationalistic common sense from its usurped dominion. Claudius, Stilling, and Lavater, preserved a childlike piety in an age of prevailing skepticism, and proved, in their persons and writings, a blessing to thousands. The Pietists and Moravians kept the lamp of faith burning in dark places. And finally the common people, in spite of all the efforts of the blind leaders to deprive them of their dearest treasure, retained a certain traditional piety, nourished by the German Bible, the catechisms, hymns, and

devotional works of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.”*

In the very capital of the free-thinking king Frederick, Euler published in 1741 his “Defense of Revelation against the Attacks of Free-thinkers.” The book maintains with great ability the following propositions against the prevailing skepticism: “The understanding,” he says, “can attain to a high degree of knowledge, and the will be not bettered. Experience proves this; for very often men of the keenest intellects are the most deficient in goodness, and yet oftener a high degree of virtue is commensurate with a mean understanding.” He shows that a revelation which should merely increase our knowledge without healthfully influencing our will, would be an injury to the race; and that in the fact that the Christian religion, by introducing the love of God as its most active element in subduing the will of man, lies the main burden of proof that the Bible is the Word of God. That Word not only enlarges our knowledge of duty, but it also gives our most needful help. Not to believe in it because it contains difficulties would only plunge us into yet greater difficulties. The refusal to accept the Bible as a revelation of God is an offense of the will; else why do those who stumble at everything which they find in the Bible so readily believe everything else?†

The science of physiology began with the labors of Albert von Haller. Unbelief seized this department of knowledge and endeavored to turn it against religion by attempting to prove that man’s spiritual nature springs from and is wholly dependent upon his bodily organization, and that it has no existence after the death of the body. . . But the mind that gave rise to the science, beheld by faith the skillful hand that fashioned the body, and pronounced, with decisive utterance, the distinction between the mortal body and the deathless spirit—“between the ground in which the plant takes root and the plant itself.”

While absorbed in the severest scientific pursuits, with the most celebrated universities of Europe bestowing upon him their highest honors, and in the midst of the thickening gloom which was setting in all around him, we hear him saying: “O

*Schaff.

†Hagenbach.

soften my hard heart ; teach me to know Jesus ; not to confess him merely with my lips, but to appropriate his grace. O teach me, when I am sad at heart, not to turn to worldly consolation, but to Thee ! O give me another heart, that shall not flatter, that shall love Thee and be wholly Thine."

Religion, he says, must be felt in the heart as well as appreciated by the understanding, if it shall prove any real solace or signal help to us. With strong opposition to all philosophical and rationalistic phariseism, his brilliant and powerful mind bowed in deep adoration before the one sufficient name and exalted only the wordrous scheme of salvation. He felt the depravity of the human heart, knew the feeling of the publican, "God be merciful to me a sinner," and the workings of divine grace in his heart. None but a consecrated soul could declare with him : "No one has truly given himself to God who does not discover as plainly the working of grace in the heart as he feels the power of sin. I am truly convinced that in the grace of God we have an Almighty helper, who can free us from the bonds of sin, and lead us on to lofty and consecrated purposes."

Gellert, the Watts of Germany, from his professor's chair at Leipsic and by his poetic gift, endeavored to correct the rationalizing tendencies of the times. For the young men of Germany, four hundred of whom were sometimes under his instructions at once, his labors were of the highest intellectual and spiritual benefit.

There was another class of minds, not less honest and sincere, who made no such utter protest, as these last mentioned, against the efforts and spirit of rationalism, but believed it the wisest policy to conciliate the enemy by timely concessions of the unessential things of faith. This class exhibits what is called "half-way rationalism." It was composed, for the most part, of "men thoroughly imbued with a religious spirit and having no sympathy with the coarse and frivolous skepticism of their contemporaries, and who felt it their mission to rescue what was holy from impious hands, and to commend what was fundamental in Christianity to the most enlightened thinkers of their day. These men were, however, somewhat tinctured with the spirit of the age in which they lived, and their efforts were mainly di-

rected to such a system of accommodation and concession of unessentials, as should disarm the opposition of avowed infidels, give a quietus to disturbed and skeptical minds, and yet not displease thorough-going believers.”*

Prominent among these were Dr. J. F. W. Jerusalem, who sought to strengthen the bond between church and school which Basedow and his followers endeavored to sunder, J. J. Spalding, who preached “more on the *religion* than the *person* of Christ,” though with limited and meager creed still uttering no word which personal experience had not proved; and Zollicoffer, who, possessed of a noble and even character himself, endeavored by preaching morality more than grace to awaken in his people an appreciation of high and noble qualities of soul.

But with a willingness on the part of such men to yield up what they called “the unessential things of religion,” there were too little appreciation and comprehension of the essential things. It was something, it is true, to lop off some excrescences in the outward manifestations of religion, but the recoil was too complete from all that might seem likely to offend men of culture and tastes, and they too much banished feeling, and substituted a cold morality for the living presence of faith. Accordingly, when they preached, they made no deep impression upon the minds of the people; a calm, philosophic, subjective view of religion cannot powerfully affect the masses; the religious life, positive and full, needs to flow out unstinted, in self-forgetful speech, before the popular mind can be aroused and molded at the preacher’s will. “The well-meaning writers of this school did not observe that all religion is a primitive thing,—that it demands the first place in the heart,—that it will allow nothing to stand between it and its possessor,—and that, if its inner kernel be gone, it can no more be made living and effective, than life can be breathed into some of the products of chemistry.”† So, notwithstanding their well-meant efforts and their ardent desire to further Christianity, they were all the time preparing, by a concession both of unessentials and of the spirit

*Hagenbach.

†Dr. Steffens, quoted by Hagenbach.

and heart of essentials in religion, for the spread of a complete rationalism.

The labors of John Albert Bengel, who is best known to American students by that keen, thorough, scholarly work called Bengel's Gnomon, were of the most valuable kind to Germany, directed by an exhaustive scholarship and ardent piety against the assumptions of perverted learning, as well as the errors of unhealthful zeal, ignorance and caprice. His vast learning found it a delight to present Bible truths in the simplest, most practical way; he became the sure support in times of the most reckless infidelity to multitudes of souls weaker than his, a bright and steady light shining over the troubled waves of doubt with cheering radiance. "Amid most depressing influences, he stands out in the full soundness of a complete, graceful, effective, Christian man."

In the eighteenth century, Zinzendorf, a nobleman of high rank, founded the brotherhood of Moravians. Laying aside all worldly honors and ease, he labored with unassuming mien and deep, fervent piety in the midst of a colony of poor artisans who had left their homes, for faith's sake, to dwell undisturbed in Germany. With untiring zeal he planted colonies in Norway, Greenland, Lapland, Ethiopia, Guinea, Persia, Palestine and Russia; and sent missionaries to almost all parts of the globe.

In religion he was a friend of every sect; his brotherhood was founded upon a community of interests, of order, and of rigid discipline. "It is the wish of my heart," he says, "to establish the Moravian brotherhood on the freest, most simple, most orderly basis, and to make myself one of the lowest among the brethren, for I hate all lordship in this matter." His great work was not that of a reformer, like Luther, nor of a leader in theology, but of one who drew many hearts from the prevailing coldness and worldly thinking to the warmth of spiritual life. He exalted Christ to the utmost, in an age when rationalism and socinianism were degrading his work and office in the eyes of men.

Christ and him crucified was the central and almost only point of his theology; Jesus was brought prominently forward

and the existence of God, the Father, almost ignored. He placed the Son in the place of the Father, says his fair-minded critic, Bengel, and even "employed expressions of great harshness against what he called the God-Father religion." The significance of the Trinity and the work of mediation was thus lost sight of. He viewed Christ chiefly as the suffering Saviour, his love went out with greatest strength toward him as the crucified one, but, however beautiful this all absorbing love appears in him, we must not forget the narrowness of any view of Christ which confines itself merely to the sufferings of the Messiah. Zinzendorf delighted in the exhibition to himself and his audiences of the picture of the blood, the spear, the nails and the death agony of the cross, dealing with the cross too much as an object of sense. Bengel in his criticism of this chief point in Zinzendorf's system observes that "the sufferings of Christ are always united in the closest manner with His life, His actions, His teachings, on the one hand; and with His resurrection and glorification on the other, and that only in this mutual connection has the cross its true significance."

"The mere hearing and speaking of the wounds of Jesus," says Bengel, "ends in nought but words. There are those who only *name* Christ and never *know* him. Even they who always bring prominently forward the sufferings of the Saviour make them common, and cannot ward off a misuse of what should be so rare and precious. They make of the blood of Christ an opiate to apply to their consciences, thinking that thus they may better distinguish between right and wrong. Through the supremacy which the Moravian scheme of doctrine grants to the imagination, the Scripture itself is made to pervert itself; the cross is buried beneath itself; the heart is made the instrument to lead itself away; human freedom becomes its own betrayer, and the sensibilities blunt their own native delicacy."

In opposition to the prevalent infidelity appeared also the school of mystics, boasting such names as Swedenborg, Lavater, Heinrich and Stilling. From the practical in religion, beyond which Zinzendorf did not go, they insisted that a continued revelation is being made to us, that men may communicate with the world of spirits, that the age of miracles is not past. The

widest difference, however, manifested itself in the teachings of these men. Swedenborg held no reverence for the letter of the Scriptures and believed that newer revelations would supersede the Bible; the others accepted the better views concerning the Bible and taught the necessity of practical righteousness.

Stilling and Lavater are ranked with Swedenborg, "not because they accepted his system, but because they shared with him the tendency to speculate on the mysteries of the unseen world, and believed with him in the close connection and correspondence of this world with the next. But while in Swedenborg there is nothing but this dreamy and insecure and fanciful speculation, and nothing of the practical, with Stilling and Lavater lawless mysticism forms but a part of religion."*

In marked distinction from the age in which they lived, Stilling and Lavater proclaimed God's nearness to men, and his power and willingness to answer prayer. They conceived of him as no mere abstract being having his abode in some distant realm of space, but as near and ready to hear the cry of all who, out of a sincere heart, call upon him. We pass over their vagaries in reference to the employments and scenes of the spiritual world, and find in them a deep yearning for personal communion with Christ, rejoicing in his divinity, having no sympathy with the view that crowds out the Father from his true position in the Trinity, not seeking to draw Christ down to men, but to lift men up to him.

Stilling writes of one of his friends: "Never have I admired any one more than this man," while he acknowledges that he had received from him "an impulse to perpetual activity." This friend was John Godfrey Herder. Goethe, looking upon Herder's active life, so full of impelling ideas and plans, exclaims: "What a motion there must have been in such a mind, what a fermenting in such a nature, can neither be conceived nor expressed. Great, however, must have been the hidden striving, as will be readily acknowledged, when we consider how many years he labored and how much he accomplished."

Inferior to Goethe and Schiller as a poet, to Kant and Fichte

*Hagenbach.

as a philosopher, accomplishing less in church history than Mosheim, in exegesis than Michaelis and Griesbach, he was a master of every department of study, and in the aggregate results of his labors achieved more than either of those great names. Michaelis was profound but lifeless in his critical labors. Herder insisted upon bringing to Scripture criticism the warmth and color of the oriental mind. He charged Michaelis with criticizing all heart out of the Bible, and was the first to oppose the levity of those who made of the history of the Bible mere poetry. He did not diminish aught from the historical while he gave due place to the poetical element in criticism. He says: "Truly it is a fine thread which passes through the Bible, Old and New Testaments, especially in those places in which figure and fact, history and poetry are blended. Rough hands can seldom follow it, much less unroll it, without tearing and tangling it, without injuring either the poetry or the history, which are spun by this thread into one web. Then, indeed, interpreting belongs to God. . . . If persons attempt it . . . to whom nothing is more foreign than a poetical feeling, especially that of the Orient, and though they are the greatest dogmatists and critics in the world—the plant grows pale at their breath and withers in their hands." New words these, surely, to the materialistic spirit of the age and the cold, heartless criticism which laid violent hands upon the most delicate pictures of sacred writ, and, too, words of rebuke to that class of critics of modern times who insist upon approaching the Bible in the most mechanical manner, with less of feeling than they would approach a marble statue or a rare painting.

While the prevailing custom of his time was to study theology without any special reference to the revealed word, he insisted, even in presence of no little ridicule, that "the best study of divinity is the study of the Bible. . . . As a child hears the voice of its father, as the lover hears the voice of his bride, so we hear God's voice in the Scriptures, and perceive the sound of eternity in it. . . . Whilst God's Word in the hands of the critic is like a squeezed lemon; God be praised, it appears to me now again as a fruit, which flourishes on the living tree."

With such a spirit he ably defended the Mosaic record from

the assumptions of those who endeavored to find in it a mere account of physical phenomena, and became the fitting interpreter of the figurative language of the Old Testament. He always dwelt upon Christ as the center of Christianity, and strove to stamp the image of the Redeemer upon the souls to whom he ministered. The fourth gospel, attacked on almost every side in the last century, and assailed with special force in the present by those especially who make Christ a mere popular teacher, Herder, with keen spiritual insight declared of it: "That little book is a still, deep sea in which . . . the heavens, with the sun and stars are mirrored, and if there are eternal truths (and such there are) for the human race, they are to be found in the gospel of John."

At first too diffident and abstract to be a successful pastor and preacher, he aimed with such success to bring his discourses within the comprehension of all and to make his manner more like that of men in society, that even the lowliest of his parish soon listened to his sermons with the greatest pleasure and found his pastoral intercourse of highest profit. He allowed himself the use of no difficult expressions in his sermons, which were addressed not to the highly cultivated and learned in his audience, of whom there was always a large number, but to those of simpler tastes and lesser knowledge. But by such a method, uniting the greatest simplicity of style and language with the greatest strength of thought and devotion of spirit, no part of his hearers were uninstructed and unblessed, while many learned skeptics who had before only ridiculed Christianity as a mass of weakness and superstition, went from his presence to respect and love the faith he preached.

We are prepared, by the foregoing references to his work, to find him rebuking the mercenary and irreverent spirit of his age by his persistent efforts to magnify and elevate the pastoral office. Upon entering the pastorate at Weimar, in his first sermon, he says, in a soliloquizing manner: "You are called to be a shepherd of souls at a time when it is frequently doubted whether there ought to be such a thing as religion, whether it ought to be regarded and cherished, and when, at least, the stream of thought flows against it and threatens to sweep over

it with its furious waves ; it is said that it ought not to be thought of, that we can least of all things take care of ourselves by being religious, and that it is the duty of each one to take care of himself, that, therefore, the ministerial office is useless, a remnant of old customs which only continues because of the prejudices in its favor, and, to say the least, is so difficult and obsolete that its duties cannot be fully performed in our day. And, behold, such an office thou enterest upon here! Their souls shall be required at thy hand !”

The pastor of that time was looked upon as an appendage of the state, a mere repository of theology without much practical value. Herder strove to make the pastor comprehend the sacredness of his office, to imbue him with a love for the souls of men, and he who would not learn such needful lessons was declared not worthy to be called a pastor. Mere moral preaching he turned from with disgust, addressing those who indulged in it, with a decisive utterance that may fittingly be listened to by many in the modern pulpit : “ Why don't you come down from your pulpits, for they cannot be of any advantage to you in preaching such things. What is the use of all these Gothic churches, altars, and such matters? No, indeed! Religion, true religion, must return to the exercise of its original functions, or a preacher will become the most indefinite, idle and indifferent thing on earth. Teachers of religion, true servants of God's word, what have you to do in our century? The harvest is plenteous, but the laborers are few. Pray the Lord of the harvest that he will send out laborers who will be something more than bare teachers of wisdom and virtue.”

He gave to all theological enquires a new direction and a new spirit. Less profound than some contemporary theologians, he accomplished far more than they for the people, exerting on the educated portion a wider and more beneficial influence. Life, vigor, light sprang up at his touch in place of the dearth, darkness and torpidity that seem to have settled so fearfully upon his generation. Church discipline had been neglected, the rich and educated often strove to free themselves from church censure by bestowment of money or the payment of fines. In scholarly and rich Weimar he stood up to advocate the old

church discipline which had become unfashionable. "There is no rank in Christianity;" he says, "soldiers, court-officers, princes, and ministers are Christians; no sin can be redeemed with money, and no prince can except sins and excuse them."

In the latter part of the eighteenth century, Kant directed the mind to the examination of its own powers. "The old inscription on the temple of wisdom, 'Know thyself,' was as it were revived, and shone like an admonishing pillar of fire through the darkness in which so many philosophers of ancient and modern times had been groping." He gave a decided check to the unbounded assumptions of human reason, and so did some service for religion, without, however, recognizing the doctrines of faith as a revelation from God. Nothing, he declares, that lies outside of time and space, outside the things which our senses grasp, can be an object for pure thinking; but not meaning by this, however, that all outside of this has no existence; not that beyond the world of sense there is no infinite, eternal existence; but he claims that the eternal and infinite things are not the proper objects for human reason to deal with, that they are not things of investigation and proof. He stops with defining the province of reason, and leaves no word for faith and designates for it no province nor work.

Kant accepted God's existence, the immortality of the soul, human freedom, original sin, and retribution in another world, not as the teachings of revelation, but as the result of practical reasoning; arguing that, as our striving for morality often conflicts with our natural inclination for happiness, there must be both some compensation hereafter, and an all-wise, all benevolent God to effect such compensation. He failed to understand the true filial spirit and the heart of faith, by making the religious motives nothing more than the hope of reward or the fear of punishment. Man is taught to heal himself, to seek by the use of reason his safety and peace, rather than to look away from self to the great Teacher of reason, the Healer of the soul.

"The moral effect of his philosophy was to expel French Materialism, and to give depth to the moral perceptions; its religious effect was to strengthen the appeal to reason and the moral judgment as the test of religious truth; to render miracu-

lous communication of moral truth useless, if not absurd; and to reawaken the attempt, which had been laid aside since the Wolfian philosophy, of endeavoring to find a philosophy of religion.”*

The God of Kant was no intimate, personal presence, alive to our needs and striving for our happiness, but rather a Judge, in some distant realm awaiting in calm, cold grandeur, the favored hour for retribution. The impulse to virtue came not from on high but from man himself; there was no Comforter abiding with his philosophy to make it a thing of solace and hope, and all aspiration began and ended with the fettered human soul.

With the announcement of the ignorance, the weakness of reason, which he makes, we expect in vain the direction to look for some revelation to weakness and ignorance from Him who sits high above the finite powers and promises to reveal what those unaided powers cannot grasp. The Bible became to him a valuable helper in the attainment of *moral* truth and was an object of regard, while the superficial and desperate Bahrdr and his school were filling Germany with blasphemous distrust of its truths. Not after the fashion of the day, he strove to honor the work of the church, and while he could not accept its dogmas and practices he had no word of ridicule or contempt for them.

We close this hasty reference to Kant with the admirable and discriminating remarks of Hagenbach: “*Christ, Christianity, Bible, Church, and Church doctrines* were not to him empty sounds, not what they were to the common deists, objects of contempt and scorn; no, they remained to Kant objects of reverence, at least objects worthy of earnest reflection and the most careful investigation. He, the master, did not decide speedily what many of his disciples afterwards decided hastily. He did not want to burden his conscience with the fact that he had torn from the heart of the people that which serves as the prop of its morality. He regarded these props as remaining, but, of course, merely as props, as crutches for the weak, as temporary levers for those who cannot raise themselves. The religion of the

* Farrar,—Critical History of Free Thought.

Bible and of Christianity had not come to life in him; and what was not living in himself how could he impart it to others? Let us honor this, however, that he did not take it from them, at least not intentionally. Of course, he could not prevent it, that his disciples removed that which the master had permitted to remain. Even if it may be doubted that one of the greatest disciples of Kant, *Fichte*, made use of the expression, that Christianity would have outlived itself in five years, still there was no lack of similar expressions on the part of others. . . . It may appear strange that a system, apparently dry and abstract, like the Kantian, a system which perhaps scarcely one in a hundred understood, should, notwithstanding this, have received so many adherents. It was nevertheless so. The Kantian system, or the critical philosophy as it was called, was too soon raised as a party standard, around which theologians, jurists, pedagogues, and physicians flocked. A proof this, that the ideas suggested by Kant were lying in the age; that the same, which he presented in a strictly scientific form, were glimmering in an indefinite manner in the minds of men, and that but the spell of a system was needed to call up the spirits who, without this spell, would have remained in the dark.”*

No history of the development of rationalism and its effects would be complete without reference to the two brightest lights in German literature, Schiller and Goethe.

The former possessed of more soul, of a higher moral sentiment, shares the larger place in the German heart. Schiller is Kant set to verse and interpreted with poetic diction. He represents the higher type of rationalism, such as was discarded and ridiculed by those of the other wing, such as Reinhard. But under the poetical form, often so rich and beautiful, there is discovered unmistakably the rationalistic tendency; and rationalism was clothed, in his hands, with an ideality not shared by the common rationalistic mind.

He was carefully trained in his youth in a home of piety, and for many years early impressions clung to him and were plainly shown in his first productions. In the glow of youthful enthu-

*German Rationalism.

siasm, with the heart fixed upon the work of the ministry as his ideal, he wrote, one Sabbath morning in 1777, these affecting, and remarkable words :

“ God of truth, Father of light ! I raise my eyes to thee with the first rays of morning, and worship thee. Thou searchest me, O God ! Thou seest the trembling of the praying heart, even when yet afar off ; O then thou also knowest the burning desire of my soul for truth ! Thou knowest, O God, that anxious doubt frequently enveloped my soul in night, my heart was often alarmed, and struggled for divine light from thee. Then there often fell a blessed ray from thee into my benighted soul ; I saw the horrible abyss on the edge of which I was already dizzy, and thanked the divine hand which kindly drew me back. Be thou still with me, my God and my Father, for the days have come in which fools arise and say in their hearts, there is no God ! Thou, my Creator, hast reserved me for troubled days, for days in which superstition raves on my right and infidelity scoffs on my left hand. Then I stand and frequently waver in the storm ; and, alas, the trembling reed would break, if thou didst not support me, mighty Sustainer of thy creatures, Father of those who seek thee.”

“ What am I without truth, without the guide through life’s labyrinth ? A traveler lost in the woods, enveloped in night, in which no friend, no guiding star shines upon his way. Scepticism, uncertainty, unbelief, ye begin with anguish and end in despair ! But Truth, thou leadest us safely through life, bearest a light before us in the dark valley of death, and bringest us to heaven, whence thou camest.”

“ O my God, keep my heart in peace, in that holy stillness in which the truth loves most to visit us. The sun does not reflect itself in the stormy ocean, but in the calm, clear surface its countenance is beautifully mirrored. Do thou, also, keep this heart calm, so that it may be able to know thee, O God, and him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ ; for this only is truth which strengthens the heart and elevates the soul. If I have truth, then I have Jesus ; if I have Jesus, then I have God ; if I have God, then I have all. Shall I permit myself to be robbed of this treasure, this sublime view, by the wisdom of the

world, which is foolishness in thy sight? No, let him that hates the truth be my enemy; but him who seeks it with a sincere heart I will embrace as a brother."

"The bell rings which summons me to the temple of God. I hasten to confirm my faith there, to become strong in the truth, and to prepare myself for death and eternity. Do thou guide me, O my Father! Open my heart to the truth, that I may become strong enough to proclaim it to those who are mine, then they will be happy. . . . "Now, my God, thou mayest take all things from me, every earthly happiness that fills my heart, every charming joy; let me but keep the truth, then I shall have happiness and joy enough." In this struggle between doubt and faith, in which it would seem that sure and lasting triumph was to dawn for the truth for which he prayed, faith at last gave way. We can hardly find in this prayer, which reminds us of Zinzendorf, but of more than Zinzendorf's strength, the promise of the later admirer of the heathen faith, of him who "deplored, in a mistaken interest for poetry, the downfall of the gods of Greece and entertained the absurd idea that the theater might take the place of the church." The poetry of Scripture made little impression upon his soul, while that of the classic nations was accepted with rapture. More and more he broke with his old faith and became more deeply attached to the Kantian philosophy. He came to regard Christianity as "an esthetic religion which is chiefly beneficial to the nature of women, and is, therefore, only met with in a tolerable form in women." Christianity he regarded as only a method of developing the race towards humanity.

While we deplore the absence of a thorough Christian spirit in his poems, we must nevertheless gratefully record the moral dignity and purity which abound in them, and rejoice over the high service he rendered in redeeming poetry from the depths of sensuality to which it had fallen and placing it upon a pure and healthful basis. "Whoever walks with Schiller, perhaps treads with him on giddy heights, may pass dangerous chasms and abysses, but he does not walk in darkness, not in filthy mire, but always with his eye directed towards the sun, though this

may hide itself behind the black storm-clouds of anxious doubts and powerful errors.”*

Goethe gave poetical expression to the philosophy of Schelling, as Schiller did to that of Kant, but without being dependent upon his master as was Schiller. Much was to be hoped for in the friendly relations once established with Jacobi, but these were soon severed, Goethe revolting from the most essential characteristic of Jacobi, the contemplative study of mind and heart. The poet had no taste for philosophy and repelled all teachings which strove to make men watch carefully either heart or brain.

Goethe was but a refined heathen without even the yearning of soul for salvation which his classical models, the great minds of Greece and Rome, expressed. His Faust and his confessions of a beautiful soul, in Wilhelm Meister, show him possessed of a theoretical knowledge of Christianity, but of the heart of faith and love he new and desired nothing. All struggle with sin was only necessary development. His calmness, which seemed to show him above all contests in politics and religion, when seen aright, is only cold indifference.

He affected admiration for the Roman Catholic faith and worship, but it was because of his overweening love for whatever had the air of antiquity about it; and he found that church the conservator of the triumphs of the fine arts in which his soul luxuriated. That church loved art and so Goethe sympathized with her; no more than this. He could see little beauty in the moral attitude of Luther and the reformers. They were, rather, iconoclasts, Vandals, despoiling the beauty of Rome. “Down to the period of the Reformation,” he says, on contemplating some paintings, “a spirit of indescribable sweetness, solace, and hope seems to live and breathe in all these paintings—everything in them seems to announce the kingdom of heaven. But since the Reformation, something painful, desolate, almost evil characterizes works of art; and instead of faith, skepticism is often transparent.”

“In the practical sphere Goethe showed himself practical,”

*Hagenbach.

and however he may have erred in respect to the work and teachings of a pastor, we find the highest wisdom embodied in his remarks upon pulpit eloquence, remarks of special value in the present age, when less thought is bestowed upon the matter and larger attention upon the mere elocution of the pulpit. Acting upon Schiller's idea that the theater was equal to the church in improving the world, many preachers actually introduced poetical phrases and theatrical declamation into the pulpit. Goethe in *Faust* makes Wagner say: "I have often heard say, a player might instruct a priest." *Faust* replies, "Yes, when the priest is a player, as may likely enough come to pass occasionally; if you do not feel it, you will not get it by hunting for it,—if it does not come from the soul, and subdue the hearts of all hearers with original delight, sit at it forever—glue together, cook up a hash from the feast of others, and blow the paltry flames out of your own little heap of ashes. You may gain the admiration of children and apes, if you have a taste for it; but you will never touch the hearts of others if it does not flow from your own."

Wagner rejoins: "But it is elocution that makes the orator's success; I feel well that I am still behind hand."

Faust replies: "Try what can be got by honest means. Be no tinkling fool! Reason and good sense express themselves with little art. And when you are seriously intent on saying something, is it necessary to hunt for words? Your speeches, I say, which are so highly polished, in which ye crisp the shreds of humanity, are unrefreshing as the mist-wind which whistles through the withered leaves of autumn."

Goethe freely declared of the Gospel, in one of his letters: "I find a thousand pages of ancient and modern times written by men favored of God, just as beautiful, and as useful, and indispensable to man." The five senses conveyed to him all the truth he longed for, and we expect to find him pitying the struggles and wrestlings of a Lavater. Christ became to him one of the great names of antiquity "with which every one might connect his own ideal of man, in which all might see the better part of their own nature." Thus he stands in the same position, as we shall presently see, with Fichte and Schelling.

ART. IV.—RECOGNITION IN THE FUTURE STATE.

BY REV. WILLIAM HURLIN, ANTRIM, N. H.

Shall we know each other in heaven? This is a question frequently asked with deepest interest. We think the Scriptures warrant an affirmative reply. They may not distinctly state the fact, but they constantly assume it.

Loose statements, merely speculative in their character, are often made on this subject, and made with as much assurance as if they were established facts. Some would have us believe that the inhabitants of heaven, will at once know each other and discern at once the characteristics of those they meet. While there will probably be new sources and means of knowledge opened up in the future, and while knowledge will probably be acquired much more rapidly, we think that it will still be gained gradually. What we mean by recognition in the future state, is a consciousness of personal identity, and the ability to recognize this identity in those with whom we associate.

We may meet with Abraham, David, and Paul, without knowing anything more about them at first than that they are inhabitants of heaven, but when they have been pointed out to us as the persons who bore those names on earth, and with whose characters we are familiar, we shall thenceforth be able to recognize them.

In attempting to prove that there is such a recognition, we remark that our future condition will sustain a relation to our conduct in this life, and to the influence we have exerted upon others. While we shall not be rewarded for our works, we shall be rewarded according to them, as taught by our Saviour in Matt. 25 : 31—46, and by Paul, 2 Cor. 5 : 10.

If we are thus rewarded or punished, there must be consciousness of personal identity. We ourselves, the identical persons that we are now, shall inhabit that future world, and shall know that our condition there has a connection with, and a relation to our conduct in a previous state of existence. In the case of the blessed, there will be a nearer relation to God but no absorption into the Deity. Neither will new beings be brought into exist-

ence. But we, who are now probationary creatures, will then, each one, "receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." But it is asked, "Will the same body, the identical particles of matter which are put into the grave, rise again?" We reply that the component parts of our bodies are continually changing, and that the particles of matter which make up the body are replaced by others every seven years. Notwithstanding these material changes, there is something by which we recognize persons as the same whom we knew twenty, or fifty years ago. Christ declares: "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." Whatever then is necessary to constitute identity will be raised by Jesus Christ, and will, with its spirit, inhabit the future world. And the spirit, thus embodied, will know itself to be the same being which lived on earth, and will know that it is rewarded or punished for its deeds on earth.

And if we are to be rewarded or punished according to the deeds done in the body, there must not only be consciousness of personal identity, but a memory of events which have transpired. We cannot conceive of a position so incongruous as that of passing through the solemnities of the judgment, and receiving according to the deeds done in the body, while retaining no remembrance of those deeds; of being approved or condemned by the Judge for acts performed or neglected, and yet having no recollection of acts performed, or of duties neglected.

But our future condition will also sustain a relation to the influence we have exerted upon others. Paul says, "For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?" (1 Thess., 2: 19.) "Whom, *i. e.*, Christ, we preach, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." (Col. 1: 28.) The apostle, then, believed that successful labors on earth would be the means of increasing future joy. The same result will occur in the case of every Christian minister, and of every other Christian laborer who has been useful in his stay upon earth. There must, therefore, be a remembrance of the persons with whom

we have been associated. If "they that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for ever and ever," (Dan. 12: 3,) there must be, in connection with this increased glory, a remembrance of those turned to righteousness through our efforts. There must not only be a retention in memory of common events, but there must be a remembrance of special occurrences and persons.

Each individual will, therefore, retain a consciousness of his personal identity, he will retain the memory of the steps by which he has been led to the position he then occupies; he will remember the persons who were made useful to him, and the instances in which efforts of his were made useful to others. Paul will know those whom he is privileged to "present perfect in Christ Jesus," and whom he declares to be his "glory and joy!" Every consecrated spirit will know those to whom his labors have been blessed, and those from whom he has received spiritual benefits.

Heaven is represented in the Bible as a place of social enjoyment. We shall not be hermits, occupying some solitary cell, spending eternity in dreamy contemplation or idle speculation. The social nature which God has given us here, and which affords us so much pleasure, will minister to our enjoyment and profit in the future state. There will be association with the Lord Jesus Christ. He said to his disciples, (John 14: 3,) "And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." He prayed: (John 17: 24,) "Father; I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory." "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." (1 Thess. 4: 16, 17.)

We shall recognize the Lord Jesus Christ, otherwise we could not be with him in any important sense, and behold his glory. He took upon him a human body, he died and was buried, but he rose again, and his changed body, for we believe it had become a spiritual body, was recognized by Mary Magdalene, Peter, the eleven, including skeptical Thomas, and by above five

hundred brethren at once. When he ascended into heaven in the presence of his apostles, the angels told them, "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts 1: 2.) Hence, those who are with him now, and those who will come with him, (1Thess. 4: 14,) at the time to which the angels referred, and those who shall be ever with him, and behold his glory, will recognize him. The apostle John says, (1 John 3: 2,) "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."

There will also be association with glorified saints. In writing "to the saints which are at Ephesus," Paul speaks of all the redeemed in heaven and in earth as one family; (Eph. 3: 15,) and in the Apocalypse we read, (Rev. 7: 9,) "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." But this suggests mutual acquaintance, and it is improbable that we shall be associated with persons through eternity, and join them in rendering praise and glory to God, without recognizing their individuality, and becoming acquainted with their antecedents.

Moses and Elijah, the one a disembodied spirit, and the other possessing a glorified body, were recognized by Peter, James and John, on the mount of transfiguration; and so we may expect to recognize them in a future state when they have been made known to us. And if we may know them, we may expect to know other saints, who shall be our companions in glory. If we have the privilege of sitting "down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven," we shall know them. And if we are of one family with all other saints, and if we join them in acts of worship, and in social intercourse through eternity, the parent and child, the husband and wife, the brother and sister, will recognize each other.

We regard heaven, then, as a place of social intercourse and worship; as a place where Jesus Christ will be recognized by all whom he has saved, and as a place of mutual recognition for the saints.

Heaven is represented as a place where there will be an increase of knowledge. Paul says, (1 Cor. 13 : 12,) "For now we see through a glass darkly: but then face to face; now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known." But if we are unable to recognize each other in heaven, it follows that there must be a loss of memory in respect to numerous events and circumstances, and so there would be decrease, instead of increase of knowledge. An increase of knowledge, implies a retention in memory of the facts and incidents of the past, and this with social intercourse, implies mutual recognition.

There will be in heaven perfection of happiness. Intelligent association with friends is a great source of happiness to us now. It is not the only source, but one of the chief fountains of pleasure and joy. The daily intercourse in the family, the frequent meeting of friends, tend to gratify the social natures which God has bestowed.

We recognize and greet our friends after long absence with pleasure. Have we any reason to suppose that this source of happiness will be closed to us in that world where there is perfection of bliss?

We are aware that new sources of happiness will be opened up to us, and that purely spiritual pleasures will be enjoyed with greater zest than now. But notwithstanding this, how could our happiness be called complete, if this source of it should be dried up. We now love the recital of the personal experience of others, and from it we gain wisdom and encouragement and it is reasonable to suppose that in the future state the same advantages will be open to us. Our reasoning thus far has been confined to the state of the righteous after the resurrection. But how will it be in the pre-resurrection state? Will disembodied spirits, without physical organs be recognizable, and possess the power of recognition? The information which the Bible gives on this subject is not so abundant as many persons desire and is much less than that which many persons think they possess. But the Bible does not leave us in entire darkness. "We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." (2 Cor. 5 : 8.) And again, "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with

Christ, which is far better : Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." (Phil. 1: 23, 24.) When Paul wrote these words, did he refer to an unconscious presence with Christ? We think not. We cannot believe that he would regard that "as far better" than the conscious enjoyment of the favor and love of Christ which he possessed on earth. He said also, "For me to live is Christ; and to die is gain." (Phil. 1: 21.) But where would be the gain, if dying, he was to lose that conscious presence of Christ which he already enjoyed, and of which he speaks with so much interest?

Again, the scene which the apostle John saw, depicted in the seventh chapter of Revelation, was evidently previous to the resurrection, and we regard the "great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues," which stood "before the throne and before the Lamb," as disembodied spirits. They were praising God and the Lamb for salvation. But could they thus stand before the Lamb, and praise him, without recognizing him? And could "the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne," feed them and "lead them into living fountains of waters" (Rev. 7: 17,) without their recognizing him? And then if they are thus associated with each other in acts of worship and of praise, and in the reception of favors from the Lamb, would they not also recognize each other?

Moses died and was buried. Hence, when he appeared with Elijah on the mount of transfiguration, he was a disembodied spirit; yet he was seen by the disciples who were with Jesus. This fact teaches us that disembodied spirits may be seen and known. And still further, in the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus, we learn that the rich man in hell was able to recognize both Lazarus and Abraham, and to speak to the latter; and Abraham replied to the rich man. From these considerations, we think there can be no doubt that disembodied spirits, previous to the resurrection, are conscious of their personal identity, and can be recognized, and can recognize each other, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

There are several objections sometimes urged against the views we have presented.

1. Some persons hold the opinion that they shall be so absorb-

ed in divine contemplation as to prevent recognition of their fellow saints. The good but eccentric Rowland Hill is reported to have said that if the spirit of his wife were in heaven for a thousand years, next to his own, he should be so absorbed in contemplating the glories of Christ that he should probably be ignorant of her presence. But we know of no good ground for such an opinion. Jesus Christ now occupies the first place in the affections of believers, and he will do so more fully in the future state, but we believe it is reasonable to suppose that then, as now, while he is the supreme object of worship, love, and affectionate regard, our natures will still find appropriate expression and gratification in communion and intercourse with the saints around us.

2. Another objection is that Christ taught that earthly relationships will cease in heaven. "For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage: but are as the angels of God in heaven." (Mat. 22 : 30.) The family is one of the institutions which God has appointed for us on earth. If it be unsuitable or unnecessary for the heavenly state; if we no longer sustain the earthly relationships of husband and wife, of parent and child, it does not follow that we shall forget those relationships, or fail to hold intercourse with or to recognize those who are now related to us.

3. It is further objected, that if there were future recognition, we might recognize our friends among the lost, or miss them from the company of the blessed, and that this would detract from the happiness of heaven. It is admitted that those we now love may be thus recognized or missed. We now mourn over the probability that some of these will be lost. But while in the future we shall remember the objects of our present solicitude, our peculiar relationships to them will be dissolved, and we shall be so satisfied of the justice and benevolence of God, and so clearly discern that those who are lost, are lost in consequence of their own folly and obstinate neglect, that we shall readily acquiesce in the will of God, and believe that, "He hath done all things well." While we may still pity those who are lost, our happiness will not then be hindered by the unhappiness of those who refused the grace of God, and would

not come unto Christ, that they might be saved. We believe that these are the principal objections urged against the views which we have advanced, and we do not perceive that they have any force against them.

There is one aspect of the subject that is not often adverted to, but which should occupy a place in this discussion. The lost will be conscious of their personal identity, and will be able to recognize those who are saved, and if so, those also who are lost. The rich man recognized Lazarus whom he had known, and Abraham of whom he had heard. Jesus Christ said to the unbelieving Jews: "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out." (Luke 13: 28.) The states of blessedness and of misery will run parallel to each other. If there is unending bliss in the one, then there is eternal woe in the other. And if recognition in heaven will tend to an increase of happiness, recognition in hell will tend to an increase of misery. Their partners in guilt will recognize each other. There the tempter and the tempted will meet, and will perhaps criminate, and re-criminate each other. Though the picture be painful we have the fullest reason to believe it true.

To the Christian, it is a pleasant thought that present Christian friendships will be continued, and that while death may suspend our intercourse it will not put an end to it. There is, however, a danger to be guarded against. We must not allow ourselves to think more of meeting our friends than of meeting God, and enjoying his favor and blessing. While God will be the chief attraction, we shall associate with and know the good of all ages. The galaxy of faithful ones enumerated in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews; the holy men and women of the Bible; the noble army of martyrs; the leaders in the church of Christ in all time; the friends with whom we have associated on earth, and with whom we have taken sweet counsel; the dear children "not lost but gone before;" they who were the means of leading us to the Saviour, or of strengthening our confidence in him; they whom we have led

to Jesus; all will be there, and we shall enjoy blessed communion with them forever.

The great joy of heaven will be that we shall be like Christ, and see him as he is, and it will be an enhancement of that joy to recognize the good and wise of earth, those who with us are washed in the blood of the Lamb.

ART. V.—BUNHILL FIELDS.

BY HEZEKIAH BUTTERWORTH, WARREN, R. I.

We dwell with special interest upon the story of Westminster Abbey, that grand pile of antiquity, where the illustrious dead prominent in English history, sleep. It is an hour of rare ministries to the mind and heart of the traveler as he stands in the vague light of its mullioned windows, wanders through its mysterious aisles, meditates in the Poet's Corner by the dust of Milton, Johnson, Dryden, Shakspeare and Gray, and by the tomb of kings who were borne to the venerable quietude of these massive walls from the splendors of state and from the executioner's block.

As one leaves this place of coronations and tombs, he feels creeping mysteriously over him a sense of the vanity of worldly glory, and the worthlessness of temporal diadems. The silent but eloquent voice of the old minster seems to be:—"Ashes to ashes, dust to dust."

There is another place in London where rest the honored dead. Few costly marbles are there, few specimens of artistic beauty, few attractions for aimless minds or æsthetic tastes. Yet the grassy graves are visited by pilgrims from many lands, and the quiet paths are well trodden by pious feet. It is Bunhill Fields, the resting peace of so many of the old English non-conformist ministers. Let us retire from the mazes of busy London and in quiet meditation recall scenes of the past, in this solitary repository of sacred dust.

We stand by the grave of Susannah Wesley, the mother of John and Charles Wesley, the Methodist reformers. A plain slab marks the spot where she lies, and tells us that she was the wife of Rev. Samuel Wesley. She died full of years and in the triumphs of Christian faith. John Wesley, on returning to London from one of his circuits in 1742, says that he found her "on the borders of eternity, but she had no doubt nor fear, nor any desire, but, as soon as God should call, to depart and to be with Christ." Shortly before her speech failed, she said to her family, "Children, as soon as I am released, sing a song of praise to God." Her last moments were tranquil, and, as soon as her spirit departed, her children joined in singing. John Wesley himself performed the funeral services, and he thus describes the affecting scene :

Almost an innumerable company of people being gathered together, about five in the afternoon I committed to the earth the body of my mother to sleep with her fathers. The portion of Scripture from which I afterward spoke, was, "I saw a great, white throne, and Him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven 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 the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." It was one of the most solemn assemblies I ever saw, or expect to see on this side eternity.

On the slab that marks her grave is the following stanza :

"In sure and certain hope to rise,
And claim her mansion in the skies,
A Christian here her flesh laid down,
The cross exchanging for a crown."

Not far from the grave of Susannah Wesley rests the dust of Bunyan. He, too, passed from delectable heights to the unseen world. He walked in Beulah, as he drew near the river of death, and heard

“——at morn and even
 At noon and midnight hour,
 The choral harmonies of heaven
 Seraphic music pourr.”

The last act of his life was one of benevolence. He was well known as a peace-maker. A young man and his father had an altercation, and the former was anxious to remove his father's displeasure, and entreated Bunyan to undertake his case. The duty involved a journey, but the tender heart of Bunyan could not resist an appeal like this. On his return homeward he encountered a violent storm, and took a sudden cold which soon resulted in an alarming illness, and after ten days of severe corporal suffering and great spiritual consolation, he triumphantly expired.

The works of Bunyan have led many a wanderer to the celestial gates, and his crown of rejoicing gathers new stars with advancing years. Who, among the multitudes that rest in yonder emblazoned Abbey, now exerts so potent an influence on mankind as the Dreamer of Bedford Jail? Not the proud arch-bishop who ceased to live when he laid aside his clerical robes. Not the ambitious, the learned, the great. Truly God chooses the weak things of the world to confound the mighty, and to humble the pride of man.

“*In uno Jesu omnia*” is the beautiful and affecting inscription on a memorial stone near the resting place of Bunyan. It is the grave of that sweet singer of Israel, Dr. Isaac Watts. The inscription is of his own selection, and aptly portrays his simple but triumphant faith. He was laid gently down to rest by pious hands, but he still lives like a flaming seraph of song, and each Sabbath reëcho through many lands the pious chords of his undying lyre. His end was perfect peace. “I thank God,” he said on one occasion, after he became a valetudinary, “that I can lie down with comfort at night, not being solicitous whether I awake in this world or in another.

The grave of Dr. Owen, the friend of Cromwell, and the

able expounder of Calvinistic theology, is a spot that the tourist would not wish to neglect. He was in his day famous not only as a writer and a theologian, but as an orator. He was called to preach before Parliament in the stormy days of the Commonwealth. The last work of his pen was a volume on the "Glory of Christ." When a friend visited him in his last hours to inform him that this work had been put to press, he said, "I am glad to hear it, but O the long wished for day has come at last, in which I shall see that glory in another manner than I have ever done, or was capable of doing, in this world." These, we think, were his last words.

Wandering about this broad enclosure, where rest the remains of tens of thousands* of beings who once swelled the hurrying tide of humanity, we meet the familiar names of Geo. Fox, the founder of the Society of Friends; of Thomas Goodwin an eminent Independent minister, who attended Cromwell in his last illness; of Geo. Burder, whose lyrics still hallow his memory; of Dr. Gill, famous for classical and rabbinical lore; of Nathaniel Mather, a zealous Methodist who once declared, that, whether sleeping or waking, he held uninterrupted communion with God, and of Richard Price, the friend of America during the Revolution. All of these lived with noble aims, and died in the hope of glory.

On leaving this consecrated place of the dead in the heart of bustling London, let us cross over to the old chapel of Wesley,† and view the venerable marbles in the yard. Here rest the father of Methodism and his poet brother, and by their side, Dr. Clarke the erudite commentator, Richard Watson the theologian, and the remains of many influential clergy of the Wesleyan connection.

Near at hand is the old chamber where John Wesley died. The death and burial of Wesley were attended by many interesting and edifying circumstances, and, although slightly wander-

*A great number of persons were interred in Bunhill Fields during the plague.

† The old Wesleyan Chapel is directly across the way from the entrance to Bunhill Fields.

ing from our subject, we will give them here. He spent the day before the morning of his release, in pious ejaculations and holy exercises. "Tuesday morning," says Richard Watson, in his affecting narrative of Wesley's last hours, "he sang two verses of a hymn: then lying still, as if to recover strength, he called for pen and ink; but when they were brought, he could not write. A person said 'Let me write for you, sir: tell me what you would say.' He replied, 'Nothing, but that God is with us.' In the forenoon he said, 'I will get up.' While they were preparing his clothes, he broke out in a manner which, considering his extreme weakness, astonished all present, in singing,

'I'll praise my Maker while I've breath,
And when my voice is lost in death,
Praise shall employ my nobler powers.
My days of praise shall ne'er be past,
While life, and thought, and being last,
Or immortality endures!'

Having got him into his chair, they observed him change for death. But he, regardless of his dying body, said, with a weak voice, 'Lord, thou givest strength to those that can speak, and to those who cannot. Speak, Lord, to all our hearts, and let them know that thou loosest tongues.' He then sung,

'To Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
Who sweetly all agree—'

Here his voice failed. After gasping for breath, he said, 'Now we have done all.' He was then laid in the bed, from which he rose no more. After resting a little he called to those who were with him to 'pray and praise.' They kneeled down, and the room seemed to be filled with the divine presence.

A little after, a person coming in, he strove to speak, but could not. Finding they could not understand him, he paused a little, and then, with all the remaining strength he had, cried out, '*The best of all is, God is with us;*' and, soon after, lifting up his dying arm in token of victory and raising his feeble voice with a holy triumph not to be expressed, he again repeated the heart-

reviving words, '*The best of all is, God is with us.*' His last words were 'I'll praise—I'll praise—'

So great were the multitudes that came to see his remains it became necessary to bury him in a private manner, early in the morning. A vast concourse assembled on the same day to listen to his funeral discourse. The burial service on this occasion was read by Rev. Mr. Richardson, an impressive reader. When he came to the passage, "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to take unto himself the soul of our *brother*," he substituted, with touching emphasis, the word *father*. The effect was so powerful as to move the vast assemblage to audible weeping.

Nelson aspired to be great that he might rest at last in Westminster Abbey. Who would not rather aspire to leave behind him influences and memories like those of the pious slumberers in Bunhill Fields?

ART. VI.—JESUS CHRIST.

BY REV. A. K. MOULTON, CONCORD, N. H.

In the last number of the Quarterly, this subject was left in the midst of the proof that Christ is called God. In the following passage, also, Christ is called God: "Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." (Acts 20: 28.)

Dr. Peabody says that the best critics read "Lord" instead of "God," in the above text. There is a difference of opinion as to who are the best critics. Scott says: "The most able critics have shown the present to be the genuine reading," and adds that the text is decided testimony to the Deity of Christ. Henry's opinion is the same. Bloomfield finds thirteen manuscripts which support the reading of "Lord" instead of "God." Of these manuscripts, five are very ancient, and the rest modern

and not valuable as authority. But the present reading he finds sustained by the most ancient manuscript and seventeen others, some of which are of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries. He also says that "Lord God" is found in some manuscripts and that "Lord and God" is found in one very ancient manuscript and in sixty-three others, though these latter are not of much antiquity. He regards it as impossible to harmonize these authorities, and he is in much doubt about the true reading. He decides, however, that the reading of "Lord," instead of "God," would still prove the divinity of Christ, as it would still show that the church was Christ's and was purchased with his own blood. With all these facts before us we cannot fail to agree that if we depart from the reading of our version, we have quite as good authority to read the text: "To feed the church of the Lord God . . . which he hath purchased with his own blood," as to substitute the word "Lord" for "God."

But as Dr. Peabody finally accepts the present reading, we accept it also. "But," he adds, "if I admit the common reading of this passage, I must interpret it in accordance with what I know St. Paul to have believed and taught." But this will not do. We are searching this very passage to learn what St. Paul believed and taught. It will not, therefore, answer our purpose to assume that he believed and taught a doctrine which conflicts with this. Such a fact must be proved very clearly, if admitted as testimony. Dr. Peabody further says: "Now St. Paul uniformly taught that 'God spared not his own Son but delivered him up for us all,' and I must therefore suppose *blood* in the passage under discussion to denote *Son*, as it does, in common with the word *flesh*, in all languages both ancient and modern. 'He hath purchased with his own blood,' that is, with his own Son." Does it follow that it is inconsistent with Paul's teachings to allow to this text its usual signification, because Paul taught that God gave his only begotten Son? Trinitarians admit and contend that not only Paul, but all the apostles, and their Master also, taught that God gave his Son to redeem the world. They also contend that Christ was divine, and do not believe that one of these opinions contradicts the other, either in their own creeds, or in Paul's writings.

But there is no Scriptural authority for making the "blood of God" mean the "Son of God." On the other hand, there is a gross inconsistency in such an interpretation of the language. The children of men are called the flesh and blood of their parents, because their parents are flesh and blood. Terms of similar import are used with reference to the human progeniture of Christ, but never with reference to his being the Son of God, for God is neither flesh nor blood, aside from the human constitution of the Son. If Dr. Peabody, therefore, would interpret this passage in accordance with what St. Paul believed and taught, in common with the other inspired teachers, he should not render the word "*blood*" as though it were *Son*, but should, rather, understand it to mean, as it obviously means, the "blood which was shed for the remission of sins;" and by which "precious blood," we are "redeemed."

Another portion of the inspired record which declares Christ to be God, is the opening of John's gospel. What an immense amount of talent and learning have been expended to neutralize this plain testimony to the proper divinity of our Lord. Dr. Peabody's effort to do this is as follows: "In order to understand this, we must look at the purpose for which St. John wrote his gospel. On this subject we are fortunate in having, among others, a competent and unimpeachable witness in Irenæus a friend and pupil of Polycarp, who was a personal friend of St. John. It is the uniform testimony of antiquity, that St. John wrote his gospel after the other three, and at Ephesus, the head quarters of the Gnostic heresy, which was the first wide departure from the simplicity of the Christian faith; and Irenæus says that the beloved disciple wrote his gospel for the express purpose of refuting the false and absurd notions which the Gnostics were beginning to spread in Asia Minor. It concerns us, then, to know what the Gnostics believed. They engrafted upon the Christian faith a hybrid philosophy, in which Platonism was blended with the Oriental mysticism. They maintained that the supreme God dwelt in the remote heavens, surrounded by chosen spirits, æons (as they called them,) and gave himself very little concern with what took place upon earth; that the world was created by an inferior and imperfect being, who

was also the author of the Jewish dispensation ; that Christ was sent by the supreme God to deliver men from the tyranny of this creator, and from the yoke of his law ; that there were also various created spirits or æons, sustaining different offices, independently, for the most part, of the supreme Deity, the names of some of which æons were *Life*, *Light*, and particularly, the *Logos* or *Word*, which represented the divine *Wisdom* or *Reason*, and that the æon, *Light*, became incarnate in John the Baptist. All these spiritual existences were represented as distinct from one another, and from the supreme God, so that the system was a sublimated form of polytheism. To fuse these disjointed fragments into one—to rebuke these babblings of philosophy falsely so called, about a divided scepter and a scattered divinity, this was the purpose of John's introduction. And not only so, but we find that the same pervading purpose gives shape and character, and, as it were, the key-note to his whole gospel. With this object in view it was incumbent on him, to show that *Life*, and *Light*, and *Logos* or *Word*, were not distinct from the supreme God; that the supreme God created the world, and gave the Jewish law ; that the same God sent John, the fore-runner; and that the same God sent Jesus Christ, not to destroy, but to complete the law—not to deliver men from its tyranny, but to complete the work which the law had begun. And this is shown in the first eighteen verses of the gospel—how comprehensively and beautifully you will see, if you keep in mind what I have told you of the Gnostic notion, while I read the passage to you, with such explanations as may be requisite."

The first question we have to raise at the opening of this section is this :—

Is John's testimony reliable? Was his mind so warped by an eagerness to condemn those wicked Gnostics, as to render his statements liable to a discount; or were his facts and doctrines written out from a heart and memory, sanctified, quickened and inspired, by the Holy Spirit, who, the Saviour promised, should bring all his teachings to the minds of his disciples?

Dr. Peabody, in common with the writer, will answer that John's testimony is to be received as divine truth. Then if this gospel is true and given by inspiration, or even if it be strictly

true without any claim to inspiration, by whatever motives it was prompted, even allowing every main fact which we have quoted above, the Word which was made flesh and dwelt among us was God: not a subordinate God, nor God in any modified sense, but God, who was in the beginning and who made the worlds.

But we are told that we must understand the Gnostic theory, and keep it fully in mind in order to understand this gospel properly, whatever be its claims to inspiration. On this point we confess to some doubts. We think the opinions of some of the fathers on this subject preferable to the opinion quoted above. A few of them are as follows: "No one can understand it, except by reclining on the bosom of Jesus; and so far indeed must he become another John, as John by sympathy becomes another Jesus." (Origen.) "In reading John, it is with me always as though I saw him before me, lying on the bosom of his Master, at the last supper; as though his angel were holding the light for me, and in certain passages would fall upon my neck and whisper something in my ear." (Claudius.) Others of the fathers record their convictions that John's gospel is pre-eminently a spiritual gospel.

But what was John's motive in writing this gospel? Was it written to condemn and refute the Gnostics, or for some other purpose? He says: "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing ye might have life through his name." (John 20: 31.)

Clement of Alexandria, of the third century, says, "John last of all, perceiving that what had reference to the body in the Gospel of our Saviour, was sufficiently detailed, and being encouraged by his particular friends and urged by the Spirit, he wrote a spiritual gospel."

Augustine, of the fourth century, one of the most celebrated of the Christian fathers, says: "He who is last in order, declares more fully the divine nature of Christ, by which he is equal to and one with the Father, and in which he made the world. As if this Evangelist, who reclined on the bosom of Christ at supper, had imbibed in a larger stream the mystery of his Divinity from his lips."

The testimony of Epiphanius, of the fourth century is: "Wherefore, also, the blessed John, coming and seeing men busying themselves with the lower coming of Christ, and the Ebionites deducing the bodily genealogy of Christ from Abraham said not . . . that the Word of God, whom the Father begat from all eternity, was from Mary alone; nor from Joseph the husband of the virgin; but, In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God."

Jerome, also of the fourth century, testifies: "The apostle John, whom Jesus especially loved, the son of Zebedee and the brother of the apostle James . . . wrote the gospel last of all; being called thereto by the bishops of Asia, against Cerinthus and other heretics, and especially the dogmas of the Ebionites, who assert that Christ did not exist before Mary."*

Others of the fathers who do not, so far as we are aware, speak distinctly as to the motive by which John was influenced, still testify to the specific doctrines which he recorded, which would strengthen the opinions we have quoted.

Athenagoras, of the second century, says: "But the Son of God is the Word of the Father, in idea and in work; for by him and through him were all things made, the Father and the Son being one: the Son being in the Father and the Father in the Son, by the union and power of the Spirit." (John 1: 3; 10: 30, 38.)†

Theophilus says: "As the Holy Scriptures and all who have the Spirit teach us, among whom John says, In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God; signifying that God alone was in the beginning, and the Word was in him. And then he says, the Word was God, and all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made."‡

This Theophilus was Bishop of Antioch in the second century, and is believed to be the first of the fathers who used the word *Trinity* in defining and defending the divinity of Christ.§

Ignatius, who was another Bishop of Antioch in the second century, and who was educated under St. John, and in early

*†† Dr. C. E. Stowe on the Bible.

§ Mosheim.

life acquainted intimately with St. Paul and St. Peter,* says in his epistle to the Ephesians: "Being united and chosen through his true passion, according to the will of the Father and Jesus Christ our God." Again he says: "There is one physician both fleshly and spiritual, made and not made, God incarnate . . . even Jesus Christ our Lord." "For our God Jesus Christ was, according to the dispensation of God, conceived in the womb of the virgin Mary." "The old kingdom abolished; God himself appearing in the form of a man, for the renewal of eternal life."† Athanasius uses similar language in speaking of John's first Epistle.

These testimonies from the contemporaries and immediate successors of John, add their entire weight to the plain teaching of that apostle, in language similar to that which he uses, and seem to have no special reference to Gnosticism unless Gnosticism and Unitarianism are identical.

We have quoted from Dr. Peabody that Irenæus says, that "the beloved disciple wrote his gospel for the express purpose of refuting the false and absurd notions which the Gnostics were beginning to spread in Asia Minor." We cannot find this passage to which he refers. But, on the other hand, we find the following from Watson: "We might wish, perhaps, to know at what time the sect of the Nicolaitans began; but we cannot define it accurately. If Irenæus is correct in saying that it preceded by considerable time the heresy of Cerinthus, and that the Cerinthian heresy was the principal cause of St. John writing his gospel, it follows that the Nicolaitans were in existence at least some years before the time of their being mentioned in the Revelation; and the persecution under Domitian, which was the cause of St. John being sent to Patmos, may have been the time which enabled the Nicolaitans to exhibit their principles. Irenæus indeed adds, that St. John directed his gospel against the Nicolaitans, as well as against Cerinthus; and the comparison which is made between their doctrine and that of Balaam, may perhaps authorize us to refer to this sect what is said in the

*Ibid. and Ency] of R. K.

†Dr. C. E. Stowe on the Bible.

second epistle of Peter. (2 Peter 2: 15.) The whole passage contains marked allusions to the Gnostic teachers. We find also from Henderson and Buck that, "John wished, by the publication of his gospel, to remove the error which had been sown in the minds of men by Cerinthus."* Is it not a little singular that these authors did not find the passage in Irenæus to which the Dr. refers?

After a careful search we find that the Gnostics, as a sect, did not exist till at least 50 years after John wrote his gospel. The word "Gnostics," however, is by many writers used as a generic term, and the above named sects are sometimes, by modern writers, classed as branches of the Gnostic family. We think Mosheim occasionally misleads his readers in this way, though he still says that the Gnostics, "concealed and unnoticed previously to this second century, came forth from their obscurity during the reign of Adrian."† Dr. Murdock, the translator of Mosheim, says: "He (Mosheim) also admits that the fathers knew nothing of the oriental philosophy, and he might have added that they testify that Gnosticism had no existence till the days of Adrian in the second century."‡ Now be it remembered that St. John is generally supposed to have written his gospel about the year 66; but Adrian did not ascend the throne till 117. The view which Dr. Murdock takes of this matter, is sustained by the American Encyclopædia. The Ency. of Relig. Knowl.* also says that the Gnostics "set a great value on the beginning of the gospel of St. John, where they fancied they saw a great deal of the æons, under the terms, the word, the life, the light." (p. 572.)

From all these quotations we think it quite plain that St. John's gospel was intended to be preëminently spiritual, was given to the world that they might learn the true faith of Christ, which had been perverted by the Nicolaitans, Ebionites and Cerinthians. We think it very clear, also, that when one assumes that St. John wrote his gospel for the express purpose of refuting the Gnostic theory of æons, and insists that all the early

*Ency. Relig. Knowl. pp. 346, 871; Rev. 2: 6, 14, 15.

†Mosh. B. 1, Cent. 2, p. 2, Chap. 5, Sec. 4.

‡Ibid. B. 1, Cent. 1, p. 2, Chap. 1, Sec. 4, and Note 7.

part of John's gospel must be interpreted as a tissue of fulminations against the theory, the assumption is unwarranted.

Perhaps Cerinthus held some vague notions about æons or emanations, as it appears that such notions, though all unsystematized, were in existence previous to the organized existence of the Gnostics. But we do not find any proof that the Nicolaitans and Ebionites embraced them.

Conybeare and Howson in "Life and Epistles of Paul," p. 396, after having set forth the fact that there were a few scattering religionists, both Jews and Gentiles, who had some crude notions of divine emanations, add these words: "The Gnostics of the second century adopted and systematized this theory of emanations, and it became one of the most peculiar and distinctive features of their heresy." This doctrine, therefore, could not have been so systematized before John wrote his gospel as to justify the representations made in reference to it by Dr. Peabody. We find, also, the following in the introduction to St. John's gospel in Bloomfield's Greek Testament: "He commences with a Proeme, (justly called the Golden Proeme,) the sum and substance of which, as is that of the whole Gospel, is, that the promised Messiah existed before the beginning of the world, with God, and was God; that he was Creator of the universe, but was made man and lived among men, and by words and works manifested himself to be the Son of God, the Saviour of mankind But to consider the remaining circumstances connected with this gospel, viz., as to the place where and the time when it was written, the unanimous voice of antiquity testifies that the place was Ephesus. And to this all the moderns readily assent. On the time, however, considerable difference of opinion exists. It has been the general sentiment, both of ancient and modern inquirers, that it was published about the close of the first century. While some of those who are best able to judge of such matters (as Lampe, Lardner, Owen, Tittman and Kuinoel,) suppose it to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, though they differ as to the exact date. The former opinion indeed is alleged to be most agreeable to ancient authority. Yet the testimonies adduced are almost entirely from writers (such as Epiphanius, Theodoret and Jerome)

of a period too far from the Apostolic age to have much weight. In fact the only authority alleged is Irenæus, in Eusb. Eccl. Hist., v. 8., (where however it is merely said that John wrote after the other Evangelists,) and another passage cited from him by Lardner VI. 187, from which it has been inferred, but very precariously, that this gospel was written long after the destruction of Jerusalem. Certainly the evidence is not such as to establish the point in question. And the opinion itself seems to have originated in the opinion prevalent, both in ancient and modern times, (but destroyed by Tittman in a masterly Dissertation *de Vestigiis Gnost. in Evang. Joan. frustra quesitis*) that this gospel was written for the purpose of confuting the heresies of the Gnostics and others as to the person of Christ. Indeed, if we inquire what evidence is alleged for that opinion, several expressions in the Proeme are pointed out, and a few others occurring up and down in the gospel. Yet these cannot without the aid of strong imagination, be thought to give any great evidence, and expositors best acquainted with the contents of this gospel (as Calvin, Lampe, Tittman, Kuinoel, Tholuck, and Bp. Bloomfield in his lectures,) are decidedly of opinion that the notion is unfounded and that (in the words of Bp. Bloomfield) 'the design of St. John in writing this gospel was of a general nature, viz., to convey to the Christian world just notions of the real nature, character and office of the great Teacher who came to instruct and to redeem mankind.' So long, however, as the opinion prevailed that the gospel was a polemic one and written to confute heresies, men were obliged to suppose as late a date as the life of the Evangelist would permit, for the publication of the gospel, since the heresies in question were not prevalent before the latter end of the first century."

But why should we not, with quite as much propriety, assume that John wrote against the Unitarian heresy? Certainly the beginning of the gospel of John, carries upon the face of it more proof that it was written to refute this than any other error of early or later times.

Indeed, if written against the Gnostics, it appears to have

been levelled against their denial of the proper divinity of Christ. Besides, the Ebionites seem to have been very nearly like modern Unitarians in doctrine. Dr. J. Pye Smith quotes from Dr. Semler, who, writing of the Ebionites, says, "Such it is apprehended, on grounds of reasonable probability, was the origin of Unitarianism; the child of Judaism misunderstood, and of Christianity imperfectly received." Dr. Priestly himself, a distinguished Unitarian divine, claims the Ebionites as Unitarians.*

Dr. Horsley says that this term Ebionite, was sometimes applied to those who denied the divinity of our Lord and his miraculous conception, and sometimes to those who admitted his miraculous conception, but denied his proper divinity.† Mosheim says of them, that: "Though they supposed Christ to be an ambassador of God, and endowed with divine power, yet they conceived him to be a man, born according to the ordinary course of nature, the son of Joseph and Mary." It does not, however, appear that they imbibed the heresies of the Gnostics any farther than this till centuries after John's gospel was written.‡ The Fathers whom we have quoted not only insist that John wrote his gospel against the Ebionites, but against this Unitarian feature of their doctrine; teaching that Christ is the only God.

If this gospel was written expressly to counteract the heresy concerning æons, it must have been a failure, since, according to the testimony quoted, the Gnostics appealed to it to prove that very doctrine. For whatever purpose it was written, it is a sweeping blow to Unitarianism, and one from which it can never recover.

But it will be a difficult matter to serve the Unitarian arguments with John's gospel, even admitting Dr. Peabody's own hypothesis. If John wrote his gospel for "the express purpose" of disproving that Christ and John Baptist were divine emanations, he does it in such a manner as to level all kindred doctrines equally with those of the Orientals and Platonists. The

*Ency. Relig. Knowl. p. 484.

†Ibid.

‡Mosheim.

sentence with which he opens his gospel demolishes no phase of early heresy more effectually than the Arianism and Socinianism of modern times. Would any modern Unitarian, of any school, open an argument against a heresy that taught that Christ Jesus was an emanation from God, by asserting that he was God?

Our author now opens the details of his exposition thus: "In the beginning was the Word, the Logos, the divine Reason or Wisdom,—not a created being (!) nor yet an emanation from the Supreme: but it always existed (!) The Word was with God and never had a separate existence; and the Word was God, was and is inseparable from his essence and attributes (!) The same Word, the same divine Wisdom, repeats the Evangelist, was in the beginning with God." Of course the reader will understand that we are responsible for the extra pointing, and italicizing of this quotation.

Would this running comment be regarded as Unitarianism if found elsewhere? In what more positive terms could the writer have asserted the proper divinity of Christ? Let Dr. Peabody adhere to these sentiments without farther qualification of them, and we could give him the hand of fellowship as a believer in Christ's divinity.

Should any be curious to know how these admissions are to be reconciled with what has been occasionally quoted from the same work, positively asserting, or laboring to prove, that Christ was a created and subordinate being, and strongly hinting that he had no preëxistence, we can only answer that we are as curious on this point as any of our readers, and that no means of satisfying that curiosity is supplied in the work itself. But perhaps the question may be asked: Why, then, were these admissions made? Another question may answer that. What less could the author do, or what less could any one do who undertakes to deal with John's doctrine of the proper divinity of Christ? Nothing less can be done, except to deny the authority of the whole paragraph. And we assert without hesitation, that these admissions are absolutely fatal to his whole theory against the proper divinity of the Saviour, unless he can in some way strike out the words of the 14th verse, which, however, he does not attempt to do. Those words are: "And the

Word 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."

Having said so much as we have quoted above, our author proceeds without apology or explanation, to another paragraph, thus: "And now St. John directs his attention to another of the Gnostic errors, viz., that of the world's having been created by an inferior divinity. All things, says St. John, were made by him, that is, by God (not by the Word—him refers to God, which is the nearest preceding noun to which it can refer). All things were made by the supreme God, and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him also was life; and the life was the light of men. life and light are not distinct essences, but God is the source of Life and where it flows from him light flows with it. And the light shines in darkness; but the darkness comprehended it not. God shed light upon men in the darkest times, though men have chosen darkness rather than light."

"There was a man sent from God whose name was John. He came for a witness to bear testimony of that light, concerning the divine light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that light, not himself an æon, a spiritual emanation,—he was a man like other men; but was sent to bear witness of the light. He from whom he came, God, was the true light, that enlightens every man that comes into the world. God had not removed himself from his creation, had not dwelt apart in the remote heavens. He was already, he was always in the world, and the world had been made by him: yet the world knew him not. He had come to his own, to the Jewish nation, his favored and covenant people, but his own received him not. That is, as a nation they had disowned and rejected him in heart and deed, though not in name. But to as many as received him, to the patriarchs and to the faithful among their posterity, to them who believed on his name, he gave power to become the sons of God, his own spiritual children, born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, (children, not in any earthly sense,) but of God. And, in these latter days, the Word, the divine Wisdom, became flesh and

dwelt among men, and we, I and my fellow apostles, beheld his glory—the glory of the only begotten, of the chosen Son, of the Father, full of mercy and of truth.”

In this same manner Dr. Peabody continues to quote and comment, down to the eighteenth verse inclusive, apparently presuming all the while, that his reconstruction of the paragraph is to pass unquestioned. Yet if his reading of the passage is correct, it still proves that Christ is God so conclusively that even himself dares not attack that proof. That is, by this reconstruction of the chapter the fact is not excluded nor invalidated, that the Word was God, and was made flesh, and dwelt among us, in the person of Jesus Christ. If the Word was God, and was made flesh, and dwelt among us in the person of Jesus Christ—which Dr. Peabody clearly admits in the foregoing quotation, and can do no less than admit—then God was made flesh, and dwelt among us in the person of Jesus Christ. And this fact Dr. Peabody cannot have been so obtuse as to overlook, nor so heedless as not to know that he has admitted, by his own construction of the text. And if this is true, then Christ cannot be what he has repeatedly called him, “a created and subordinate being.” This, again, is not merely our conclusion but his own, in proof of which we quote from p. 6: “Christ cannot be both a self-existent and a created being . . . both equal and inferior to the Father.”

Having finished this comment on the first eighteen verses, he only adds, by way of enforcing what he has taught: “Thus we see that the introduction of John’s gospel, so far from authorizing the breaking up of the divine nature into a plurality of persons is a noble assertion and vindication of the divine unity, well worthy the pen of inspiration,—a passage in which, as with a prophet’s wand, he waves back into their native nothingness the chimeras of an arrogant and impious philosophy.” So he does indeed, at least that part of the philosophy which denies the divinity of Christ. As for the plurality of persons in the Godhead, however, he very clearly hints the doctrine of plurality in unity when he says that the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

If Dr. Peabody’s construction of the opening chapter be cor-

rect, then God and not Christ is proclaimed the Light of the world, and the Life of men. But Christ says: "I am the Light of the world, and he that believeth in me shall not walk in darkness." And Paul says: "Ye are dead and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear," &c. The Prophet and Evangelist both testify that the coming of Christ was the springing up of light to those in darkness—a light to enlighten the Gentiles, the glory of Israel. John, also, in his first epistle, calls Christ the word of Life, and says: "the Life was manifested and we have seen it and bear witness." These are only samples of a numerous class of passages. 2. Dr. Peabody claims that John came to proclaim God and not Christ. This is contrary to a host of passages which we have considered elsewhere which show that the mission of John was to prepare the way before Christ and to testify of him. 3. God and not Christ is said to have made the worlds. But we have also shown by several passages which are absolutely incontrovertible that Christ made the worlds. 4. That God and not Christ was in the world and the world knew him not. But John who bare record to Christ said: "There standeth one among you whom ye know not, "and I knew him not," referring to Christ. 5. That God and not Christ came to the Jews and they received him not. But the Scriptures show that Christ came first "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and that he also first sent his disciples to them, and that they went not at first among the Gentiles nor Samaritans. They teach also that the breaking off of the Jews was occasioned by their rejection of Christ. 6. That God and not Christ imparted to those that received him power to become the sons of God by regeneration. But the Scriptures teach that men are born again by "the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." That "Christ was exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and the remission of sins," and that "his blood cleanseth from all sin." It was of the gospel dispensation that it was said by the prophets that the people should become the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty.

Some of those facts and works enumerated above, might, with nearly equal propriety, be referred to the Father but not all of

them, whereas all may with the utmost propriety be ascribed to the Son. But we seriously object further to Dr. Peabody's construction of this section, because it is unnatural and almost wholly unprecedented to refer the personal pronoun "him," in the third verse, to "God," instead of to the "Word." "Word" is the theme of discourse, as shown in the first, second and fourteenth verses; and nowhere is it hinted in the discourse, between these two points, that that theme is changed. Yet, by the interpretation of Dr. Peabody, that theme is changed in the third verse and changed back again in the fourteenth. This is too violent a supposition to be admitted. We object again because such a construction of the section narrows it down to a limit unworthy of the pen of inspiration. It makes it a kind of special pleading against a particular class of men;—first against one phase of their doctrine and then against another;—in a manner so indistinct and obscure that we are sure to be misled by the petty argument, unless we happen to be well informed in relation to some weak and frivolous notions about æons, which notions died almost as soon as they were born.

To Dr. Peabody's skill as a philologist, we readily subscribe. But a change in the interpretation of the first chapter of John, which is to reverse the united testimony of eighteen centuries, should rest on a better foundation than this.

We have passed by one strong point which our author presents early in his work. He asks: If this doctrine of Christ's divinity is a truth, when did the disciples first make the discovery, and what are the indications of the discovery of such a stupendous mystery? The emotions of the disciples, he thinks, must have been overwhelming when they first learned that he, with whom they had been associated, and who had exercised such forbearance and kindness towards them, was the Almighty Creator. "This was," as he thinks, "the most amazing and momentous fact of all—indeed the most important fact in the world's whole history."

We answer that we do not know when this truth, in all its fullness burst for the first time upon the understandings of the disciples. Perhaps the conviction crept upon them gradually, like many other truths which were progressively revealed.

Possibly, like the nature of his kingdom, it was but partially comprehended till that hour when all were so astonished at the descent of the Holy Ghost, after his ascension; though on this hypothesis it would be difficult to account for the homage they paid him, during the whole term of their discipleship. Possibly they, in common with other Jews, understood that the true Messiah was to be divine, and therefore regarded him as divine as soon as they admitted his Messiahship.

Perhaps this fact was not fully apprehended by all the apostles at the same time. Perhaps Thomas first learned it when he put his fingers into the prints of the nails, and thrust his hand into the Saviour's side, after his resurrection. If so, how overwhelming was the effect! Perhaps Peter, James and John first perceived this truth on the mount of transfiguration, when they beheld his glory and became completely overwhelmed and bewildered by the sight. Possibly John only learned it a short time previous to the writing of his gospel, and gave vent to his rapture in the first chapter. At least there are plenty of instances in which the disciples were amazed and enraptured with the character of their Lord, which induced them to "rejoice with a joy unspeakable and full of glory," and to exclaim, as they preached "the unsearchable riches of Christ," and tried to fathom "the breadth and length and depth and height, and to know the love of Christ: "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" We fully agree with Dr. Peabody that "it is a most amazing and momentous fact—indeed the most interesting and important fact in the world's history." The Word made flesh and dwelling among men! He by whom all things were made, in the world, and unknown by the world! The First, the Last, the Almighty, becoming the seed of Abraham! The son of David on an eternal throne! A child born and a son given who is the Father of eternity! God become our brother and sympathizing friend! A human hand stretched out from amid the mysteries that envelop the eternal throne, which manly faith may grasp and live! God, in human form, descending to the arena of mortal strife, battling with temptations, overcoming the world, suffering death,

treading the interior stronghold of the king of terrors, and leading him forth captive, a foe subdued for man! To us it seems that the expurgation of this stupendous fact from the Christian faith, robs earth of its greatest wonder, and the salvation of the world of its greatest glory.

THE TWO NATURES OF CHRIST.

The work which we are examining, like too many of its kind, finds it quite convenient to attack the positions of others without defining its own. We are sufficiently notified by the arguments of the author, that he does not believe in the divinity of Christ, nor, of course, in his two natures, as Trinitarians do. But exactly what he does believe is not so clear. Sometimes he reasons like one who believes in the preëxistence of Christ and in his super-human and the super-angelic nature. He ascribes to him, when apparently forced thereto by Scripture texts, position, power and attributes, which seem to place him higher in the scale of being than any other finite intelligence. He deems it unnecessary, in one portion of his argument, "to consider those texts which imply, or seem to imply, the Saviour's pre-existence; for the question whether he existed before his birth in Bethlehem is entirely independent of that of his supreme divinity." Again, he says: "Of these texts, I set aside, as having no bearing on the doctrine in question, those which simply teach our Saviour's continued presence with his church, and his power over the spiritual creation of God; for these are truths of which I entertain not the slightest doubt. They imply no more than a headship over the church, conferred by the Father, and are but the fulfillment of the words of the Saviour, 'all power is given me in heaven and in earth'" (p. 19.)

Again, in speaking of the worship and praise offered to the Saviour, he seems only desirous to show that such prayer and praise were only offered him as a Mediator and Redeemer; and appears fully satisfied if he can show that Christ is not, in these adulations, pronounced, beyond all controversy, to be the living God; freely quoting such praise and adoration as it could not be consistent to offer to any human being nor any angel. In speaking of his having made the worlds, he aims to show that he was

building them for the Father. But anon the scene changes, and we receive a volley from a masked battery on the other side. Texts are thrown upon us which clearly establish the humanity of Christ, beyond any possibility of refutation, and which make no show of argument in any other direction. By such texts he proves nothing more nor less than the proper humanity of Christ. By the use he makes of other texts we should be perfectly satisfied that he is ready to admit that Christ sustains a rank in the order of being far above all other beings and powers, except that of the eternal God. Now we sincerely believe that the greatest apparent strength of this work, consists in this kind of strategy. Whether it is a fair and honorable method of dealing with the subject, evincing a confidence in one's own cause is left for the reader to decide.

Whatever may be said of the Unitarian Association in regard to settled opinions, no one need be told that Dr. Peabody knows what he believes, and can tell it when and where he pleases. Now though his opinions may have been published to all the world, in a hundred thousand volumes, that cannot change the facts in this case. He has reasoned sometimes from one standpoint and sometimes from another.

If those who attack Trinitarianism have full faith in the super-human nature of Christ, what right have they to wield against their opponents those arguments which prove Christ to have been a man? Do not such arguments, whether from Scripture, or reason, or history, demolish their own reserved doctrines? Are not such logicians really at the wrong end of their guns? Arians deny the proper humanity of Christ; Trinitarians affirm it. If Dr. Peabody, then, or any other Unitarian, is an Arian, and parades those texts which prove the humanity of Christ, (as Unitarians invariably do,) to disprove his divinity, on whose side does he argue? The more passages of this kind they quote and the stronger arguments they make, the better for us and the worse for them. "Go your way and make it as sure as you can."

This is not all. If Dr. Peabody believes the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence, as in some of these admissions he really appears to, and which we think we have proved in a former

article, how does he escape the conclusion that Christ possessed two natures? For if Christ existed previous to his birth in Bethlehem, of course he had a nature wholly distinct from humanity,* whether supremely divine or not. Then if he was born of the virgin Mary, and took on a physical system, with attributes and appetites, resembling the human body and human appetites, was not this another nature? And were not these two natures, whatever they might be, for the time being, associated in the person of Jesus of Nazareth? And does not such a union, be the terms of it whatever they may, involve as great a mystery as that of God manifest in the flesh, or a union of Deity and humanity?

But when the Unitarianism of our time defines itself, it is generally on the side of Christ's proper humanity, and against his pre-existence, or his super-human nature. In a publication of the American Unitarian Association, by Rev. Wm. C. Tenny, entitled "Unitarianism and 'Orthodoxy,'" the writer says "Disclaiming thus the right to speak for others, I nevertheless avow my confident conviction, that the opinions given below as my own express, substantially the belief prevailing among Unitarian Christians every where." Of Christ he says, "I believe that while all men are sons of God, Jesus Christ was pre-eminently the 'Son of God;' the chosen and best beloved Son, in moral likeness to, and spiritual sympathy with the one God, the Universal Father; . . . He is, in my view, the Mediator, not as standing between God and man and acting an official part, but as allowing all of God morally to manifest himself through him; the glory of the infinite and paternal God beaming in the softened light of humanity. As to his 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 'Matthew' and 'Luke.'"

Shocking as it seems at first to read such emanations from a

*For we do not understand him to believe in transmigration.

professedly Christian pen, there is but little ground for doubt that what the writer says in the outset, is correct, that this "is substantially the belief prevailing among Unitarian Christians everywhere." Yet it is refreshing to be informed that "as to the rank of Christ in the realm of being, all do not agree with the writer of this paragraph," provided their doctrines are more Scriptural than his.

According to this doctrine, every word in the Scriptures, whether prophecy or narrative, which ascribes to the Saviour an existence prior to his human birth, or intimates that he, in and of himself, possessed any super-human power, quality, attribute, office, position, or "rank, in the scale of being, above that of a mere man," becomes a "legend which has attached itself to the fragmentary biographies of" the Evangelists, or is the result of some blunder in doctrine on the part of the epistolary authors, and is therefore to be rejected as spurious; or is to be subjected to some gloss or interpretation which shall wholly change its apparent meaning.

With such latitude in its interpretation, no wonder the same author should say of the Bible: "It shuts us not up to the belief in a completed and oracular infallibility, an endowment it neither possesses nor claims. With very unequal merits in its different portions, it is the 'autobiography of human nature from its infancy to its perfection.'"

On the subject of Christ's two natures, our author, in another place, uses the following language:

"It is said that Christ spoke and did thus in his human nature. To this I reply, in the first place, that the doctrine of the two natures of Christ, is not claimed, even by its advocates, as a doctrine of revelation. They quote no declaration, or passage of Scripture, in which they profess to find this doctrine expressed or implied. It is confessedly an hypothesis which they have assumed as the only mode in which they can reconcile Christ's supreme divinity with his own reiterated assertions to the contrary." Such is the opening of the argument against the doctrine of the two natures of Christ. We will yet see whether he is correct or not. After this he proceeds with a few pages of rather pointed ridicule, and argument, in the

course of which he says : " I press this point the more urgently because to my eye the doctrine of our Saviour's supreme divinity renders all his recorded discourses a tissue of prevarication, fitted only to bewilder and mislead his hearers." pp. 10—12, &c. Farther on, he says that this hypothesis of two natures does not obviate the difficulty, and it virtually charges the Saviour with equivocation, as it makes him say some things with reference to his human nature without explanation, which seem literally to apply to his entire being. But we answer, that the doctrine of one nature only in, Christ, furnishes no solution to the enigma of his character, but greatly increases the difficulty, for in that case these apparent contradictions exist without any possible explanation. For example, the record would still make him claim to be one with the Father and yet protest that there was a day and an hour which the Father knew and he did not know, &c. And the record would also make him declare that he came down from heaven, and that he was the son of Mary.

Dr. Peabody evidently attaches great importance to this doctrine of the two natures of Christ. He feels, as all his readers must feel, that every proof passage which he brings against the divinity of Christ, will be greatly weakened, and many of them rendered wholly unavailing, if this doctrine of two natures cannot in some way be set aside. Having, however, hardly a shadow of Scriptural proof against it, he is compelled to attack it with other weapons, and makes a furious assault upon it, in a manner indicated by what we have quoted. We need not, therefore, particularly review his proof-texts in this department, the most of which have been already considered under other heads. Nearly all of them are such as show that the Saviour possessed a human nature, which every Trinitarian fully believes.

But Dr. Peabody denies that the Scriptures teach that Christ had two natures. He denies that any passage can be quoted which proves it, either expressly or by implication. For the time being we will admit there is no such passage, and what follows? Dr. Peabody has asserted often and labored hard to prove that Christ was a " created and subordinate being." If he has proved this, he has proved that he possessed a subordinate or finite nature. We fully believe he has established this latter

hypothesis, at least. That is, we fully agree that the passages of Scripture, and the arguments of the learned author have proved beyond controversy, that Christ had a subordinate nature.

On the other hand, we have made some effort to show that Christ had a divine nature. If we have been successful, then Dr. Peabody and the writer have proved that Christ had two natures, in defiance of all satire and denial. And yet, in none of the passages which either of us have quoted, is it asserted that a human nature and a divine nature are two natures, or that one and one make two.

The word "Unitarian" is not in the Bible; and yet the absence of the word does not disprove the doctrine which the word indicates. We do not remember to have seen it distinctly stated in the New Testament that Christ had one nature, yet we all believe he had, and this fact can be very clearly demonstrated, because he exhibited the characteristics and attributes of a nature. If he exhibited unmistakably the phenomena and attributes of two natures, human and divine, would not that, by the same method of reasoning, prove that he had two natures though the Bible may not expressly state it?

But does not Dr. Peabody himself believe that the Saviour possessed two distinct natures? If only one, which was that human, or super-human? From the whole drift of the argument, we are fully satisfied he would not like to answer these questions. As for the mystery of the two natures in Christ, so perpetually urged against it, this is no real objection. There are in nature not a few mysteries, equally incomprehensible. For example, the union of animal life and instincts with the gross material of the corporeal system; and then the union of intelligence with these, in the human constitution. Until one can at least solve these mysteries, he has no right to reject the doctrine of the divine and human in Christ, because it is mysterious. But we find this doctrine of Christ's two natures in the Christian church, at a very early period, and have no means of accounting for its origin, unless it was taught by Christ and the apostles.

Ignatius says of Christ that he was "God incarnate, true life in death, both of Mary and of God, . . . according to the

dispensation of God, conceived in the womb of Mary, of the seed of David, by the Holy Ghost. . . . God himself appearing in the form of man, for the renewal of eternal life, . . . who was of the race of David according to the flesh; the son of man and Son of God.”

We will not now stay to trace this doctrine of the two natures of Christ minutely through the early times. We think it evident, however, from the testimony of the most ancient Christian writers that the general opinion of the church in the first and second centuries, and indeed ever since that time, has been that there were three persons in one God. But even those who denied this doctrine and combatted it, held to two natures in Christ. Mosheim says, while writing of the second century, “As the doctrines held by the Christians respecting the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and respecting the two-fold nature of the Saviour, were least of all at agreement with the precepts of this [Grecian] philosophy, they first endeavored so to explain these doctrines that they could be comprehended by reason. This was attempted by one Praxeas, a very distinguished man, and a confessor at Rome. Discarding all real distinctions between the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, he taught that the whole Father of all things joined himself to the human nature of Christ.” Theodotus was another distinguished person of this same century, who propagated similar doctrines. Artemon was another of a similar creed. In the third century, one Neötus held and propagated similar sentiments. Some of the errorists of those times believed that God, in his own proper person, became united with the human body of Jesus, others that it was a divine essence or emanation from God that constituted the divine part of the Saviour’s being. These were not efforts, as it seems, to introduce a new doctrine, but so to explain and rationalize the Christian doctrine of two natures in Christ, as to render it comprehensible. In this, however, all seemed to concur, viz., that Christ did possess two natures, one human and one divine. We have already mentioned Theophilus of the second century, who was the first to introduce the word Trinity, [*Glc. Trias*] into the Christian church, as expressive of their doctrines. He was a bishop

of Antioch. Tertullian, a Latin father of the second century, uses the words *Trinitas*, and *Trinitatis Unitas*. We thus find that the doctrine of the Trinity and of the two natures in our Saviour, are kindred doctrines, and doctrines of the early church.

But if, in addition to the proof of the divine nature of Christ contained in the foregoing pages, it can now be shown that he really possessed a human nature, will not this be sufficient proof that he had two natures? 1. He is the fellow and brother of men. "God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." (Heb. 1: 9; Psa. 45: 7.)

"Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow." (Zech. 13: 7.) "If Christ was the supreme God," says Dr. Peabody, "who were his fellows?"

We reply, if Christ was a subordinate being and "the only begotten of the Father" and not a man, who were his fellows? Or, if Christ possessed but one nature and that super-human, who were his fellows? In short, we think it clear that the Shepherd must have been a man, and his fellows men also.

"The first born among many brethren." "For which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying I will declare thy name unto my brethren." "In all things it behooved him to be like unto his brethren." (Rom. 8: 29; Heb. 2: 11; Psa. 22: 22.) "Men are not God's brethren," says Dr. Peabody. We reply that men are not brethren of a being who possesses only a super-angelic nature. Christ said those who did the will of his Father were his brethren. This no doubt was spoken because he, though a man, could not acknowledge those who did not wear the semblance of his divine nature.

After his resurrection he said; "Go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me." (Matt. 28: 10.) These passages fairly bring out the nature of Christ's relationship to men as human beings and servants of God, and children of God, by regeneration.

2. He had a body resembling that of other men, and composed of flesh and blood and bones. He had a mind which appears to have developed with age and increased in power; for

“He grew and waxed strong in spirit filled with wisdom”—
 “increased in wisdom [*Gk. sophia*] and stature [*Gk. heelikia*],
 and in favor with God and man.” (Luke 2 : 40, 52.)

He had a soul [*Gk. psukee*], which was troubled and sorrowful. (John 12 : 27 ; Mark 14 : 34.) He had a system, “in fashion as a man,” “in the likeness of men,” which exhibited all the phenomena of humanity. He was begotten, conceived, born an infant, and grew to boyhood and manhood ; hungered and thirsted, and labored, and tired ; ate, drank, rested, slept and awoke ; was sorrowful, and rejoiced, sighed, groaned and wept, loved, approbated, blamed, was angry, amazed, endured temptations and resisted the devil, agonized, bled and died.

3. He is called a man some thirty times, and the Son of man nearly ninety times, in the New Testament ; sometimes by unbelievers, sometimes by his disciples and apostles, and sometimes by himself ; and all this for one reason only, so far as appears to the contrary, viz., that he was a man.

Besides this he is called the last Adam and the new man ; terms which could not be applied to him with propriety if he were not a man. (1 Cor. 15 : 45 ; Col. 3 : 9, 10 ; Eph. 4 : 23, 24.) In several of these instances in which he is called a man, it is so stated that it would be false assertion, or false reasoning, if he were not properly a man. For example, in 1 Tim. 2 : 5, 6. “For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.” Now if Christ was a man then the doctrine, which is the essential feature of this text, is true. If he was not a man then the apostle teaches false doctrine. Again, in 1 Cor. 15 : 21, 22, “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,” there is a parallel instituted between the first Adam and the second. It is as clearly stated that one of them was a man as the other. Here is a parallel drawn between the procuring cause of death and that of the resurrection, both of which are said to have been man. If, therefore, the first was a man and the second was not, the doctrine of the apostle cannot be true. After having continued this argument down to the thirty-seventh verse, he says

again, "The first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is the Lord from heaven." What has been said of the last two or three texts may also be said of several passages in Hebrews, where the doctrine is stated that "this man" had more glory than Moses, an unchangeable priesthood, and must have somewhat to offer in sacrifice as a priest.

4. He was the seed of Abraham: "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." (Gen. 22: 18.) "And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise; (Gal. 3: 29.) "He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ;" v. 16. He was the son of David.

He is so called, in Matt. 9: 27; 21: 9; 22: 42. In the first of these passages, two blind men followed him and claimed his mercy on the ground that he was that Son of David who was to come. In the second, the multitude offered him praises on the same ground. In the third, the Saviour confounded the Jews out of their own confessions that Christ was the Son of David. Now, if Jesus was not really the son of David, he was not the true Messiah of prophecy. If he was the Son of David then he possessed human nature. "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David; he will not turn from it; Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne." (Psa. 132: 11.) This and the following are parallel passages. "And when thy days be fulfilled and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels and I will establish his kingdom." (2 Sam. 7: 12.) To the above promise Paul undoubtedly refers in the following, "I have found David, the son of Jesse, a man after my own heart, who will fulfil all my will. Of this man's seed hath God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus." (Acts 13: 22, 23.) "Remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead, according to my gospel." (2 Tim. 2: 8.) If the words of sacred writ mean anything, these quotations prove that a literal descendant of David was prophesied of as a future king of God's people, and that this prophecy was fulfilled in Christ. "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots, and

the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. . . . With righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth ; and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. . . . And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse which shall stand for an ensign of the people. To it shall the Gentiles seek ; and his rest shall be glorious." (Isa. 11 : 1—10; See also John 7 : 42; Acts 13 : 22, 23.)

We have only quoted a portion of this sublime prophecy of the reign of Christ, but, enough to show that Christ is the theme and that he is pronounced essentially the seed of David. If these passages do not prove that Christ was a literal descendant of David, twice that number could not.

5. We will make a few quotations that include both natures. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch ; and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute justice and judgment in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, and this is his name wherby he shall be called, the Lord our righteousness. [Heb. *Jehovah* — *tsidkenu* Jer. 23 : 5.] What is here but a union of the seed of David and Jehovah? "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given ; and the government shall be upon his shoulder ; and his name shall be called the Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." (Isa. 9 : 6.) We have quoted this heretofore, as a proof-text showing that Christ is called God. But it does more than that ; it shows that the subject of this prophecy was both a child and son, and also the Eternal Father. "And behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a son, and shall call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest. And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." If this child should be born of Mary and should be the Son of God, and David should be his father, he should have two natures. But this promise was a profound mystery to Mary, who exclaimed, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the

angel answered and said unto her, the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." (Luke 1: 31—35.) If this statement can be in any sense true, then, according to the natural course of these miracles, Christ possessed two natures, human and divine.

But mark,—ye who declare that Jesus of Nazareth was the natural son of Joseph and Mary,—if this record is not true then has this New Testament gospel palmed off upon mankind the most stupendous fraud the world has ever seen or dreamed of. If your doctrine is true, then are the New Testament doctrines no more reliable than those of the Hindu Shasters, and these New Testament facts are more untrustworthy than the fables of the Greek and Roman mythology. But if real facts are recorded in the New Testament, what other crime is darker than that unbelief which says, virtually, 'This story of the Holy Ghost is a sheer fabrication, to conceal an illicit transaction, to palm off upon the world an illegitimate birth, as the Son of God?'

"But while he thought on these things, behold the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us. Then Joseph being raised from sleep, did as the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife; and knew her not till she had brought forth her first born son; and he called his name Jesus." (Matt. 1: 20—25.)

A narrative which melts the believer's heart in thankfulness, and his eyes to tears of gratitude and joy! A narrative that sets before the eye of faith the Son of man and the Son of God, in all his beauty, glory, faithfulness and power! If, until this hour, we had doubted the two natures of Christ, we could

doubt no more. One calm, steady look at these heaven born doctrines, as recorded here should chase all doubts away. "Jesus asked them saying, What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They say unto him, the son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son? And no man was able to answer him a word." (Matt. 22: 42—46.) And who that does not admit this text as proclaiming the two natures of Christ, can answer him a word?

"Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he, seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ." (Acts 2: 30, 31.) This text declares that Christ was the fruit of David's loins; and yet the clause, "according to the flesh," clearly implies that Christ had another nature, which was not of flesh and blood.

"Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." (Rom. 1: 3, 4.) The same doctrine taught in the previous text is repeated in this, and the two natures are more clearly delineated. According to the flesh he was the son of David, but by his resurrection from the dead he was proved to be the Son of God. "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven." (1 Cor. 15: 47.) By using the term "man" in this sentence, the apostle pronounces upon the human nature of Christ. If the whole argument preceding the text be read in connection with it, the reader cannot fail to see that the argument is weak and nearly or quite a failure, unless Christ was a man; and yet, in the same sentence, he is declared to be the Lord from heaven. Those who can tell how many natures there are in a man and in the Lord from heaven, may be able to tell how many there were in him whom the apostle claims to have been both.

"God was manifest in the flesh." "The Word was made

flesh." (1 Tim. 3: 16; John 1: 14.) God being manifested in the flesh, and the Word, which was God, being made flesh and dwelling among us, and exhibiting his glory, are identical statements, both of which teach to those who do not reject the divine testimony, that Christ possessed a divine nature, and assumed a human nature, that he might reveal to the eye of man all the divine glory that men could endure to behold.

"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. Words can hardly render this passage and its connections more distinct in the declaration, that Christ possessed a divine nature, and humbled himself to take a human nature. And then as though he would remove all place for doubt, the apostle adds "Being found in fashion as a man he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." (Phil. 2: 6—8; see also Heb. 3: 9.) He was not humbled, then, by his foes, and martyred for the truth's sake, because he was a man and powerless, but he was in fashion as a man; and having so far humbled himself he descended still lower, and became obedient unto the death of the cross.

"I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David and the bright and morning star." Rev. 22: 16. The root of David and his offspring cannot be the same. The root and offspring can be in one being only on the principle of two natures being associated in him. I am David's ancestor and David's descendant. And this proclamation was made on no secondary authority, but on the word of Christ, himself. Can any one define how Christ grew from David and David from him, except on the very principle of the doctrine for which we contend? "For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come whereof we speak. But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels: thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands. Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. But now we see not yet all things

put under him : But we see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man. For it became him for whom are all things and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons into glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings, for both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified, are all of one ; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren : saying I will declare thy name unto my brethren ; in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee. And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, behold I and the children which God hath given me. For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise, took part of the same ; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil ; and deliver them, who, through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels : but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things, it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren ; that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." " Seeing, then, that we have a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not a high priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities ; but was in all points tempted like as we are yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need." Heb. 2 : 5—18 ; 4 : 14—16.

In this quotation the apostle argues Christ's humanity, assumes his super-humanity, and shows the results of each of these natures.

He reasons that as all the works of God's hands are not put under *man* in general, that this prophecy must refer to Christ, (who then must of course be a man), to whom all things will eventually be subjected. He then reasons that the captain of man's salvation, in order to be a perfect Saviour of men, must

suffer death, and that this suffering of death shows him to have been lower than the angels. He then declares that Christ was of the seed of Abraham, or the nature of Abraham, and not of the nature of angels, that he was a brother and flesh to those whom he saved, and a partaker of the same faith and blood of which others are composed; see Acts 17:26 and Luke 24:49. He says he was made like other men—his brethren in all things, and like them tempted in all points.

The results of this humanity, as Paul gives them, are, that he will sympathize with the tempted, and be merciful to them, and that his resurrection gives us an assurance of ours. These are just such results as follow from Christ's humanity, and could not follow if he were not human. How could an angel be tempted in all points as we are? And even if he could be, we are unable to understand how we could realize that fact, and be benefited by it, since an angel has scarcely a single attribute or emotion which can move in perfect harmony with humanity. But Christ can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, for he being human, has endured them all, and suffered, being tempted. This we can comprehend.

Throughout this argument, however, Paul constantly assures us that Christ was more than man. He was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death. He was not then always lower, but in order that he might taste death for every man he became lower. In this we have evidence that he possessed a nature superior to humanity before he became a man. And all things are put under him though God would not trust those things pertaining to the world to come (or the gospel dispensation) to the hands of angels, v 5. This shows that the nature of Christ was not only super-human but super-angelic, as also stated in ch. 1:4, 13; and this trust which has been committed to him, crowns him with glory and honor. He is also the sanctifier of the church, the destroyer of death and of him who hath the power of it, the devil, and the deliverer of those who would otherwise spend their whole life in the fear of death; he makes reconciliation for the sins of the people, (being a faithful High Priest,) and is the captain of our salvation. But a

mortal man could be neither a sanctifier of men, a destroyer of death and the devil, nor a deliverer from the fear of death, nor be the captain of man's salvation. Nor could he be a high priest who could make of himself an offering and a real atonement for sin; the priests of the former dispensation having been in the official character and acts representatives of Christ.

By this divine nature, Christ is fully qualified to perform what he undertakes, and to keep that which we have committed to him; being the head of all principalities and powers, and possessing all power in heaven and earth. The blending of these two natures, the human and the divine, give us an assurance such as no other view of Christ's character can give. It assures us of the human sympathy and brotherly kindness of a sinless human nature which has felt the weakness of all our human infirmities, the pressure of all our temptations and woes, a nature associated and blended in the same being with the almighty power, self existence and holiness of an infinite God. Here we have a ground on which our faith can stand, and a stimulus by which it can be excited. And without faith we have no salvation, though the works were finished from the foundation of the world. In view of this twofold nature, Paul insists that we come boldly to the throne of grace, that we may find mercy and grace for every time of need. No trials so peculiar that Christ does not understand them, and feel their force, for he too is human; none so intense that Christ cannot afford strength for their endurance; none so inevitable that he cannot remove them, for he is divine. No temptations whose terrible nature he cannot fathom, for in his humanity he has been tempted as we are; none over which he has not power, for he is Almighty.

Such, as it seems to us, is the view which Paul presents of the two natures of Christ; a view in which every true believer may well rejoice. A portion of this passage has been quoted by Dr. Peabody as proof against the deity of the Saviour, apparently overlooking the fact, which we hope has been made clear to the minds of the careful, candid reader, that whatever else these quotations prove or fail to prove, they show that Christ possessed a nature far above that of mortal man, or that of an

angel, and also a proper humanity; that he possessed the former before he possessed the latter, and took upon himself the latter, that he might become a perfect Saviour to man.

In presenting the two natures of Christ as a scripture doctrine, we have done no more than many able and profound writers have done before; to some of whom we are indebted for having offered some of these very passages as proofs of the two natures of the Redeemer. How it has been that the productions of those writers, or the bearing of these texts, could so long have escaped the keen eye of Dr. Peabody is to us a mystery. That they have so escaped his notice is evident from that passage already quoted from his works, wherein he declares that the advocates of the two natures of Christ resort to a mere hypothesis, rather than to revelation, to prove their doctrine.

We now leave this most vital theme with the reader. We lay down our pen with faith in Christ increased, and love for him invigorated, as a result of this re-examination of the evidences furnished in God's word that he is "God manifested in the flesh." May the reader be equally blessed, is our fervent prayer.

ART. VII.—DR. SHEPHARD'S SERMONS.*

Of published sermons there is no lack in number. Of really readable sermons there are few. We rarely rise from the reading of a series of discourses with thought so quickened and spirit so stimulated for high Christian effort, as from this volume presenting something of the pulpit labors of the late Dr. Shephard.

A graduate of Amherst and of Andover, his first labors were

* Sermons by the late Rev. Geo. Shephard, Professor in Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me. With a memorial, by Prof. D. S. Tallcott, Boston: Nichols and Noyes, 1869.

in connection with the First Congregational church in Hallowell, Me., as its pastor. After eight years of successful toil, full of promise of future usefulness, he became connected with the Theological Seminary, Bangor, as Professor of Sacred Rhetoric. Lucrative and important positions were offered him elsewhere, but he gave to this field of labor his best and untiring efforts to the close of his life, in March 1868.

He early took a high place in the first rank of preachers, wielding no common influence, exhibiting no ordinary elements of power. The secret of this power, says his biographer, "lay in the practical and all-pervading ascendancy of faith." "I believed, therefore have I spoken," was the spring of power with him. There was never any doubt on which side of any great question of political or religious life, he stood. He saw clearly the moral bearings of an act or theory and took at once a decisive attitude.

"His whole manner of speaking betokened a man thoroughly in earnest. His words were plain, direct, graphic, strong. The things he had to announce were things that he had seen." He recommended to his students strength of expression. That quality was a natural product of his own mind, because he felt strongly and was compelled by his emotions. He shunned and condemned common place and sought the word most pregnant with life and power to convey a living thought. So, too, he condemned verbosity.

His sentences were written, not to be put away as complete and delightful fossils in his sermon-drawer, but to move men; written, not to be read with tame utterance and nice regard to mincing propriety, but to be spoken with clarion voice in the ears of attentive listeners. The thought of how a sentence would read troubled him far less than how it would affect and mold the hearts of his congregation, whom he had ever in mind in the preparation of his discourses.

"While in some respects Professor Shepard's style of writing is the very opposite of that of Paul, there is sometimes that in his sermons which very forcibly recalls to us the manner in which the impetuous earnestness of the apostle overrides all rules of speech. There is the like 'disproportion between

thought and language ; ' the thought,' in the words of another, ' straining the language till it cracks in the process, a shipwreck of grammar and logic as the sentences are whirled through the author's mind.' The one point is gained. The truth, as it presented itself to his own view, is made to stand out, in the view of the hearer, as clearly as language can make it ; and all other considerations are given to the winds."*

That preacher strives in vain for power and influence with men who comes before them with an apology in his manner for troubling them with the truth, or with tameness of speech which shrinks from an earnest, free expression of the living word. It is not enough to say to men, now you have an opportunity to hear ; I give you such an opportunity and if you improve it, it will be well with you. Professor Shepard took no such position. He " was not satisfied with giving men the opportunity to hear. Hear they should. And not only so, but attend they should. Accordingly, attend they did." Memorial p. XXV.

We find many a preacher cramped and injured by constitutional timidity. Few perhaps, possessed a larger degree of timidity and self-distrust than Dr. Shepard. He wrote to a friend in respect to the matter, as follows : " As to the shrinking and trembling and all that sort of thing I seem to myself to have been doing nothing but just that very thing all my life. I have taken up no new duty except with dread and apprehension ; but with God's grace I have worked my way through it so far." Memorial p. XXVI.

This very weakness was made, " by the grace of God," a source of increased influence. When he rose to read a hymn, or to lead the devotions of the congregation, it was fully manifest that he felt himself to be nothing. He was obliged to forget himself in his subject or he could do nothing at all. After the utterance of a few sentences the painful embarrassment was gone, and the hearer, who had expected the exhibition of mere timidity, the speech of a plain, quiet, unobtrusive preacher, was startled by the change of demeanor, the boldness of appeal, and attracted by the entire self-forgetfulness of the speaker.

* Memorial.

His life was a power with men. They felt that his utterances were sincere, they confided in his honesty of purpose, in his unaffected goodness. His daily course of living gave illustration to the theme which he delighted to dwell upon: "faith working by love." When he denounced with burning words the insatiate thirst for wealth, his own self-denying beneficence furnished the strongest rebuke to a mercenary spirit. "Those of his fellow-citizens who differed from him most widely in their religious views, rendered willing homage to the beauty of his life."

He was no less eminent as a professor than as a preacher. No student could listen day after day to his lectures on Homiletics and to his sermons, which were a living commentary on his lectures, without carrying away something of the impress of the soul of the teacher. His words have gone out, in their influence, to the ends of the earth. "In Arabic, Turkish, and Armenian, in the tongues of Hindostan and China, and in savage dialects first reduced to writing by his pupils, words that to him would have been unmeaning, are every Sabbath and every week day wrought into new and more expressive combinations, and convey the message of salvation with a more commanding energy, because he has lived and taught;" and many spirits who dwell no longer in darkness and in the shadow of death, "will have reason, though they know it not, to be thankful for the grace that was poured into the lips of one that sleeps on the banks of the Penobscot."

The first sermon in the volume purposes "to set forth that type of preaching which is fitted to take effect on the less cultivated minds,—the more common minds in the world."

He notices the complaint by preachers, of failure to reach the mind and heart of the people; and, also, the complaint from the people of too refined and intellectual discourse on the part of the preachers, of style and matter too exclusive, failing to reach any except an elect, educated class of hearers. He does not attempt to pronounce upon the justice of these criticisms but leads the mind to consider that type of preaching which prevailed in the early church, and was exemplified by Paul, the most effective of preachers.

The words: "We preach Christ crucified," announce the

method of the apostle and furnish a study for the modern pulpit. In considering his method, we must bear in mind the witnesses to its power, exhibited in its radical and efficacious reforms, in the number of souls saved, in its influence upon the history of the world; it produced no mere outward conformity to morality but changed the whole man, it wrought alike upon barbarian and Greek, upon the philosopher and the rustic. If such was his method and his power it is wise and needful for the preacher, in every age, to sit as a humble and attentive scholar at his feet.

Dr. Shephard proceeds: "It is very evident from the broken specimens we have, that preaching, in the hands of Paul and his co-laborers, was no set or formal affair, was held to none of the now recognized canons, but was rather in a somewhat loose, free discourse, drawn from the Scriptures, and aimed to establish in the minds before them, certain facts, as being in the Scriptures, and also as being their doctrine and material of redemption."

Preaching, by the early teachers, is more an announcement, than a systematic, studied conformity to rules of composition and oratory; "it is a sort of heralding, a trumpet tone and service; a seizing and greatening of certain primary and essential facts, giving them an unqualified and unmistakable prominence, somehow making them obtrusive and adhesive to the men in hearing."

The modern pulpit would complain of Paul for giving it too confined a range, when he sets them this one idea for development, and would accuse him of sameness in subject and matter, but it is evident that the power over men lies in just his method and this one central topic. "We are not to suppose or admit that this species of limitation, recognized by the apostle, operated to cramp or enfeeble his action; but the opposite. For we find, all down the past, that the great achievers, by speech and deed, have been more commonly of like limitation,—a very few things, on their part, to say or do; but those few overwhelmingly put." p. 4.

Every thoughtful preacher has observed how difficult it is to fix in the memory and understanding the simplest, most rudimentary truths: and many are they who from a despondent

spirit cry; "I have sowed in vain upon barren soil." Many hearers have repentance preached to them from year to year and yet have no clear idea of what repentance is, and "if their salvation turned upon their having the right intellectual idea or apprehension, they would not be saved." Therefore the preacher must make unceasing efforts to present clear, positive, direct statement at the sacrifice of his over critical or finical taste. The taste of the audience may be pleased, their imaginations enkindled, the enchanting web of rhetoric may be woven around them but of what matter is it all, if not a single strong thought, not one leading idea is fixed in the mind or made to stir the depths of the heart.

"The kind of preaching we are considering—preaching with the obtrusive and implanting intent—not only does not ask for the refinements of rhetoric, the mere aesthetics; but instinctively dismisses them. The very aim and tone of this kind necessitates plainness. And then the great precursor in this line has struck for us the key: he has given us the pattern, who, in carrying through his resolve not to know anything among the people, save Jesus Christ and him crucified, fell, as he tells us, upon the simplicities of language; abjured the high-wrought, the artistic, or what he calls, as given in our tongue, the excellencies of speech. He appears before us as one evidently burdened, and greatly hesitating on account of the disadvantageous, the homely, the enfeebling, lying in his case. And yet when he came to the work, he did it manfully, and he did it mightily; because his preaching was not with the enticing words of man's wisdom, but with the opposite both in spirit and style, and therefore with demonstration and power." p. 5.

We imagine many readers of this volume shrinking sensitively back from the strong language and bold idea of the author, as they do from the bare statement of Paul's "foolishness of preaching," when he pungently and faithfully says: "And it was done in his case by the foolishness of preaching; and also in the case of most who have come after him in any like efficiency, it has been by the foolishness of preaching. And how we all sprung to the rescue of this phrase of Paul's using, ready to show that it does not mean foolish preaching! Yet, I confess,

for one, that I have been somewhat shaken on this point, and from later observations, am about ready to confess that it does sometimes, at least, mean foolish preaching. One thing is certain,—that to us of the rules and the forms it is foolish preaching. There is no linking of a process, or backing of an argument, or felicity of figure or phrase; only this: the great things of God are boldly given, done with a rough depicting, a vehement downrightness, a persistent affirming. The people are told, it is so, just as it is written in the Book; and it is amazing. The eternal all, with you, is at stake! See the rage and swelter of the devouring fire! Behold the Lamb of God! Now is the time! Escape for your life! And the rugged, steaming words take hold; and men in crowds, that never heard before, hear now; and the weakness and the foolishness strangely become to them a power of redemption. This when it is about certain that the far abler men, by the more authentic modes, and by a speech replete with all the selected qualities, never would have reached them.” p. 6. He who produces any great effect on an audience must have something marked and positive about him to do it with. We may wonder where his power lies, may ridicule the means he adopts, but nevertheless, and in spite of all our theories, the people feel his power.

Another great feature in this style of preaching is, that it is self-evidencing. The preacher adopts, it is true, a coarser and ruder rhetoric, but he more than compensates for this by adopting, also, a briefer mode of proof,—a short, cohesive way of putting a matter that makes it stay in the mind and conscience of the hearer. “The result of argument is not always reached by the paths of logic.” Often it is secured in quite another way. “What, for instance, did the most incontrovertible reasoning, pressed for a generation by some of our purest and ablest men, avail to convince this Christian nation, that a man is a man, and that the doctrine of right in enslaving him is of the Devil! Almost nothing,—except to bring contempt on the pestilent agitators. God at length changed the style of proceeding. He employed upon us the shorter and more palpable process; dealt in premises that were blows: and, in a single year, the extreme of the conversatives joined to intensify the conclusions

of the old fanatics; and our Wall Streets and State Streets rung out the cry: Down with slavery." p. 7.

The very announcement must carry its proof. The way a preacher states a fact proclaims to his audience its importance. When he sees a truth, he knows it because he has felt it; when he says out of a full heart, "I believe, therefore I speak;" his very mode and temper of speech will be his strongest argument. His preaching must be authenticated by his personal experience, truth must become a visible, apprehended thing to his soul. "It is superfluous to say how such a man, with the saving message within him and the massed auditors before him, will speak. It will be, very likely, with a process not hinted in the books; in the use of short links and abrupt connections,—the quick forging of his own heart; in the utterance of words and phrases, charged, as they go, with the very instincts of truth; and hence with authority they go; with strong impulsion he speaks; with bulks and points he speaks; at once heavy to strike, and keen to enter in." p. 9.

Pulpit power springs from no mere careful adjustments of speech nor from the accomplishments of literature, but only from the spiritual enduing of the man from on high. We are strongly liable to run in the wrong direction, to externals. "We come to regard preaching as a profession. We cultivate the humanities. We get steeped in the literatures; are trained to the peculiarities and niceties of style,—grow partial to the novel modes, phrases, expressions, and use them. Thus we carry away the religious discourse from the unalterable conditions of a large effect. Preaching does not lie, it never can lie, in these aesthetic conditions. The entire history of the church, the failures and the successes in preaching, alike show this." p. 12.

There are many circumstances which hinder the appropriate results of the gospel, and lessen the effect of preaching. Business with its absorbing interests effectually banishes a devotional spirit. The ministry is not held in that estimation by the people as in former days. The preacher comes inevitably into a sort of competition with many others who attempt to teach society. Comparisons are instituted between him and them. Then there is the hindering effect of various schemes, theories

for saving men. The minds of the people are unsettled and distracted by them, until it is deemed sufficient by many that they merely adopt some one of these theories, and it will make no difference which one it is.

“Matters not relished, because they cross the depravity, though they come with demonstration, many say, ‘we won’t have them.’ Matters which come with a novelty, and deal gently with the depravity, and open another gate than God’s contracted one to go out from our troubles, are received, all evidence wanting.” p. 21.

In dealing further with these hindrances to the appropriate results of preaching, our author pointedly rebukes the literary and mental habits of the age as follows :

“There is another matter which may go into our detail of obstructive causes. It is found in the mental conditions increasingly prevalent, the growing want of good mental habits. These may be characterized as getting light, superficial, in distinction from the patient and solid. . . . The reading, as a general thing, is light,—not invigorating and nutritious. There is brought along, first, an indiscriminating state of mind,—a blurred vision,—intellectual eyes which see every thing in a sort of confused and muddy conglomeration. Another thing is a state which shrinks from close thought and veritable argument ; consequently shows but little patience before the discourse which asks for continued thought in the hearer. This is a state which does not relish substantial preaching,—intellect, discussion, matter in preaching,—because grown incompetent to cope with such things. No mind is wanted in sermons, because no mind in themselves ; both indisposed and incapacitated ; indisposed, because incapacitated. A long reach of massive matter threatens to break them down. A chain of compact reasoning, forged out, linked together, and directed toward them is about as formidable to them as so much chain-shot.” pp. 22, 23.

We turn to the sermon which gives us an insight to that benevolence which he so signally practiced and to which he often sought to lead others, in which he speaks of “giving of what God may have given us as the means of disciplining, purifying, elevating the character.”

He spares none who have heaped up wealth at the expense of others, those who by fraud or by "grinding the faces of the poor," have added to their substance. They are guilty if they seek not, as much as possible, to redress past wrongs, make restitution as far as can be done; else the offering of gifts from ill-gotten treasure is heinous in God's sight. And, referring to Zaccheus, he suggests, "whether this backward correction, this retrospective discipline, should not be a matter of thought and consideration now: whether the Lord's cause and the welfare of men would not receive means for their promotion, if there were more inquiring and acting in this direction; the Lord's treasury receiving numberless fragments, and some huge masses, which are now in hands that would be better off without them. Let each take the candle of the Lord and pass through his own premises,—its rays penetrating all the tortuous intricacies of the past,—and then let him do what this revealing light shall teach him to do; and he will be likely to do both generously and well; certainly, be likely to improve his standing for this world and the world to come." p. 125.

To make men clean, pure, certain corrupting things must be removed from them. Chief among these corrupting agencies is the love of money. From it, what crimes and follies spring; wrongs, oppressions are its offspring. Men are maddened by a fearful thirst for gain, which is increased by every success, by every new measure of possession. Sometimes it is one man alone whom the Saviour meets with the terrible reproof: "Thou fool." "Sometimes,—and have we not seen something of the kind?—large masses are frenzied together. There stands forth pretty much a whole generation of fools, inciting and inflaming one another, expanding and spreading out, till there comes a crash and a conclusion; and the whole surface is seen strewn with wrecks of character and fortune . . . But it is repeated. The same ones, with the smart of the old chastisement in their skins, and the indented bruise of it in their bones, will spring forth, eager to re-enact the same old fury." "This terrible lust, you cannot pet it, play with it, and say, you will keep it under. No man can. No man can serve two masters. It will be one, a single allegiance; one up, and the other un-

der." pp. 127, 131. "The carnal and the corrupting given, the spiritual is received, and so the treasures of your house become vastly greater and richer. The crowning good is, that all is clean; your hands clean; your reputation clean; your soul, through grace, clean; your children, through the same grace, clean; all these clean to you." p. 136.

In the sermon on the Glory of Christ, we strikingly perceive, even in reading, that glow and earnestness which proclaimed the man bound up, lost, in his theme. The emotions of the soul are too strong for language. Exultation, glory in the supreme glory, beams out from every paragraph. There is no weak yielding to the prejudices of the unreconciled heart; he sees the glory of Christ exhibited in Christ's discriminating love.

"How exceeding in glory; and how much more admirable and glorious as a love that discriminated; that would not tread down principle to gain its end; and, while it would save if it could, would not and will not save to the dishonor of God, or the weakening of his government, or the obliterating of the distinction between holy and unholy; not that weak, loose, profligate love that pities, but cares not for integrity and purity, as though happiness were the great ultimate good, not righteousness. And whilst the glory of this love is the fact that it discriminates, it is not, we add, narrow nor partial; that death of the Son was borne for all; the provision made for all." p. 241.

The most joyful emotions spring up in the heart of the preacher as he contemplates Christ in his glory of Achievement, his glory as a Conqueror. Conquest on the part of the Son of man makes men not slaves, but freemen. It is glorious to be overcome by the King of kings; to be brought by conquest from Egypt into Canaan. He still works as the conqueror and none shall withstand him as he goes on to put all the world in submission to himself. As if entranced, overcome by a view of a present and of a coming glory he closes his argument: "But the subject is too vast for our hearts. It comes with a greatness and opulence that holds us, at times, in a species of confused, abstract admiration."

The glory of the Master is manifested and advanced among men just so far as Christians invite and promote his glory. They

are his witnesses. His glory, boundless, full of help and consolation to men, is restrained, held back, concealed. Unbelief prevents still the doing of many mighty works. "Worthless and weak as we are,—yet, astounding fact!—we do stand at the gate of such outgoings as these, and succeed in holding back, or more copiously inviting, the enriching floods. Unbelief shuts back all outflow from the infinite fountains." p. 248.

"Oh, Lord, how long? In wailing cries it comes repeated to our ears, How long? We here bow before the glory of mystery; and there is no mystery profounder than this delay on his part to work and to save. Let not our faith falter for this. Let it ride still that ocean of grace gathered in Christ; safely and confidently ride, because anchored on the unfailing bottom of eternal promise." *Idem.*

In the sermon on Eternal Punishment, after speaking of the disfavor with which a discussion of this theme is usually received, he remarks that those who object to its introduction seem to think the whole matter turns "on this,—namely, whether we who preach make out a case in favor of the punishment of the wicked hereafter,—that the fact would be very much according to the state of the argument in this world or according to the prevailing sentiment; and God would adjust his severity, or his clemency, very much to the judgments and expectations of his creatures. Hence, every person taking a position adverse to any punishment, is himself a voice, a vote, an influence, against the infliction of such punishment. Hence, again, the preacher whose argument goes in favor of the punishment of wicked men, is supposed to be thereby using an influence which shall increase the probability of such punishment. If not, why are any displeased?" p. 337.

It is essential to all law that the "law be executed." God is a God of law, so manifesting himself in all his works. There are physical laws which no man can violate with impunity; there are psychological laws and the world of mind is inevitably bound by them. In the department of nature and mind, law, penalty, exist.

Men find it impossible to get on without law with its regulations and retributions. Social and civil relations require it.

When we pass to God's realm, his government, law there has its penalty. The law established in Paradise was visited upon the transgressors in the very day of guilt. Penalty fell upon the transgressors of the wilderness.

“If the life, the glory, is eternal, which every one admits, then the punishment, put right by the side in the same sentence, means eternal punishment. The argument here is simply this, that it is what the language means.” “If the language which the Spirit of God uses on the subject does not express the idea of punishment eternal, literally without end, then no language can express it. If God has not declared it, it never has been and it never can be declared. For language, in God's employment of it, has been put to its utmost tension, its last capacity of expression, on this very subject. No believer of the doctrine, no preacher of it, on this theory of language, has ever yet succeeded in expressing the idea of the endless punishment of the wicked. If God has failed, certainly man has and must. And we add this, that the disbelievers, the rejecters of the doctrine, who have gone away displeased from before the evangelical pulpit, have spent their wrath for nothing. And if there is one here to-day, I say to him, Friend, what is the matter? What the ground of your displeasure and dissent? What have I said?—Said! you have been preaching the horrible doctrine of eternal punishment.—Pray, tell me where and when. You cannot put your finger on the justly offensive sentence. According to your theory and understanding of language, I have preached no such thing as the endless punishment of the wicked. According to your rule of interpreting, this very sermon is redolent with the happiness of all men after death, and every person of that way of thinking ought to be satisfied with it. The fact that he is not satisfied is proof that he is no believer, after all, in his own rule of interpretation: but admits, knows, as everybody else does, that punishment means punishment; and that the Bible, the New Testament, fairly interpreted, does teach the endless punishment of the wicked, the unbelieving, in the future state.” pp. 343, 344.

The serenity of character, the inspiring hope of the writer of these sermons appears sweetly and strongly in the closing sermon,

in which, before the glory to come, he lays down the tribulations and sufferings of the present life calmly at the feet of Jesus and then rejoices in the flinty path that tears the feet, in the thorny way that wounds the brow.

This series of discourses is fragrant with the self-devotedness, the large, overflowing benevolence, the sterling Christian manhood of the consecrated scholar who pronounced it. His memorial volume consists not chiefly of these few pages sent out to the world, but of living records and grateful memories in the hearts of those who drank in with delight and profit, words of wisdom from that earnest presence in the pulpit and the chair of the professor.

ART. VIII.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES. By Harriet Martineau. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 1869. 12mo. pp. 458.

Miss Martineau is a woman of great mental independence and eminent vigor of thought, and she writes in a direct, forcible and self-contained style. She does not lack information, and all her accumulations of knowledge appear to be ready for use. She is thoroughly conversant with public affairs. She has made herself familiar with the qualities and lives of all classes of public men. Equally at home in politics, literature and science, there are few eminent names in any one of these departments of thought but have become familiar and significant to her, and she can at once sketch the career of their owners and portray their qualities with definite features and vivid coloring. We have in this volume,—which is a fine specimen of book-making,—brief sketches of nearly fifty personages; and much information and a fair amount of thoughtful criticism are compressed within the few pages that are devoted to each. Her estimates appear to be honestly and intelligently made up, though it is not at all likely that they will be universally approved. The sketches are by no means as carefully written nor as valuable as those which our own Mr. Tuckerman gave us a few years since, but they are, nevertheless, of sufficient interest and merit to warrant their republication in this

country, and to guarantee them a general and cordial welcome. The subjects are taken from varied circles, they represent a great variety of opinions and positions, and they get as fair treatment as any biographer and critic of Miss M's pronounced opinions could be expected to render. She has fourteen subjects under the head of "Literary," two classed as "Scientific," ten are called "Professional," four figure as "Social," eleven are designated as "Politicians," and five belong to the circle known as "Royal." The author has done an acceptable service in bringing together these scattered sketches and putting them into a small gallery by themselves.

MY RECOLLECTIONS OF LORD BYRON; and those of Eye-Witnesses of his Life. By the Countess Guiccioli. New York: Harper & Bros. 1869. 12mo. pp. 670.

This is certainly in some sense the apologetic or white-washing era of literature. Charity is a good thing, and they who have been unjustly judged are entitled to have their cases reviewed before a new court committed to fair play. Censure is always in danger of lacking discrimination, and when one has offended society there is an impatience, while passions are heated, of listening to any extenuating plea. A manly defense of a severely accused man is creditable to the advocate. But there is some danger that this generous tendency may develop a vicious extreme. The old maxim,—“Say nothing but good of the dead,” is a false one, and its tendency is mischievous. Criminal lawyers, when they have acquired a reputation that makes every great rascal instinctively turn to them after an arrest, in the hope of securing an acquittal, are in danger of demoralizing the community and giving wholesome statutes over to contempt. He who helps to obliterate the distinction between right and wrong, and make vices appear tolerable by throwing over them the glow of genius, is working no ordinary mischief. There is little danger that men will hate evil too intensely, and the tendency is quite strong and general enough already to slur over the immoralities of men who have marked talent and high popularity.

This white-washing tendency is appearing freely in literature. Aaron Burr is transformed into a patriot by one of the most skillful of American biographers. A clergyman paints the first Napoleon as having had only an ambition to serve the cause of popular liberty in Europe, and his nephew at the Tuileries is set forth as having taken the mantle of the noble and pure-hearted patriot who was martyred at St. Helena. Gibbon is now written down by a critical theologian as a profound believer, whose famous XV. and XVI,

chapters were meant to exalt a supernatural Christianity. Rousseau is set forth, by a late reviewer, as a genuine moral philosopher and a truly religious man. A persistent attempt is made to drown the protest against the low vices of Robert Burns by vocalizing the music of his ballads and rehearsing his admirable "Cotter's Saturday Night." And now a woman, eminent in letters and social position, gives us nearly seven hundred pages of glowing panegyric, indignant denial and ingenious special pleading, in order to induce the public to reverse its verdict over Lord Byron, to concede that his virtue was not surpassed by his genius, and that, properly estimated, he was almost as much a saint as a poet.

Now that is carrying matters rather too far. Charity is a Christian virtue; but that is only a bastard charity which seeks to make iniquity tolerable, and would smother justice with generosity. Byron may have been over-censured and adjudged guilty now and then on insufficient grounds, and may not always have had a proper regard paid to the extenuating circumstances that affected him and his life. Whatever was noble in him should be fully brought out and fairly estimated. But this attempt to make of him a moral paragon as well as an intellectual genius, and to make Lady Byron responsible for the scandals that abounded in his domestic and social relations, will not answer. And that is the central and glaring fault of this really interesting and well-written book. The biographer's task, of which the author shows herself fully capable, is subordinated throughout to that of the defender and the panegyrist. These details in Byron's history and life are interestingly and intelligently exhibited, and though not much is told that is really new, yet no one, appreciating the rare abilities of the celebrated poet, can fail to find much in this volume that is both readable and instructive. We wish it satisfied the conscience as well as it does the literary taste.

THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY, with an Introduction on the Existence of God and the Immortality of the Soul. By Ebenezer Dodge, D. D., President of Madison University. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1869. 12mo. pp. 244.

The author of this work has not figured very prominently in the sphere of authorship, but this volume will at once give him a position which many men who write abundantly never acquire. Though the subject discussed is one which has enlisted the service of many of the best scholars and most critical thinkers for a long time, yet Dr. Dodge has something fresh and significant to say, and he says it with a directness and force that would be anywhere noticeable. The book has grown up in connection with the author's labors as an instructor

of young men during the last fifteen years, and it has therefore no marks of haste and imperfection. It is constructed on a thoroughly philosophical plan, and the clear, calm, self-poised thinker appears on every page. The method adopted is one which students will appreciate, and which indicates that the author is a man of mental comprehensiveness and critical habit. He sees truth on its various sides and in its several relations, and he beholds many truths in their mutual dependence and their connection with a system. As he says in his preface, the governing idea of the book is, that "Christianity is its own witness. The nature of Christianity, its influence, its relations to Divine Providence and to human progress, and its historical triumphs, constitute the best evidence of its divine origin." With the exception, therefore, of forty pages devoted to a consideration of the Historical Character of the New Testament, he occupies himself chiefly with what are very properly termed the internal evidences. Among the separate though related topics, he considers Christianity as a Supernatural Fact, then as a Divine Life, &c. His last two chapters will be found specially interesting even to those who may find the close logic and rigid philosophy of some earlier chapters taxing to the thought;—he discusses in these Christianity a Fulfillment, and Christianity a World-Power. His critical insight, his power of analysis, his mastery of the art of reasoning, his ability to penetrate to the very heart of an idea and separate the husk from the kernel of an argument, find illustrations throughout the entire discussion. He excels in compactness and accuracy of statement. There are no overloaded sentences, and when a point is fairly made it is left for another. There is more vigorous thought in this volume, and more that will compel and energize thought in the reader than in many a score of pretentious treatises. To those who know how to think, and are willing to call the brain into vigorous service, this book will offer a real and a rare stimulus, and its argument for the divine origin and the all-conquering power of Christianity will add something both to the intelligence and the restfulness of faith.

SERMONS ON THE FAILURE OF PROTESTANTISM, AND ON CATHOLICITY. By the Rev. Ferdinand C. Ewer, S. T. D., Rector of Christ Church, New York. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1869. 12mo. Paper covers. pp. 168.

The number of panaceas offered to the world, some of which are meant for the cure of its body, and others for the cure of its soul, indicate the pretty wide prevalence of the conviction that it is seriously sick, and suggest that there is a good deal of credulity that affords encouragement to the great army of quack doctors whose ranks are

kept full to overflowing. Dr. Ewer, having a prescription to administer, begins by drawing out a very sorry picture of his patient,—that is humanity,—with a view of convincing him that he is not only in a bad but even a hopeless way. His conviction that our religious condition is very far from satisfactory is one that is very generally shared and is most abundantly proved by facts; his remedy is one not quite easy to understand after listening to his long and wordy harangues; and even when one catches glimpses of his method of cure, it is impossible to see how he is to make it applicable to the case in hand.

He says Protestantism is a failure. As evidence, he alleges that it does not reach and influence the masses, and that it does not save those whom it does reach from the tendency to skepticism. A clergyman in the Protestant Episcopal church; he is ashamed of the name Protestant, protests against it, says it is utterly illogical, because “it founds the Church on the Bible, making the Bible prior,” when it ought to put it the other way. He goes so far as to say, in his protest against Protestantism and his sympathy with what is really Romish,—though he calls it Catholic,—such things as these: “The name has wrought us untold harm and loss. It has falsified our position in the eyes of the public. It has identified us with those who hate our distinctive and vital peculiarities,—our Apostolic succession, our non-recognition of man made ministries, our non-reception of their “ordination” of the Lord’s Supper at their hands, our real presence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist, our baptismal regeneration, our natural sympathies with the Greek Church, which they regard as only one step less vile and monstrous than Rome.” Dr. Ewer is plainly right in objecting to the name of Protestant. It does not belong to him surely, and we are glad that he is frank enough to say that he abominates it. He is right, too, in saying that the tendencies of the age are critical and skeptical; but when it is demanding something that is rational, vital and practical, when it is scorning mere authority and throwing contempt upon imposing ceremonies, we do not precisely see how a fresh exaltation of the claims of the Church as such, a more sonorous recitation of the creed, and the adoption of a more pompous ritual, are going to beget faith in the minds that are clamoring for logic and evidence, or reach the masses that need kindling forces, by offering them only a sanctified decency. We can prize this High Churchman’s earnestness, but are compelled to hold his theories at a serious discount; he is a pretty fair negative critic, but a very poor positive builder; he knows how to complain, but he is

a sorry comforter ; he is quick to see indigo tints, but slow to scatter golden light ; he can play a dirge, but stumbles at half the bars when dealing with a psalm ; he is ready enough to discern a disaster and sound a retreat, but utterly unable to rally men with the call to charge and lead the way to victory. If the nineteenth century finds Protestantism a failure, shall we go back to the Catholicism which the sixteenth impatiently flung away because it was too offensive to be longer endured ? We confess to difficulties and to only a partial success in the effort to Christianize mankind. But the way of relief and triumph is forward, not backward. As well might the man, taxed and struggling with his new cares, go back to the life of his boyhood for relief, or the Israelites retrace their steps from the border of the wilderness to the Egypt they had left. The true way is onward, and when the providential pillar lifts and moves on, there is nothing to do but to follow where it leads. The battle, the wilderness, the weary wandering, the delays, the threats of defeat,—all these may be in store for us ; but the promised land is ahead, and they who neither rebel nor falter are sure to find at length joy in its possession, wealth in its abundance, and blessedness in its peace. Protestantism is proving no failure to the believing and resolute souls that are true to its principles and faithful to its calls ; it is only such men as Dr. Ewer, who wear its badge with a blush and have no sympathy with its spirit, that are doomed to a failure as pitiable as it is complete.

ISAIAH ; with Notes, critical, explanatory and practical. Designed for both pastors and people. By Rev. Henry Cowles, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1869. 12mo. pp. 552.

Prof. Cowles has a distinct idea of what he wishes to accomplish as an expounder of the prophets, and he keeps his end ever distinctly in his eye. He is a man who has definite opinions, and they are frankly though modestly expressed. He has studied his subject attentively, made himself familiar with the results of the work of his predecessors, put himself into vital sympathy with the thoughts and spirit of the inspired men whose stirring words remain to us, and he has evidently no misgiving respecting the supernatural origin and divine authority of the prophetic books. He sits, therefore, as a reverent student at the feet of these divinely taught men, and studies their utterances like one in quest of the highest instruction and joyfully assured of gaining it, and hopeful of helping others to appreciate and find true quickening in the messages whose meaning he sets himself to elucidate.

In the main features these Notes on Isaiah are like those already given to the public upon the Minor Prophets and upon Daniel. In a somewhat elaborate Introduction he exhibits the peculiarities of the period during which these prophecies were written, analyzes the prophet's character and exhibits the leading qualities of his style, and then devotes himself to a reply to those critics, mostly German, who set up the claim that the latter portion of the book—chapters 60—66, were written by another and a very different person from the one who wrote what precedes. In dealing with these critics he first points out the misapprehensions and fallacies into which they have fallen,—insisting that their premises are untrue and their conclusion from them illegitimate; after this he sets forth, in plain and vigorous forms of statement, his positive reasons for the conviction that the book had but one author, and that he is the very person that he is declared to be in the sacred narrative itself. This whole argument is well managed, and the points made are of practical importance and value. The Notes are given in a plain and pleasant style, without parade of learning; they frequently throw light upon the text; and when they fail to satisfy, they command respect and stimulate wholesome inquiry. Another volume, devoted to Jeremiah, is promised us at no distant day, which will complete his contemplated work in this department of effort, and lay the Christian public under no small debt of obligation to him for his industry and its grateful fruits.

RELIGION AND THE REIGN OF TERROR, or, The Church during the French Revolution. Prepared from the French of M. Edmond de Pressense. By Rev. John P. Lacroix, A. M. New York: Carlton & Lahanan. 1869. 12mo. pp. 416.

The French Revolution has been properly accounted one of the great tragedies of history. Romance falls far below its strange, varied and exciting facts. Its noble impulses and its brutal passions; its triumphs of justice and liberty on one day and its carnivals of passion on the next; the supremacy of one class or interest for a brief period, and then the tyranny of what was so lately an almost unrecognized element in the struggle; royalty toasted in the streets of Paris at one instant and sans culottism carrying even conservative men whithersoever it would but a little time afterward; the dictator of last week becoming the sport or the scorn or the victim of the populace before the following week had ended; grand principles cheered and the lowest demagogism exalted almost at the same instant;—these were some of the varied and contradictory phases of that movement which so few historians even yet agree in interpreting.

Pressense has undertaken to inspect and explain it from a Christian stand-point. He is a man eminently fitted for the task. He is a public-spirited Frenchman, a scholar, a philosopher, a liberal, a fearless and yet serious thinker, and a truly devout and earnest Christian. He has studied his subject carefully, and he treats it with a purpose to make its lessons plain and practical. His work has vigor, freshness and merit. His style lacks the epigrammatic vigor and sparkle of such writers as Lamartine and Victor Hugo, and its philosophical quality may perhaps repel more or less readers who find close attention and thinking disagreeable, but his work will richly repay the reader for his attention. His view of that great political upheaval seems to us just, comprehensive and discriminating, and the lessons drawn from that fearful chapter of history are the real lessons which it has to teach and which it serves to impress. The translator has somewhat abridged the original work, and appended some notes that are not without value. The volume is one that aims at high results and can hardly be read without profit.

POPULAR COMMENTARY on the Gospel according to Luke. By Alfred Nevin, D. D. Philadelphia: William Flint. Octavo. pp. 725.

This Commentary differs in some respects from any other work belonging to the same general department of literature with which we have become acquainted. It has been prepared especially for use in the exercises of the Bible Class, and so the various features are to be considered in their relation to this end. While there is nothing marked or original in that part of the work especially devoted to the exposition of the text, yet the author has manifestly made himself familiar with the labors of other men, and has skillfully wrought the results of much study into these ample and generally judicious notes. The gospel of Luke is divided into 139 lessons, and at the end of the notes devoted to each lesson, there are questions, exegetical, historical, doctrinal and practical, to guide the teacher in the work of class instruction. Possibly the notes may be found needlessly full and prolix; too much space may be sometimes given to the passages whose import is quite obvious; the homily is brought forward with great freedom and frequency; and the attempt to make each lesson teach as many things as possible, and some things that can be drawn out from it only by a sort of forcing process, may be alleged as faults of judgment and taste, and sins against brevity and economy. But in spite of all these things, the work is one of real value and deserves a wide and permanent patronage. It is a commentary, question-book and Bible dictionary all in one, besides

being very suggestive to those who need help in the way of having the form and the substance of expository lectures, or even of pulpit sermons, furnished them at second hand. It is the first installment of what the author has planned as a popular Commentary on the entire New Testament.

TOBACCO AND ALCOHOL. I. It does pay to Smoke. II. The Coming Man will drink Wine. By John Fiske, M. A., LL. B. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 1869. 12mo. pp. 163.

Parton has found a confident critic and an open and resolute antagonist in Mr. Fiske, and the general verdict of medical men and the experience of hosts of victims are boldly challenged in the name of science, and assailed with logic and evidence. That Mr. Parton wrote somewhat loosely upon the subject of Tobacco was obvious enough on reading his essay; that Mr. Fiske is a much better physiologist than the *litterateur* is undoubtedly true. There is an ingenious argument adduced here in favor of a careful and discriminating use of Tobacco and Alcohol in the form of indulgence; much learning and considerable logic are arrayed against the total abstainers; but we suspect fallacies and inconclusiveness where we do not feel competent to argue the question from the physician's plane. We are sure that this wise and healthful use,—if there is any such use,—of the two articles in question, for which Mr. Fiske pleads, is, for the great mass of men, simply impracticable and impossible;—first, because there is a lack of knowledge; and, second, because there is a lack of self-control. To tell men that moderate smoking and drinking are safe and wholesome, is to put them on the path along which all the drunkards of the century have walked to their present sottishness, and which leads to *delirium tremens* and a terrible grave that opens before its time. The Massachusetts Legislature framed the very opinion which this book advocates into a law less than a year since; the result is that the State became so demoralized and the work of ruin went on so rapidly as to strike terror into the hearts of brave men, and raise the cry for reform in the very circles where license had been glorified. Mr. Fiske has shown real ability in his book, as Gov. Andrew did in his plea; but the reputation which the author may acquire will not probably be more desirable than that which accrued to the advocate. There is no lack of courage in either case; the wisdom displayed will be held at a decided discount.

ARCTIC EXPLORATIONS: The second and last United States Grinnell Expedition in search of Sir John Franklin. Beautifully illustrated with twenty-three steel and more than two hundred and fifty wood engravings, from original designs. By Elisha Kent Kane, M. D., U. S. N. With a biographical sketch of the author by Prof. Charles W. Shields, D. D., of Princeton College, N. J. Published by subscription only. Hartford, Conn., and Toledo, O.: R. W. Bliss & Co. 1868. Octavo. pp. 766.

We cannot well forget the intense and deepening interest with which we pressed through the two splendid volumes in which this narrative of Dr. Kane was first given to the public. Most of the accounts of Arctic exploration which had preceded this were technical, dry and cold; this was as full of intense human life as a novel of Dickens or Thackeray, as juicy as Beecher's *Norwood*, and so warm with sympathy that it set the pulses leaping till all the nerves tingled. Dr. Kane suddenly sprang into the public view a marvelous literary artist and an unconscious but transfigured hero; and from the day that he made the world familiar with the fortunes of the "Advance," and the experiences of her officers and crew as they wrestled with difficulties and fought their way toward the North Pole, Arctic expeditions have never failed to enlist the attention of thinkers and win the sympathy of the people.

The work now issued is substantially the same production that then so stirred the community. The two volumes are crowded into one, and the one not only retains all the merits of the two, but, in the very pleasant and admirable sketch of Dr. Kane and his life furnished by Prof. Shields, the reader will find an addition of real value and rare interest. We commend the work with emphasis and without qualification, as one which equally fascinates, instructs and kindles the reader. Of the mechanical excellences of the volume, including both the letter-press and engravings, nothing but superlatives are in place if one would fairly tell the simple truth:

JESUS OF NAZARETH: His Life and Teachings; founded on the Four Gospels, and illustrated by reference to the manners, customs, religious beliefs, and political institutions of his times. By Lyman Abbott. With designs by Dore, De Laroche, Fennu, and others. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. Crown Octavo. pp. 522.

The interest over the great question of Christ's real character, mission and claims was never greater or more general than now. Men perceive that he is the center and soul of the Gospel. If he was really the Messiah and if the New Testament record of him is trustworthy, the supernatural and authoritative character of Christianity are put beyond question. Hence the interest felt by skeptics to reconstruct both the record and his own character, and the interest

felt also by evangelical believers to render that record luminous and that character effective.

Mr. Abbott has given us a valuable volume. It shows the fruit of much study; there runs through it a spirit both of free inquiry and of genuine reverence; whatever in sacred geography, or eastern temperament, is adapted to invest the narrative with added interest or force, is carefully developed and effectively impressed. The aim is high, and the effort is not at all fruitless. Not a few readers who perhaps find it difficult to form a clear, adequate and satisfactory image and biography of the Lord Jesus from the fragmentary elements given us by the Evangelists, will be aided by this book to comprehend that wonderful life which has been for so many centuries the light of men, and which is still to be the hope of the world. Even this portrait will not satisfy. Mr. Abbott himself was not content with the pictures which other men had painted, or he would not have undertaken this task. It is not probable that even this result will leave either others or himself wholly content. The ideal is too high for embodiment, and it rises with study and meditation and effort. Scarcely one of the old painters but sat down with his pigments and canvas that he might embody his conception of Christ's face. But among all the hundreds of portraits that hang on the walls of galleries and churches throughout Europe, there is only now and then one that can be inspected without a measure of pain. The subject seems belittled by the representation. Words are generally as impotent as colors, and the historian and the artist may well feel that their success is only partial and that difficulty baffles the highest skill. But in presenting vivid pictures of the life and land where Jesus lived and labored,—in throwing added light upon many passages of the New Testament,—in making the significant incidents set forth by the evangelists stand out with new freshness and deeper human interest,—in giving the aspect of nearness and preciousness to what may have seemed far off and cold,—Mr. Abbott has really accomplished enough to render his volume richly worth a careful reading and a frequent reference. The publishers have done their part of the work with unusual liberality, skill and care.

LECTURES ON THE FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES OF PETER. By the Rev. John Lillie, D. D., late Pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Kingston, N. Y. author of "Lectures on the Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians," etc. With an introduction by Philip Schaff, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway. 1869. 8vo. pp. 536.

These discourses embody the results of patient and vigorous study.

The reader will not find here those excellent divisions that gave a charm to Dr. Brown's exposition of the same epistle, but the lectures are less diffuse and the exegesis more satisfactory. As a biblical scholar, Dr. Lillie had few superiors in the United States, and his conclusions are generally the result of thorough investigation. One instance of an opposite character, we think, may be found on p. 301, in which he follows the mass of interpreters giving *martos* the double meaning of the English word witness, and, if we understand him, the idea of spectator the primary one. If there is any authority for this besides that of commentators, we know not where to look for it.

We heartily commend this volume as of great worth to that large class of ministers who wish to expound the word of God to their congregations, to escape from the narrowness and poverty of human speculation into the richness of divine revelation, commending also to them the weighty words of one who himself has furnished a good illustration of the course he urges upon others: "the minute study of the Scriptures, in the spirit of devotion, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, will lead us to truths and conceptions and emotions, of whose precious value and edifying power we shall not otherwise even dream. The mysteries of the kingdom of God come to us through these words of inspiration. A doctrine of grace may dwell in the right understanding of a single preposition. Who can measure the significance and worth of this one expression of the New Testament, IN CHRIST?"

THE
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

No. LXVI. JULY, 1869.

ART. I.—THE DIVINE PREROGATIVE TO SAVE AND
TO DESTROY.

EXPOSITORY OF ROM. 9: 10—22.

BY REV. J. M. BAILEY, SACO, ME.

This subject perhaps may seem to some dry and metaphysical. But however that may be, it is a question of the utmost practical utility to all whether God will have mercy upon us and save us, or harden us and leave us to perish. He can do with us as he pleases.

No one will dispute but it is God's right to do what he will. He is the author of all things. He could do and did do as he pleased at the beginning. He had no one to dictate or oppose him. He made man just as he pleased, and he pleased to make him after his own image; and "Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus?" Shall man reply against God, when he has endowed him with all the powers necessary to fulfill his mission, and given him his word for his guide, a safe and sufficient guide? It agrees with his purpose, nay, it is his purpose revealed, as far as man is concerned, full and adequate to its design. He there says to Moses "I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious." He is "the LORD God,

merciful and gracious, long suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin and that will by no means clear the guilty." Here God asserts that it is his right to do as he pleases. Then it is his prerogative to have mercy and to harden.

In this matter God has not left us in the dark, or in uncertainty and doubt. It does not depend on a secret purpose, or an absolute decree unknown to us, or which may not be known to us. The conditions are revealed. Then we may inquire—

1. On whom does God will to have mercy? Rom. 9: 18 reads: "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will." Therefore, taken in its connection, has reference to Jacob and Esau about whom he has just been speaking in the twelfth and thirteenth verses. Before their birth when neither had done good or evil "that the purpose of God according to election might stand," it was said to the mother "the elder shall serve the younger." At first view this might seem to signify that Esau should serve Jacob according to the absolute purpose of God made anterior to their birth. Let us ascertain the facts in the case and see what it does mean. In Gen. 25: 23, we have the original account to which Paul refers, and which will, perhaps, throw some light upon the subject. As we have it there, it was said to the mother prophetically before the birth of the children, "Two nations are in thy womb—two manner of people" are to be born; "and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger."—Elder what?—Younger what?—What is understood?—Certainly not *child*. God is speaking to her of nations—of two distinct people that should descend from her, and the elder—people, of course—shall serve the younger people.

In vindication of this, the first question to be asked is, Did Esau ever serve Jacob? If he never did; of course it was never fulfilled in their persons. Jacob took advantage of Esau when he was hungry, and bought his birthright for a mess of pottage. Afterwards by artifice and treachery he deceived his father, and obtained the blessing which belonged to Esau. But Esau was not subject to him—Never! Instead of this, Jacob was afraid of Esau, and by the advice of his mother and the permission of

his father, he absconded, to avoid his brother's ire. He fled to Padan Aran where he married and remained for years, until he had a large family growing up around him, when he set out to return. On his way he heard that Esau was soon to meet him; he was exceedingly afraid of him lest he should be avenged on him for his treachery, and he prayed earnestly to God that he would deliver him from "the hand of Esau." He not only prayed but he sent before him a magnificent present to appease his wrath and secure his favor, consisting of 580 animals of different kinds, viz., goats, sheep, oxen, asses, and camels. These he arranged in companies putting a distance between them and commanding the servants in charge to be very obsequious in offering the present to "my lord Esau." Jacob and his family followed in the rear. His handmaids and their children first, Leah and her children next, and Rachel and Joseph with himself last. Each party was instructed to say, "Behold thy servant Jacob is behind us." When Jacob met Esau it was Jacob that did obeisance and not Esau, by bowing himself to the ground seven times, calling Esau his lord and himself Esau's servant. Jacob was evidently in Esau's power, and he obsequiously acknowledges it. This does not look much like Esau's serving Jacob. He is rather his avowed lord. Jacob always treated him as his superior. Hence we infer that the text was not fulfilled in their persons. Esau never did serve Jacob.

The questions then arise when, and how, was it fulfilled? It was fulfilled in their posterity just as it was prophesied. The elder people did become the servants of the younger people, as we may learn by reading 2 Sam. 8 : 14 ; or 1 Chron. 18 : 13 ; "All they of Edom became David's servants." By reading the thirty-fifth chapter of Ezekiel, and the book Obadiah, it will be seen that all this was brought upon Edom on account of corruption and sin, and not on account of any anterior decree.

Paul goes on to say in the thirteenth verse, "As it is written, Jacob have I loved but Esau have I hated." This was said to Israel, another name for Jacob, as recorded in Malachi twelve hundred years after the death of Jacob and Esau, and with direct reference to the nations called after their names. Why did God hate Esau and lay his mountains and his heritage waste for

the dragons of the wilderness? For the same reason that he destroyed Sodom and Tyre and Babylon. God's dealings here as well as elsewhere have reference to character. He does not arbitrarily have mercy or harden.

To have mercy is to justify—to pardon. That God might be just and justify sinners, he gave his Son to die, who thereby became a sacrifice for us, a pledge of his willingness to have mercy.

He will have mercy on his covenanted people. "God will be merciful to his people." He keepeth covenant and mercy with his servants that walk before him with all their heart. These are reliable assurances. He will not only have mercy on them that fear him but also on the returning backslider and the repentant sinner. This he has clearly asserted. "Return backsliding Israel and I will not cause my anger to fall upon you; for I am merciful." Again it is said "Rend your hearts and not your garments and turn unto the Lord; for he is gracious and merciful." However base, "Let the wicked forsake his ways and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord and he will have mercy, and to our God; for he will abundantly pardon."

Many are the passages which make repentance, faith, obedience, conditions of mercy, and assure us that there is no failure to him who complies with them. In short so free and full are the overtures of mercy that whosoever will accept through Christ, shall receive. The order is, "Let him take the water of life freely." This is not only in accordance with the declarations of Scripture, but also with the experience of men, and the history of the church. Whosoever will, may come and be saved. It appears evident then that God wills to have mercy on all who will receive it of him through Christ.

II. Whom does God will to harden? We have here strong intimations that he does harden some. "Whom he will, he hardens." The question is whom does he will to harden? It was his will that Pharaoh should become hard; and so of all who do in fact become hard. Not that he desires it—he forbids it. "He will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." God then wills the salvation of all men conditionally; i. e. through a knowledge of the truth, to

which they are to come. But if they will not come that they might have life, he has so constituted them that this same truth rejected will harden them and become the savor of death unto death, instead of life unto life, as it was designed. Now if the former may be ascribed to God why may not the latter in as much as it is equally as legitimate? In this sense God willed that Pharaoh should become hard. Even when his case was hopeless and his probation was virtually ended, he raised him up, i. e. roused him up and preserved him for a wise purpose. In vindication of his course, the apostle says, "What if God, willing to show his wrath and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction."

Wherever we find hard hearts, we may rest assured that it is the will of God that they should become so, not independent of their own deeds, but in consequence of their own deeds, by perversion of his mercies and blessings. We will mention some classes.

1. The skeptic. He is hard as a matter of fact; and he becomes so by his skepticism. If he does not believe in God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, he will not acknowledge himself susceptible of any tender impressions; and if the Spirit does strive with him he resists him, and in consequence, he becomes obdurate. He hardens his own heart—God hardens it or gives him up to hardness of heart.

2. Those who make God the author of sin. We have a good illustration before us. During our civil war and since, we have had tangible evidence of the hardening influence of slavery especially on those persons who made God its author. Only a few years ago, all were ready to acknowledge that slavery was a great moral evil, but there was no way of getting rid of it. It was entailed upon them. Since that day the public mind of the South changed remarkably, so that they were generally ready to affirm not only that slavery was right—the corner-stone of our Republic, but also that it was a God-given institution—founded on the Bible. In advocating these principles, they soon became hard. They demanded that slavery should be crowned monarch of the land, and control the government. If the nation

would not accede this right which they claimed then they were ready to destroy it, at the sacrifice of the blood of their own sons. The hardness of heart manifested in their reckless butcheries, and in the cruel starvation of more than 60,000 prisoners, exhibits itself in many hearts harder if possible than Pharaoh's.

So it is with every sin which makes God its author. It has a tendency to make a man callous to all moral obligation, as well as to Divine succor.

3. Those who will not work out their own salvation. All men are required to do this, and he who will not do it, ignores the convictions of his own heart as well as the commands of God; and as a consequence he becomes insensible—torpid. It is useless for him to shield himself under the idea that if he is to be saved, he will be, without any effort on his own part; or under the antinomian heresy that it is no use to pray, as prayer will not change the mind of God, who will do just the same for him without it as with it. How can any one believe this when God has so plainly told him in his word to seek him—to work out his own salvation, to run the race—to ask as conditions of receiving. If he refuses to do what God commands, what is duty, he will harden his heart just as really as Pharaoh did in refusing to do what God commanded him, which was his duty, viz., to let the children of Israel go. It is just as necessary that the drowning man take hold of the rope thrown him, which is his duty, as it is that the rope should be thrown. Duty must be done or the fatal consequences are inevitable.

4. Those who encourage others to sin become hard. Take for example the rumseller. He entices a man to drink for the sake of the pittance which his family ought to have for bread. Taking this from the poor man and sending him home to his starving family worse than a beast, is like a hot iron to his own conscience. No wonder that when the haggard, starving wife and mother pleads with him who has been the cause of her wretchedness, with tears in her eyes not to sell her husband any more liquor,—no wonder that he has no feeling, and drives her harshly away, saying, that he shall sell him liquor as long as he pays for it. Such a man must be hard; and though God may will such a result to such a course he does not will the course, and

he who pursues it does it on his own responsibility in violation of God's commands; and he is so constituted that induration of heart will inevitably follow. It is a penal result. So it is with any who pander to the appetites and passions of others—who sell themselves or procure others for illicit gratification for the sake of the pay. He who seduces the innocent for his own gratification is a hardened wretch, but he who does it for paltry gain to minister to the gratification of others, is still more obdurate.

5. Those who profess to be Christ's, and in works deny him. The Scribes and Pharisees made great professions; but who among the Jews were harder? Christ points out their sins, representing them in the strongest terms. He says, "Ye serpents! ye generation of vipers! How can ye escape the damnation of hell?"

The hypocrite is a clear case. He directly if not designedly, adopts the hardening process, and what else could be expected?—There is a class of persons more innocent than the above, who are in danger of experiencing a similar result. They honestly mean to be Christians, but they are so reluctant to attend to religious duties that they neglect one duty after another until they become cold, indifferent, callous, without hardly knowing how. They do not realize that "Faith without works is dead"—that they may be dead while living. The process is so gradual and insinuating, that their hearts become hard before they are aware of it. They forsake perhaps the assembling of themselves together for worship, omit little duties and sink gradually down into a state of darkness, doubt and spiritual death and hopeless despair.

6. Those who utterly refuse proffered mercy. God offers mercy in such a way as to make them feel. He sends his Spirit to touch the heart, impress the truth upon it, and strengthen the good resolutions. The refusal to accept re-acts like cold water upon the heated steel, and makes the heart hard. The process goes on until it is no longer susceptible of impression. The Spirit no longer strives, and the sinner is given over to inveteracy of heart—"to believe a lie that he might be damned." He commits the unpardonable sin.

7. Those who harden themselves, God will harden. Under-

stand me. God does not will that they should harden themselves, but if they do, it is his will that the result should follow. It is legitimate and must follow. God will not work a miracle to prevent it. Indeed he has established the law of sequence and in this sense he may be said to harden the heart. This leads us to inquire—

III. How does God harden men? The Bible affirms that he does do it. "Whom he will he hardeneth." No one can doubt that the allusion here is made to Pharaoh of whom the apostle has just been speaking. Here let us go back to the account in the Old Testament, and ascertain if we can how God hardened Pharaoh's heart; for I presume that on the same principle, he hardens men's hearts at the present time.

In the account in Exodus it is said that God hardened Pharaoh's heart, that he hardened his own heart, and that his heart was hardened. These expressions all have reference to the same thing, viz., to the hardening of Pharaoh's heart; and I suppose that they are all true. It appears that God performed miracles by the hand of Moses which had a tendency at the time to soften his heart, but when the judgment was removed, then his selfishness prevailed and his heart became harder than before; just as it is now when God strives with the sinner and makes his heart tender, if he does not obey him, he will inevitably become harder. Either God hardens his heart, or he hardens his own heart, or both. We think both have a hand in it. This was doubtless the case with Pharaoh.

The question is how does God harden the heart? I do not suppose that he has any secret way of doing it, which is not open to inspection. He did not exert a direct, secret influence on Pharaoh's mind in order to secure the result. This would destroy Pharaoh's responsibility. God's dealings with him made him hard; and what were these but the manifestation of his power in the withdrawal of his judgments and the exhibition of his mercy? God evidently hardened him by the interposition of mercy, and the withdrawal of judgments. It was then, as it is now, and always has been. "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." Who sets the

heart? God mercifully delays the punishment; but is he therefore responsible for the condition of heart which follows the abuse of the mercy? No one would think of making him so. All God does will not relieve the sinner of his responsibility.

God hardens men—

1. By continuing life, health, the many blessings of life, and the use of the moral faculties and of the intellectual powers of mind. He preserved Pharaoh else he would not have been so hard as he was. Restoring temporal blessings which had been for a time removed, seemed to be followed again and again by greater obduracy; just so it is now.

2. By withholding punishment which is due. As we have already seen, delay leads to forgetfulness. If a man is not arrested immediately for a crime of which he is guilty, he hopes; if a long time intervenes, he becomes confident of escape. So the transgressor becomes hardened in sin—callous to all tender feeling. We sometimes say “he is gospel hardened.” The Gospel hardens just as God does. Not that it was designed to do this specifically, but if it is neglected and perverted that is the result—a punitive result.

3. God hardens men by offering them salvation through Christ. It seems strange that it should be so, yet so it is! There is a natural aversion among men to the religion of Christ, and the disposition to procrastinate the free offer of eternal life is such that it is deferred under the impression that there is time enough yet. Men know that they are in danger but they become inured to it so that it makes no very deep impression. Like those exposed to a volcanic eruption or an earthquake, they become indifferent to it. Our soldiers in the late war would be exposed to the fire of the enemy every day for months, and think nothing of it. I have seen an account of a village among the Alps so situated that it was exposed to an avalanche of rock from above, which would completely destroy it. The inhabitants knew their danger, and their only safety in flight, and still they remained! They measured the fissure, made it a subject of conversation, became familiar with its progress of separation and speculated on the time it would probably take to detach itself entirely and fall upon them. Under these circum-

stances, they remained and grew harder and harder. As they could make their escape at any time, they delayed and became indifferent to the danger. So the sinner becomes indifferent to his salvation.

4. God hardens men by continuing the influences of his Spirit. This is not the design of the favor on the part of God but as in the other cases it is a result, through the perversion of men. The Spirit comes to soften, to help our infirmities, and to lead us to Christ; but if he is resisted—if means are taken to extinguish his influences, it harden us just as really as cold water hardens the heated steel. No greater blessing is conferred on man than the gift of the Spirit and if he rightly avails himself of his assistance, it proves of incalculable benefit. But if it is perverted, the greater the blessing, the greater the injury.

Here may be seen the guilt of the hardened sinner. It is his own fault, and public sentiment usually so considers it. To say that a man is a hardened criminal is to say that he is deserving of a severe punishment, implying that he is responsible for his condition. If God hardened him in an absolute sense, his condition would be the occasion for pity instead of censure, as in the case of a broken bone or a mangled limb, which could not be avoided. Now, the harder he is, the more guilty he is in our estimation.

But says one, "Does not the Divine foreknowledge fix the facts?" We answer No! The facts determine the foreknowledge. The facts or acts of the free agent determine the foreknowledge very much as they determine our present knowledge. Without them we could not know them; and without them God could not foreknow them. The difference appears to be that we take cognizance of them as they transpire more or less imperfectly, while God takes a perfect cognizance of them beforehand. His prescience is not to be questioned. All the events of time were a present cognition to him at the beginning, just as much as they will be at the judgment, so that predestination is founded on the same free responsible acts of the creature—the deeds done here in the body—as is the final sentence. Men will be finally judged "according to the deeds done here in the body." Men are predestinated "before the foundation of the

world," "according to the deeds done here in the body," apprehended by that God who knows the end from the beginning, as perfectly as at the judgment.

Whatever the moral agent does, God knows it because he does it, and this knowledge is antecedent to his election or rejection, in nature, though not in time; so that the guilt falls upon the sinner as really as though God had no prescience of his acts.

The great practical question however is, to secure the divine mercy. This we have every encouragement to seek. "Seek and ye shall find." There can be no doubt of the result, if we comply with the conditions. Here is where our duty lies. We can have no excuse. "He that is wise is wise for himself and he that scorns he alone must bear it."

ART. II.—THE FIRST RESURRECTION.

AN EXPOSITION OF REV. 20: 4, 5.

BY REV. S. D. CHURCH, BRUNSWICK, ME.

This passage of Scripture has given rise to much discussion. Expositors are divided in opinion, as to whether these words are to be taken in their literal, or spiritual sense; whether a physical or a spiritual resurrection is intended. We hope to be able to present some thoughts which may aid in understanding the matter.

We think there is no foundation for the idea that there shall be a resurrection of the bodies of the righteous dead prior to that of the wicked. We adduce the following reasons for rejecting the theory of two corporal resurrections:—

1. Nothing of the kind is indicated in the text itself. The Revelator says: "I saw the souls of them that were beheaded." The men whose souls he saw had been beheaded on account of

their fidelity to the cause of Christ. These souls lived and reigned with Christ. This is the first resurrection.

2. No intimation is given elsewhere in the Bible that the resurrection of the righteous will precede that of the wicked. 1 Thes. 4 : 16 is sometimes quoted in proof of such a position ; but a careful examination of the text in its connection will show that the apostle had no such thought in his mind. The Thesalonians were concerned about their pious brethren who had died already, or who might die, before the coming of the Lord ; the Apostle assures them, that such persons would be raised before those who were alive were caught up to meet the Lord in the air. No allusion, whatever, is made to the wicked. "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."

3. Elsewhere the doctrine of one bodily resurrection is taught. Says Paul : "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." Acts 24 : 15. Here the apostle, instead of saying there shall be two resurrections, one of the just, and another of the unjust, says, there shall be a—one—resurrection for both the just and the unjust. Of similar import are the words of Jesus : "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in their 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." John 5 : 28, 29.

4. The Bible associates the coming of Christ with the resurrection of the dead, and the perdition of ungodly men. But the coming of Christ is a day of joyfulness to the saints. Hence, if it can be shown, that the ungodly receive their doom at the same time that the righteous are rewarded ; there will be left no room for the resurrection of the saints a thousand years before the rest of their fellow men. Says the apostle Peter : "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night ; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat ; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burnt up. But the heavens and the earth which now are, ac-

ording to the same word, are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and the perdition of ungodly men." 2 Pet. 3 : 7, 10. In these texts the following points are made :

1. The coming of the Lord and the day of judgment are closely connected.

2. The coming of the Lord and the destruction of the earth are presented as occurring nearly together.

3. In verse 13th the rewards of the righteous are introduced as occurring subsequently to the punishment of the ungodly.

The order of events as sketched by Peter is as follows :

1. The coming of Christ. 2. The burning up of the world. 3. The perdition of ungodly men. 4. The reward of the righteous. But this is very different from the order of events which those insist upon who teach two bodily resurrections. Their order would seem to be ; 1. The coming of the Lord. 2. The resurrection of the righteous. 3. A thousand years reign on earth. 4. The resurrection of the wicked and their destruction.

But there are other passages of Scripture which bear upon this subject ; among them we note 2 Thess. 1 : 7—10 ; " The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power ; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints." Instead of the punishment of the disobedient being reserved until after a thousand years reign of the righteous, they are here represented as receiving their doom, when Christ comes again. Of a similar nature are the teachings of Christ, as recorded in Matt. 13 : 30. " Let both grow together until the harvest ; and in the time of the harvest I will say to the reapers, gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them ; but gather the wheat into my barn." " The harvest is the end of the world," not a thousand years before that time. " The wheat and the tares grow together until the harvest." The tares are not pulled up a thousand years before the wheat, nor the wheat a thousand years before the tares. The tares are first burned, then the wheat is garnered. " The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast

into the sea, and gathered of every kind; which when it was full they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away." To make this parable comport with the theory of a thousand years' reign of the righteous on earth, prior to the resurrection of the wicked, it should read as follows: The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net which was cast into the sea, which gathered only the good fishes; but a thousand years later it was cast in again and gathered only the bad.

In Matt. 25:14—30, there is a record given of the parable of the talents. The point in this parable that touches the matter under consideration, is the fact that the slothful servant is punished in the same day that the faithful ones are rewarded; indeed, a part of the reward is taking the one talent from him that had neglected it, and giving it to the one who had been the most faithful. In the verses following this parable, there is given a vivid description of the judgment-day. All nations are assembled before the Lord; the people are separated the one from the other as a shepherd divideth his flock, the sheep from the goats; the one class is separated from the other. To the one he says; "Come," to the other, "Depart." It will be observed, that in the parable of the tares, the tares were "first" bound in bundles, and burned, then the wheat was gathered into the barn; but in the parable of the net cast into the sea, the order is reversed, the good are first gathered into vessels, and then the bad are cast away; while here in this most graphic description of the judgment, the one class now takes the precedence of time in the narration, and presently the other has it. Hence there is no room for a thousand years to intervene between the resurrection and the judgment of the two classes.

We now turn to consider some of the embarrassments under which the doctrine of two bodily resurrections labors, in the attempt to adjust itself to the Scriptures in connection with which it is supposed to stand. If we assume that the first resurrection is a bodily resurrection, we must also assume that the coming of Christ precedes it. But we have seen that at the coming of Christ the ungodly are punished with everlasting destruction, that the heavens, being on fire, shall pass away with a

great noise ; the earth and all that is therein shall be burned up. But how shall we reconcile these things with what is stated in the same chapter, in which the first resurrection is described ? The righteous are found reigning (according to the theory we are considering,) with Christ on earth a thousand years. What earth ? This earth ? According to Peter, at the coming of the Lord, the heavens, being on fire, shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. According to John, the heavens and the earth will flee away, at that time, and " no place be found for them." Reply may be made that the reign of the martyrs will be on the new earth. But can we account for the presence of ungodly nations on the new earth ? Will ungodly men, who were buried in the old world, have a resurrection in the new ? Will Satan find his way upon that new earth wherein only righteousness dwelleth ?

But there are other difficulties in the way of the exegesis to which we have objected. No mention is made whatever of the coming of Christ, or of the destruction of the world, or of the judgment of men, prior to the first resurrection, or in connection with it. On the contrary, the coming of Christ, the fleeing away of the earth, the resurrection of the dead, and the general judgment are placed by the Revelator after this first resurrection.

Having found the doctrine of a bodily resurrection of the saints a thousand years before that of the rest of the dead, beset with so many difficulties, and supported by no Scripture authority, we turn from it as untenable, and seek a theory against which less may justly be urged. We shall assume, therefore, that the first resurrection is the resurrection of the soul, which takes place when its connection with the body is dissolved. The text reads ; " I saw the souls of them that were beheaded . . they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years . . This is the first resurrection." We are not to suppose that they ceased to reign when the thousand years were ended, nor is it necessary to suppose that they did not reign before the thousand years began. The essential thing in this resurrection is, that souls not incarcerated in the body reigned with Christ. No allusion is made as to where they reigned, except it is said, that they reigned with Christ. Wherever Christ is before the judgment day, there his saints will be.

We are now to discover, if possible, support for this interesting doctrine. One text alone might be enough for the support of a doctrine, but where it has been tortured so as to be made to teach all manner of errors, it may be well to compare its most literal meaning with other texts of Scripture. Christ discoursing with the Sadducees, said some things "touching the resurrection." It becomes us carefully to notice where he touched that doctrine.

"But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Not a syllable is here uttered concerning a bodily resurrection. The bodies of the patriarchs here named were dead, and God is not a God of the dead, but of the living, hence he was the God of the souls of these men. But where does this fact touch the doctrine of the resurrection? Certainly not at the point of a bodily resurrection, else God had said, "I will be," instead of, "I am the God of Abraham." The point where the resurrection is touched in this discourse is where these patriarchs are represented as enjoying it, the soul-resurrection, at the time God spake to Moses. But the Revelator called the soul-resurrection the first resurrection.

Additional light is cast upon this subject by St. Luke. "They that are accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage." Luke 20: 35. Here, then, is a resurrection which some are accounted worthy to obtain, and those who obtain it are called the "children of God, being the children of the resurrection." This certainly cannot pertain to a bodily resurrection; for all must have a bodily resurrection whether they be good or bad. "All that are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth." But some come forth to shame and everlasting contempt, to the resurrection of damnation. Hence it follows that there is a resurrection which some are accounted worthy to obtain, and having obtained it, they are henceforth the children of God; they are equal to the angels, neither can they die any more. This corresponds with what John said of the souls of them that were beheaded; they reigned with Christ,

they were blessed and holy, and on them the second death had no power. So, according to the word of Jesus, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were enjoying a resurrection while their bodies were in the dust; and, according to his most beloved disciple, those who for their fidelity had been beheaded, were enjoying a similar resurrection.

The apostle Paul speaks with reference to this same resurrection in Phil. 3 : 11, 12. "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." Here, again, is a man seeking after a resurrection; of the resurrection of his body he is assured; but there is another resurrection for which he endures all things, for which he is willing to die, one which he shall possess when he dies; this is none other than the first resurrection of the soul.

The next question that meets us while considering this matter is, when and where shall the saints reign with Christ? It is apparent that if they reign with him, they must reign when and where he reigns. This is a subject worthy our candid attention.

After Jesus rose from the dead he appeared unto his disciples and said; "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." His reign must date from the reception of this power, which we may suppose he received in its fullness after his resurrection. His throne is in heaven. When Stephen was stoned he saw the heavens open, and the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of that glory. Paul says of him, "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 to the glory of God the Father." Phil. 2 : 9—11. Jesus himself also testifies to the same thing, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne." Rev. 3 : 21. Thus the reign of Jesus may properly be said to commence at

the time of his resurrection; his throne is in heaven; his subjects are both in heaven and in earth.

To make assurance doubly sure, the Scriptures reveal to us the time of the end of this reign. 1 Cor. 15: 24, 28. "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. . . . And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."*

A few things are noticeable here. The apostle is discoursing upon the resurrection of the righteous dead, their bodily resurrection. Christ's coming is spoken of as occurring at this time; a time which is to be delayed until all enemies are put under his feet. When he comes, it is not to reign with the saints a thousand years, but to deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father. Hence it follows, that if the saints ever reign with Jesus on earth or in heaven, they must reign with him before he comes to raise the dead, whether they be good or bad.

We have now determined the time of this reign of a thousand years, and incidentally located the throne of the kingdom in heaven. In one passage which we have adduced above, mention is made of the conditions upon which men who now live on earth may share in the joy of this reign; "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne." The inference is that he shall sit with him when he has overcome. The matter of reigning with Christ is presented in Matt. 19: 28. "Jesus said unto them, verily, I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." In this text no mention is made of any but the twelve apostles sitting, and judging with Christ. Still, as others are mentioned in other places, and as they are not excluded here, we may infer that all

* For a fuller discussion of this interesting subject the reader is referred to *F. B. Quarterly*, 1867, No. I; Art. V.

shall share in this glory. The time is here stated to be, when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory. As he leaves that throne when the judging is ended, we are forced to the conclusion that this reigning with Christ must end when the judging ends, that is, at the judgment.

The discussion thus far must be considered as preliminary to a correct understanding of the text in its connection. Questions like the following will very naturally be asked:— If the reign of the righteous begins at their death and continues until the coming of Christ, why is it limited to a thousand years in the text? And if all the righteous share in the first resurrection, why does the Revelator limit the number to such as were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, during the reign of a certain power symbolized by him as the beast and his image?

To answer such questions the discussion must be continued on a new basis. We find ourselves, while studying the book of Revelation, in a world of symbols, and when we have discovered the meaning of the symbol, and the source whence it is drawn, we have yet to find out its application. The author of this book is delineating in chronological prophecy the history of the world from his time to the end. Step by step he has traced the events until now he reaches a new epoch. The seven-headed, ten-horned monster, by which Rome is designated, is bound and cast into the bottomless pit.* A new state of society is now to be ushered in upon the earth, and a new symbol is necessary. Dragons and devils were fitly chosen to symbolize the dominion of Rome; but something very different is necessary for this new order of things.

In selecting the symbol a number of things are to be borne in mind: (1.) That the symbol itself be appropriate. (2.) That it shall be so chosen as to give encouragement to men under persecution to endure. (3.) That it shall suggest the state of society during the time to which it is intended to pertain. We shall now see that all these conditions are fully met. (1.) Its appropriateness. John had seen dragons, and furious beasts

* For a fuller discussion of this subject see *F. B. Quarterly*, 1868. No. 3. Art. IV.

coming up out of the sea and land, as symbols of the iniquity that had hitherto prevailed. It is fitting that he look towards heaven for symbols of a better state. Accordingly he catches a glimpse of the heavenly world. He sees the souls of the righteous reigning with Christ in glory, and he makes the glory which he sees in heaven an emblem of the happy state which is to be experienced on earth. He limits the time to a thousand years, not because the bliss of the heavenly reign is thus limited, but because at the close of that period the joy of earth is to be broken in upon by the demonstrations of ungodly men, having similar designs with those who ruled the earth before that period began. (2.) There is something like poetic justice done in thus choosing these men as the symbols of the better state. Many had suffered martyrdom during the reign of the "dragon," or the power thus symbolized. But the Revelator is made to see them in their enthroned condition. This must have been a source of strength to the church at the time that it was passing through the fires of persecution; and, rightly understood, it is still a source of strength to such as suffer for the cause of Christ. Each precious saint, as he laid his head upon the block, knew that his soul should live and reign with Christ. But beyond this source of personal joy and strength, by choosing these souls in their enthroned state as symbols of the condition of the earth, after the reign of the dragon is past, the Revelator is saying: "Ye shall not die, but live and reign. The principles for which you are beheaded shall triumph upon earth. Men with your faith, and love, and power, shall arise and rule the earth, and the rest of the dead, such as corrupted the earth in their lifetime, or denied the faith, shall not live, shall have no place on earth for the thousand years."

What shall be the state of society during this period? The wildest vagaries, the absurdest visions, and the crudest conceptions, have been put forth as sound sense, when discoursing upon this symbol. We need not suppose the world to be then much different from what it is now in its best portions to fulfill all that is implied in the symbol. The rule of Rome is broken. Men fearing God and loving righteousness have the control of the affairs of the state. Righteous laws protect men in the service of God. Even while the dragon ruled, the world was

not wholly bad. There were some good men else there had been no martyrs. Nor need we expect that the world will be wholly good when good men rule.

Many have erroneously supposed that the dragon here bound was Satan in his real person. Nothing of the sort is intimated in the Scriptures. The dragon of Revelation is Rome. Satan doubtless worked in and through that power for the accomplishment of his purposes, and when that organization is broken up he will lose so much of his power; but there is no reason to suppose that there shall not be a probation still; wheat and tares growing side by side; the marriage feast and the funeral dirge; children born and old men dying. Is. 65: 17—25. Indeed, there is no intimation that idolatry will entirely cease during this period. This may seem extremely absurd to such as reveth only in dreams of bliss without comparing Scripture with Scripture. See Micah 4: 1—5. "And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. For all the people will walk every one in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God." By this it seems that no one is to be persecuted on account of his religion whether it be true or false.

Many have supposed that all nations will be Christian during this period, but this idea is not sustained. It is stated that the dragon shall deceive the nations no more during that period. But what nations? The nations which were under his sway before; just these and no more. Indeed, the "whole world," as denominated in the Scriptures, embraced only a small territory lying around the Mediterranean sea. Luke 2: 1; Acts 2: 5—11; Col. 1: 23.

Taking this view of the subject, we have no difficulty in accounting for the presence of the nations which dwell upon the four quarters of the earth, at the close of the thousand years. They may never have been converted; or having been converted, the government of them may fall into corrupt hands, and their power become used for the destruction of some people in what is denominated the "holy city," perhaps Jerusalem as re-

builded, and restored to the worship of the true God. If Satan should then find some nation through which he might operate as he has through Rome, it would indeed be a loosing of him out of his prison.

ART. III.—CHRIST'S EXALTATION AND UNIVERSAL DRAWING.

Christ never concealed from his disciples that the great end he had in view by his coming, could be gained only by his sufferings and death. They expected a present glory. Why not, they said, build the Tabernacle on Tabor, though it be an earthly mount; why not erect the throne fittingly within that city which is a type of the joy of the whole earth. They dwelt in thought upon the glad hour when, wayworn and disputed no longer, the kings of the earth should bow to his scepter.

So when certain Greeks sought him, Philip and Andrew hasten to tell him of the new honor. The expression of Isaiah, "The Gentiles shall come to thy light and kings to the brightness of thy rising," flashes upon their memory. This is the earnest of fulfillment. Surely, they think, the Master will be comforted by this dawning prospect of triumph.

With the assurance of a conqueror the reply comes: the hour is indeed come when the Son of man shall be glorified, but not by the seeking of Jew or Greek; the cross and its agony alone, can glorify him who receives no glory from the homage of men; deep as my humiliation has been, greater burdens are before me and sharper trials await your faith; the grain of wheat abides alone and is fruitless save it fall into the ground and die; take this declaration, rather, strange as it may seem to you, as the sign of my triumph, "for now shall the Son of man be lifted up upon the cross."

Christ's death upon the cross is the casting in of the seed; the fruit is the drawing of all men unto him. We are concern-

ed to inquire : how does this death result in such a ministry to the race ; how is this drawing exerted ; what is its power.

It proves God's unlimited, all-pervading love. It declares in the most emphatic way that God loves us. In some general way, without turning our eyes toward the cross, we believe that God loves us. But the sense of that love is imperfect and inconstant. If unclouded skies are above us and the joys of life come pulsing in upon the heart, we readily conceive of God with approving thought; we say he loves us. But when adversity spreads its pall over our cherished projects or darkness rests upon our loved pictures of beauty, we readily chide him and declare that he does not love nor care for us. God's love is always a distant, undefined thing save as the cross of Christ brings it near and makes it the one great reality to the soul. Christ's mission and death for our sakes, correct our wayward and imperfect thinking, and teach us that the Father's love surrounds us like the atmosphere and pervades all things; sustains every faculty of body and mind; watches every movement; is glad over a right deed but is wounded by our ingratitude, is pierced by our guilt. Before that view of Calvary is gained, the love of father, of sister, or of wife or mother may seem the very dearest love of all, but the tenderness and compassion, the pity and the love, which beam out from that divine sacrifice, exhibit Christ's supreme right to say to the soul: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me. Whosoever forsaketh not all that he hath cannot be my disciple."

In the days of his earthly mission only a few hearts comprehended his love. They saw it in each act and holy utterance, and gave themselves to its guidance. But this comprehension must be made possible to a universe. His life was indeed a continual seeking of helpless, sinful wanderers, a constant drawing from death to life, but such a ministry was local. He must likewise show that this divine love extended beyond the hours he might spend with his disciples here; in proof of love he must die; as an unfailing assurance of enduring love he sends the Comforter.

By his death his work for tempted, sinful souls is freed from any one locality where his bodily presence might be, to become

a more mighty drawing for the whole race. Clothed in the body of flesh, only a few, comparatively, could hear his words of hope and forgiveness; his feet could hasten to the bedside of only a few sufferers; only here and there could a group of mourners feel his comforting presence. The fountain may be sweet and full where it gushes up amid the cool recesses of the valley, but its ministry is confined and simple; the fountains in the sky send refreshment to all the meadows and furrows of the husbandman.

So his voice is no longer confined to the shores of Gennesaret, the words of blessing are breathed not upon the mount of Olives alone; they fall upon every shore and every land; they distill as dew upon every mountain top and fall in refreshment upon every plain. Tenderness finds expression not at the grave of one Lazarus only, but beside the graves of our buried treasures, the world over, he stands with words of consolation. Every sufferer may now hear his voice and grow strong for endurance.

“But warm, sweet, tender, even yet
A present help is he;
And faith has still its Olivet,
And love its Galilee.

“The healing of his seamless dress
Is by our beds of pain,
We touch him in life's throng and press,
And we are whole again.”

His abode here confined to a narrow work that mighty heart which would draw the whole world unto him. He ascended that heaven and earth might be filled with that love; then that heart was open to the seeking of every soul. His enemies feared that he would draw all the world after him and therefore slew him. So, then, his prophecy opened up into fulfillment— they lift him up and the mightier, fuller drawing began.

This drawing results from Christ's death because of the attractive power which his death imparts to the truths he uttered. Truth is commended to men in the strongest possible manner by him who dies to defend it or to prove its worth.

The principles of republicanism are exalted beyond measure in the eyes of other nations as well as our own, by the sacrifices which a four years' struggle for national integrity laid upon the altar of freedom. In proportion to the costliness of sacrifice, so are the principles which noble hearts maintained in mortal combat glorified in the sight of men. A struggle that cost us Lyon and Foote and Dahlgren, Shaw and Mitchell and Lincoln, with a host of brave, true hearts, gives sacredness to liberty and throws a halo of living, sacred light around the question of universal freedom, such as shall make men fear as never before, to attempt to cast reproach upon it or to resist it.

Christ proclaimed God's love and men mocked at him; his death places the truth beyond cavil and gives untold urgency to his invitations to receive it. That must, we feel, be the most sacred, necessary truth which the Son of the living God should die to prove. He overcomes the disbelief of the heart in respect to the interest of God in its welfare, by showing the abounding love of God.

The noblest thing we can say of any man is: "He died for us." We willingly build his monument and keep his memory sacred. Henceforth we are glad to acknowledge the power of his life by imitating his virtues and striving for like strength and honor. So when the sinner feels in his very soul that Jesus died to save him, he yields himself a willing sacrifice for Jesus' sake. Penitence and love must go out to meet him when he is truly beholden as the sufferer for our guilt.

He only could draw us unto him, who should thus ascend triumphant over death to reign in heaven. To-day we look up to him. He is above us in exceeding honor, enthroned above all other excellence. We need an exhibition of supreme, perfect self-denial. Take this away, bid us no longer look up for its impersonation in a crucified and risen Saviour and we should cease to exhibit self-denial. That exhibition alone makes the demand of Christ that we lose our lives for his sake, at all welcome to the heart; for hath he not borne all and become our sacrifice?

The noblest and best things must be placed above us. That which we can familiarly see and touch loses its power. Great-

ness is pictured as a high; improvement is going up higher. Reverence is inspired by that which is above us. The mists that are without beauty when encircling us, bring pure delight and peaceful ministries when once risen on high and become beautified in the robes the sun bids them wear.

This lifting up—this wondrous act of sacrificial love—resulting in highest glory, makes his ministry to the heart the needed one for unlocking the fountains of human feeling. Before it the soul is melted in penitence, imbued with awe, wakened to joy, bowed in fear, roused to triumph. By it we are taught to vanquish self-love and accept gladly the sheltered, though almost deserted ways of God-given duty.

How in all that centers about the story of the cross, we are let into the deepest possible discovery of God's great thoughts of salvation for the race. "We cannot think of Him superficially now any more; but we must go far enough in, deep enough down, to be mining, as it were, in his nature. . . . God is manifest in the flesh. In his human person, Jesus is the incarnate word of the Father. By great works and all divinest charities he shows the precious thoughts and becomes the express image of God's inmost mind. He has no difficulty in saying, 'I and my Father;' and as little in saying, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' Herein is love, herein are all God's dispositions, all God's patiences, condescensions, tendernesses, forgivenesses, all the righteousnesses; and the sacrifice of the cross declares them as in one comprehensive act of expression. God is visibly out, so that an apostle is moved to say: 'For God hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' The revelation is facial, so to speak, as if the cross of sacrifice were some inside-out forth-coming. And when he is declared as 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' what are we to understand but that in God's previous eternity of thought and character there was a bleeding side of sacrifice, a cross, which John saluted when he recognized the Lambhood of Jesus: 'Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world?' And when he dies—this Lamb of God—how far in opens the gate upon God's inmost counsel and feeling? We

behold the one great, world-forgiving thought, we are fully atoned, our gospel of life is born!"*

This drawing exerted by Jesus is the one great fact in which heaven is interested. There is no joy felt concerning this earth like that over a returning soul. We mistake greatly when we imagine God's efforts for us and the blessings he bestows, to be proofs of his pleasure in us while we are in our sins. All that God does for us is meant to lead the soul to his salvation, to catch the wandering gaze of the wayward soul and fix it upon his love in Christ. We pervert his utterances and take pleasure in our sins as if heaven were not striving for our rescue. There is no voice swelling up from tree or flower, singing in the harmonies of rolling spheres, which varies its utterance from this great end: the salvation of the soul of man.

In these days of culture men are pleased to worship nature. She is our God, she is our Mediator and Atonement, rings out upon our ears from those who proudly break with a faith that heals, strengthens and saves. By the heart seeking to be its own redeemer, nature is falsely interpreted to the increase of its pride, to the fatal exclusion of God. To the obedient heart she points only to the Son of God. All her voices, all her forms of beauty are meant to remind us of things of soul-joy which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard. In her untiring zeal for her Creator, she says to us boldly: if you speak pleasant words over my offerings but have no real gratitude swelling forth to God, if in my calmness you are wrought into serenity but look not upward for everlasting peace, if you love flower and lake and tree, if you look with adoration upon sun and star, and yet do not adore the Redeemer to whom all these bow, your voice is in discord with every other voice and your presence is the only godless one. In their intimate sympathy with the Redeemer, the forces of nature shrink from him who insists upon throwing the discordant notes of an unreconciled spirit into her heavenly singing.

The universal answering of nature to the quickening rays of the sun is telling in the unwilling human ear how our hearts

* Dr. Bushnell's sermon before the S. S. Convention, Hartford, Ct.

should respond to the drawing of the Saviour of men. As the sun's rays fall upon lake and ocean and stagnant waters of the pool or foul morass, but suffer no defilement, so the beams of the Sun of Righteousness fall upon the heart of the malefactor and of the moralist, upon the sinner and the saint, the reprobate and the penitent, leaving all without excuse. None can say: He neglected me, for the witness of mercy comes in some form to all. Though the life to which it appeals give back answers of hate, yet is Christ glorified by even unavailing offers of salvation—all are without excuse. But as the responsive mists, rising up at the bidding of the natural sun from the slough and the ocean, are beautified in the glories of his dawning or from his radiant car as he hastens to his setting, or are formed a bow of hope and beauty over the earth, so the souls which respond to the drawing of Jesus shall reflect his glory in the hues which he shall bid them wear in heaven, encircling his throne with a radiance gathering new glory forever and ever.

Christ draws but we do not yield, and so the direst defeats and heaviest woes of life fall upon us. That we may yield to his drawing he sends many of the bitter experiences of life to break up the fatal illusions of the soul. So he throws us into dissatisfaction with our cherished earthly plans that we may seek his paths. He sends defeat to the seeking for earthly gain that we may learn to lay up heavenly treasure. He has taught many a soul how to stand up amid the wrecks of earthly fortune and thank him for the new revelation of a firm, sustaining hand amid the desolation. As the eagle stirs up her nest, making it uncomfortable for her young, that they may fly out to freedom and strength, so Christ sends disturbing forces, unrest of soul that we may "arise and depart" for the enduring rest. "Thank God for suffering," is the calm utterance of the chastened heart, as suffering borne by Jesus' help brings in the deep peace of God. We repine over wearied bodies and aching nerves; let us rather say in trust: how know I what experiences my Master deems needful to steady passions strong as mine, to send groveling thoughts upward to the source of help and patience. Out of chambers of grief the soul may, in its yielding to the heavenly cords drawing it, walk forth with purer commun-

ings, cherishing a new life. Grief is transfigured as it ascends the mount of divine promise. Bereavements are the storms that beat upon our imperfect, yet trusted joys, to show our defenceless state without God. The language that discomfort and pain are ever uttering is: lay here no overmastering hopes, plan for enduring happiness high above the perishable and fleeting things of this life; look away to the everlasting hills of paternal promise, thence cometh your help.

By these truths we are taught that there is no elevation without some form of suffering. Our natures are unsubdued and weak because they are the slaves of passion. The will is unbent and two cannot walk together except they be agreed. We count only those worthy who endure. It behooved the Captain of our salvation to be made perfect through suffering. Only by such an ordeal could he be felt to be the Saviour of the race. He suffered and died for us, therefore we trust him. If any soul would grow strong, there is the race, the struggle, the contest, and after all, eternal rest. Aiming to tread easy, sunny paths, we miss the grandeur of a true life and mistake the indifference of the slave for the strength and calmness of a conqueror.

Only they who toil with an earnest, disinterested spirit for the race, only they who make real sacrifices for it, can win it to any better life. Until we are willing to accept the Master's lot, to be baptized with the baptism he was baptized with, to go cheerfully to unrequited, nay, to thankless tasks, until we can endure reproach even in well-doing, until self-love and ease are conquered in the presence of difficult tasks for a world's redemption, our efforts will avail little, and after all, will only awaken suspicion rather than confidence. With harsh, embittered spirit we shall learn to chide, and condemn the world we ought to save.

This drawing of Jesus cannot affect our hearts till we consent to yield to its power. His words are still powerful to draw the willing heart. Time weakens no utterance and destroys no claim to our supreme love. It is the great, earnest speech of the only one by whom we can be saved that says to-day, "If any man thirst," "I am the door," "Come unto me." But all these—needful, tender, urgent—have come to many in

the past as vainly as the voice of a mourner, calling again and again the name of the cold, dead form, as if to raise it to life.

Christ waits now for the eye to open, and the heart to answer to his drawing; till we heed him all is in vain.

What mean that yearning for a better life, that longing for a true hope, O unbelieving heart, which come in sometimes upon your hours of reflection and quiet, when you seem almost to come to yourself, and remember that in your Father's house there is bread enough and to spare? It is your Redeemer drawing you, it is his voice that troubles you and will not cease asking, is it well with you? Though you have tried with careless thought and trifling speech, by seeking companions whose society you knew would scatter your better convictions, yet Christ seeks avenues by which he may win you, sorrowing till you yield.

"Are there few that be saved?" was the earnest enquiry of old. "Strive to enter in at the strait gate," is the only answer given by the Teacher. Heaven is not shut to the seeking soul; thence are let down the most powerful, yet tender cords, drawing every heart that will not draw back. But what saith the Scripture; "If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him."

The only fear that need really agitate our hearts is, that when Christ speaks we shall not hear and interpret his words of love, nor be willing in the day of his power. Levity will have its laugh, but it proves nothing against its object. The frivolous will trifle. Irreverence will mock at this divine drawing and heavenly call, but do thou, O soul, if thou wouldst be at peace, follow them until they bring you to everlasting joy in Jesus Christ.

ART. IV.—RATIONALISM.

(Continued from the April Number.)

Fichte early became acquainted with Kant, adopted his philosophy, and became, at length, the representative of the Kantian system.

From the humble position of tutor in a noble family at Zurich, he was called to Jena, then the center of culture and erudition, to a philosophical professorship. He exerted a powerful influence upon the scientific movements of the day, aided, as he was, by the most celebrated thinkers of his time. Youth from Denmark, Poland, Switzerland, and from all parts of Germany, flocked to the lecture-room of this new interpreter of Kantian philosophy. His was the wand that, stretched out over the dim conceptions of the age, called up the spirits who else had been undefined.

While Kant taught that nothing which lies outside of time and space—outside the things grasped by the senses—can be an object for pure thinking, he does not attempt to prove that nothing outside of these things can exist. But the latter step was taken by his disciples, especially by Fichte, without shrinking, and soon led to the gross philosophy of Hegel.

Fichte, departing from the more modest and healthful teachings of his master, declared that the entire objective world is only a product of the human mind, only a reflection of what we create in our own brain; that instead of the images of outward things coming in upon our minds, we originate those images, images of things that have no existence except in the world which the mind makes for itself and in itself; that we first create things by thinking, we know them only as our thoughts create and present them to us. We shall soon see how, in Hegel, this idea was boldly developed so as to assert that *God* has no existence except as the mind gives him one.

While Fichte regarded the gospel of John as the only true source of the genuine doctrine of Christ, discarding the other three gospels, he so far failed to learn from John as to declare that, "Christianity is not a means of expiation or of reconciliation; man can never separate himself from God, and in so far

as he *imagines* himself separated from him, he is a nothing, and therefore cannot sin." His admired disciple declares: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."

Christ was not a Saviour to him in the sense of the Scriptures. But still Christ was conceived of in a manner entirely different from that of the Rationalists. He beheld the Master not as a teacher of morality, not the mere moral example, but as possessed of that real unity, that *oneness* with the Father, of which John speaks. But Christ was to him only the representative of something which occurs not once, but constantly—the experience of every religious man. So he says, "the eternal Word becomes flesh at all times, in every one, without exception, who understands, in a living manner, his oneness with God, and who really yields his entire individual life to the divine life in him . . . quite in the same manner as in Christ Jesus."

"At all events," says Hagenbach, "Fichte has the merit of having directed the attention to the soul of religion, and of having freed it from the servitude of mere morality. Although so many, and even orthodox Christians, had conceived eternal life only as future, as in another world, and though Kant had founded the faith in God and immortality chiefly on the necessity of a retribution in another world, Fichte placed eternal life (quite in accordance with Scripture) in this, that we know God *here*, love him, and feel ourselves united to him in blessed communion; and this living in God was to him, even in the earlier period of his life, before speculation had grown too strong for him, the sure guarantee for the future, just as it again," after his emancipation from a ghostly and dismal idealism, "became the same in his later years."

Schelling was at first an ardent admirer and follower of Fichte, but he soon became dissatisfied with that idealism which regards the world as only the reflection of our own minds. This dissatisfaction became very general among the thinking classes, but the influence of the idealistic philosophy could not be eradicated. When they returned to nature again, from their soaring with Fichte, they found it more beautiful, possessed of sweeter ministries for the soul; in it God was daily and hourly writing

out inscriptions of love and care, rather than leaving it to the control of mechanical laws, while he himself retired far from the scene.

Schelling's system appeared under the name of Philosophy of Nature. He made nature and spirit "the poles of one and the same life." Nature appears as a copy of the mind, the former being developed through successive stages, just as the latter is developed in its way to self-consciousness. Hence, in every organic thing, there is something symbolical, every shrub, flower and tree bears some feature of the human soul. The Kantian theory of the opposition of attraction and repulsion, of positive and negative electricity, of the opposition in physiology of irritability and sensibility, was rejected by Schelling. He insisted upon the unity of everything opposite, declaring that there were no dualities, but a harmonious, concrete identity. He conceived, therefore, of a world-soul, as the result of this unity of the positive and negative principle. Later in life, in common with Spinoza, he taught that, "besides reason there is nothing, and in it is everything. Reason is the absolute." He acknowledged no distinction between God and the world; the creature and the Creator he fused into one; our life is but a part of the world-soul which resides in all material substances,—“the stroke of the pulse of the great all-moving mundane soul.”

It will be perceived, at once, that this is utter Pantheism, leading to no real adoration of God but to a blind worship of nature, like that which characterizes the religions of heathendom. "No philosophy," says Tschirner, "ever promised me more, none ever gave me less. It has a lovely and bright appearance; if, however, we strip off the beautiful covering, a hollow, pale form appears, whose aspect we cannot bear to behold." He found himself deprived, notwithstanding all the bright promises of the Philosophy of Nature, of the substantial foundations which previous Rationalists had spared, namely, the ideas of God, freedom and immortality.

In history, Schelling finds five periods of the world. "The first is the golden period, the time of blessed indecision, when there was neither good nor bad, when man, as a creature of na-

ture, spent his time in unconscious innocence. Then follows the period of ruling gods and heroes, the omnipotence of nature, which, however, in the third place, changes to a period of ruling destiny, to a period of decline and division, till God reveals himself according to his love and mercy. God had to become man in order that man might come to God again. Thus, in the fourth place, a new kingdom is established by the incarnation of God in Christ, in which the Divine Spirit is continually realizing itself more and more fully, till, fifthly, at the end of this period, destiny transforms itself to providence, all evil is overcome, God is realized, is all in all."

Dr. Hagenbach, after giving the quotation above, remarks in reference to it, with a profound penetration to the very soul of this system: "In this we indeed hear a language which, with Scriptural and ecclesiastical sounds, actually reminds us of Christian truths which were lost at that time, especially the fundamental truth, that, as Schelling expresses it, God became man, that man might become divine. But if we examine the matter more carefully, we find that by the incarnation of God, Schelling means nothing else than God first coming to a consciousness of himself in man. To him, God the Father is not that Father to whom Christ bids us pray in the Lord's prayer, and whom Paul calls the Father of all in heaven and on earth; not that Father who, before the foundation of the world was laid, out of pure mercy chose humanity as his inheritance in Christ; no, what Schelling calls Father is only that mysterious, unconscious, primeval cause, or rather non-causer, of all things, who first knows himself in the Son, and through him first comes to consciousness, a dismal paternal countenance indeed, a Saturn who devours his children, not God the Father who clasps them to his bosom even before they exist. But how is it with the person of Christ? As with Fichte, so with Schelling, the historical Christ, the Jesus of Nazareth, as he lived and taught as man, is not the essence of Christianity, for God comes to consciousness in man in general. The incarnation of God is, according to Schelling's own words, not an incarnation happening once, but an ideal incarnation from eternity, and is properly the same as the mystery of nature. . . . Schelling's suffering God

is nothing else than the progressive self-development of God amid struggles. Thus, (although more sensually and fantastically) the ancient Manichæans had already called the suffering of nature, the perishing of the vegetable kingdom, and similar metamorphoses, the suffering Jesus."

Before we pass to the name of Schleiermacher, we must notice a man who had, in common with Schelling, much to do with his education; we refer to Jacobi.

As the systems of Kant and Schelling passed the review of his powerful mind they gave him no satisfaction. He felt no sympathy for the growing pantheism of his age. Averse to speculative philosophy, he yet was no despiser of reason, but rather a defender of it. He held that reason and faith, when their province is rightly apprehended, cannot be seen as opposed to each other; faith supplying what knowledge fails to grasp. Man may despair of reaching God by thought, but to know him we must love Him. "If He were not thus immediately present by means of His image in us, what outside of Him should make Him known to us."

Jacobi departed from the position of the friends of positive Christianity in His belief that God is making a continual revelation to man, "a revelation which he perceives with his reason, but cannot comprehend with his understanding." But his vast learning was meekly laid at the feet of Jesus; thoughts of his heart were Christ-ward; his whole nature was satisfied in the atonement offered by him whose life was seen unencumbered by myth or fiction. He "wanted to know nothing of a God who is no helper, of a God who makes the eye and does not see, the ear and does not hear, the understanding and does not perceive, does not know, does not will, and therefore is not. Pantheism and Atheism were not the same to Jacobi; for a God who first receives his existence through the world, and comes to consciousness first in man, is no God, but an idol, just as little did Jacobi want a God merely above and outside of the world (as the Deists) who is sundered from the world and humanity, and who does not appear to be concerned about them."*

*Hagenbach.

We turn with special gratitude to God, to deal with the great revival of evangelical Christianity in Germany. Several important events contributed to bring about this revival. It was promoted by the national struggles in opposition to the usurpations of Napoleon. A deep, patriotic enthusiasm, a noble desire for the political and moral regeneration of all Germany sprang up. A great advance was made in the interests of political and religious freedom when, after the battle of Leipsic, the Protestant king of Prussia, the Roman Catholic emperor of Austria, and the czar of Russia, head of the Greek church, vowed in Holy Alliance to reign henceforth only for the happiness of their subjects and the triumph of the Christian religion.

This was in 1813. In 1817 came the third centennial jubilee of the Reformation and "although" says Schaff, "it displayed more admiration for Luther as a national hero and German patriot, than a proper appreciation of him as a man of faith and a religious reformer, yet it directed the interest and research of the age to the great movement of the sixteenth century, and elicited a series of works which made its story as familiar as household words."

Harms, after the manner and with the faith of Luther, published his ninety-five theses, in which he boldly declared the rampant Rationalism of the day a fearful abuse and caricature of Protestantism.

Just before the third centennial jubilee of the Reformation, Frederick William III, king of Prussia, expressed a noble desire to have the separate Lutheran and Reformed confessions in his kingdom, united into one. He set the example in the church at Potsdam, where he worshiped, by joining in a united celebration of the Lord's Supper. His recommendation of a plan for union was readily adopted by nearly the entire clergy and laity. The example of the king was followed in Nassau, Baden and Wurtemberg. Whatever disappointment subsequently ensued to the friends of this great movement, whatever of agitation and controversy followed immediately upon it, its effect upon the interests of the new-born spirit of evangelical piety was full of importance.

While all these movements were going on, philosophy was largely wrested from the grasp of an arrogant Rationalism and became imbued with a more spiritual life. A more powerful and consistent Christian theology took the field against the foes of revelation and faith.

This new epoch in Protestant theology dates from Schleiermacher. He found religion changed to mere morality. The attendance upon divine worship was commended by the educated, not as a needful thing for them, but as a salutary influence upon the uneducated masses. There was a general striving to reconcile the difficulties between Rationalism and supernaturalism by mere intellectual processes. God, in the thinking of the day, was far removed from the world, and sustained no intimate relations to men.

In opposition to these cold, deistical ideas, Schleiermacher presented the quickening view of a personal God in living contact and sympathizing nearness to humanity. He strove to inculcate true ideas of the nature of religion by teaching that feeling is its proper seat. "By feeling he did not mean the agitation of transient emotions, which ceased as rapidly as they were excited, and became the deceitful play of the frame of mind at the moment, not that irritability which he attacked earnestly; but the inmost part of man, the central point, the focus of his spiritual life, the source and root of all our thinking, striving and acting. Religion cannot be learned from anything external; it cannot be imparted by dogmas and precepts; it must originate in the heart of the pious as something felt and experienced, and must announce itself as a power controlling all, appropriating all."*

Possessed of the highest philosophical culture, Schleiermacher advocated the thorough separation of philosophy and theology. He felt no fear that theology would fall with any philosophical system, but only as religion and the church fall. He boldly asserted that without religion there is no theology; that if a man has no experience in divine things he has no data given for passing judgment upon them; mere philosophical knowledge furnishes no guide nor help.

* Hagenbach.

With all this, however, he denied the authority of the Old Testament, treated as non-essential a belief in the resurrection and ascension of Christ, and taught the final salvation of all men. But his best disciples, starting from the advanced position of their master, made a nearer approach to the vital things of faith, and became sources of richer blessings to those who were longing for a sweeter, brighter faith.

“No theologian,” says Hagenbach, “of any importance, whatever might be his tendency, has appeared in the last decenaries who did not, for awhile at least, sit at the feet of Schleiermacher, exercise his mind on his powerful thoughts, and gain great and enlarged views from the study of his works.” But the strictly orthodox party could not fully sympathize with this new defender of the faith. He was attacked sharply, of course, by the old Rationalism which was gradually waning before the new life given to the church. Orthodoxy and Rationalism both uttered a rallying cry as they felt themselves sinking in this new crisis. The result was that a new philosophy which overthrew entirely the teachings of Kant and his followers, arose and promised support to trembling orthodoxy, while with triumph it prophesied the entire destruction of ationalism. The new philosophy was the system of Hegel which was soon to prove itself the most formidable foe to the very orthodoxy that welcomed it at the outset, with such gladness.

So ambiguous were Hegel's statements that it was quite natural that there should arise two parties immediately after his death, disputing about their master's words. The right wing of the Hegelian party attempted to show that the defense of Christianity by Hegel was a serious one, and the only one by which the chasm between Rationalism and supernaturalism could be bridged. Among these were the eloquent and pious theologian and preacher, Marheinecke, and the devoted, eminent jurist, Goeschel, and the learned author, Dorner. But, so limited was their spiritual vision, they praised Goethe as a high-priest at the altar of Christian faith, and saw in Faust the embodiment of pure Christian principle. They penetrated so little the real meaning and tendencies of their teacher's thought that they

worshiped him as the highest exhibition of a Christian philosophy.

The left wing, finding in the Hegelian philosophy the quickening of their malice toward the faith of the cross, imbibing its real spirit, carried this philosophy to a development of which Hegel never dreamed, but for which he is responsible.

We have thus reached, from Spinoza and Condillac, the positivism of the present day. The God of Spinoza became the God of Kant. This school ended with Hegel. Without a Kant, there had been no Fichte, nor Hegel.

We have spoken of the Hegelian philosophy as the most dangerous opponent of Christian faith. We now draw near our own times, and find ourselves living among the influences which this philosophy has scattered. It is necessary that we study its phases more at length than those of any other we have met, since it most vitally concerns our time.

After the foregoing attempt to trace the various steps of rationalistic thinking, we are better prepared to speak of the recent assaults upon Christianity, which proceed, almost without exception, from the Hegelian school; to portray that fearful mode of thinking which to-day enters into many a Christian pulpit and robs it of power. We now deal with no abstract speculation, as it first existed in the mind of Hegel, but with an active, proud, godless enemy, whose tread beats out the life of Christian faith wherever it goes.

From Halle went out the denial of the existence of a personal God, and the repudiation of the immortality of the soul. Man was made a thing of divinity. God found consciousness only through man. Religion was only a dream of the fancy. The youth who gathered at Tübingen for the study of Christian theology, found themselves unfitted for the ministry by the influence of Hegelian pantheism. They were systematically taught that every being is all-sufficient in himself, that religion is only man's consciousness of his own infinite being, that to know God it is only necessary to know one's self, that there is no personal accountability, no immortality.

We almost imagine ourselves in Paris amid the revolutionary madness of '89, rather than in the Frankfort parliament of 1848,

when we hear Prof. Voight declaring that there can be no permanent freedom until the religion of the Bible is banished from the earth. The spirit of the French revolution, and of atheistic Germany, finds expression in bold words in our own land as it declares that : ' Religion is the cause of all existing oppression, the product of ignorance, the source of all our ills.'

The self-worship, the large self-conceit of Hegel and his German followers, find their counterpart in the land to which religious faith has imparted all that makes that land superior to the Old World despotisms. Men declare themselves weary of a religion of forms. ' Cast off the forms, spurn them away,' says Parker, ' and amid the gross mass you will find some pure gold, but yet very little to reward the seeking.' It is pleasant to a nature restive and daring in the presence of the religion which binds the conscience and the will, to be told that " there is but one religion, as but one ocean, though we call it faith in our church, and infidelity out of our church ;" thus meeting the assertion that the religion of the infidel and the Christian is the same.

This form of Rationalism is polite and pleasant to the ear. It does not affright by blasphemous phrase, it uses the language of the Bible. It would not shock us by saying there is no religion, there is no God, but it tells us ' there is a God, reverence him in your own inner self, for that is God ; there is a religion, do not repel the thought, but it is the same in every man and age ; its forms vary, its rites change, but every man has the true religious instinct, and therefore the true religion.'

The light literature of Germany became saturated with the virus of pantheism. Poetry was turgid with prophecies of the downfall of Christianity ; while it demanded that all moral restraints should be swept away. The novel portrayed in its peculiar guise, the doctrine that God was created in the image of man, and gave its readers pictures of disgusting licentiousness. The school of writers and publishers of this blasphemous style of literature assumed the name of " Young Germany." But " fortunately, these champions of the flesh, with all their brilliant talents, found an insurmountable barrier in the moral seriousness of the German people. They were thrown out of de-

cent society, and found a more congenial home in the atmosphere of Paris. Some of them have turned their attention to more worthy pursuits. Even Henry Heine, the most gifted of them, after long keeping swine, like the prodigal son, began to see his folly on his hopeless sick-bed in Paris, and thought of a return to his forsaken God. His memoirs, published in 1854, a year before his death, contain some very remarkable confessions on the bankruptcy of his former views, and the beauty and grandeur of the Bible.”*

The left wing of Hegelianism found its strongest advocate in Strauss, who declared in his “Life of Jesus,” that what the Christian world had hitherto received as fact, as history, was only a myth. This idea was not new but had existed, in some degree, from the days of Origen. That which had previously been kept within bounds, Strauss carried beyond all limits. But an ideal Christianity could not make progress among men who asked some stay and comfort for the heart, some resting-place for the soul. The powerful replies of Tholuck, Lange, Neander, Ebrard, and a host of other consecrated scholars, scattered to the winds the proud fabric of infidelity, and to-day Strauss is intellectually buried and forgotten in Germany. But with his theories, as well as with those of other German pantheists and infidels, it has happened that they are being raised anew to the light for the special delight of the young men of England and America, who wonder at and admire the bold theories of these opponents of the religion of the cross, without even suspecting that the translations which they delight in are from volumes scarcely ever read now in Germany; that the theories they accept with such enthusiasm have been completely exposed and exploded in the land where they first appeared. It is hardly a compliment to Anglo Saxon intellect that to-day it takes up and appropriates that which has been discarded at home by the ablest minds.

Strauss boldly declared that Christ did not found the church, but that the church had made its Messiah out of the materials and predictions of the Old Testament. A certain Jew forms,

* Schaff.

according to Strauss, the noble design of the moral regeneration of his nation. In his infatuation he believed God would help him in his efforts. The Jews hearing him preach were led to believe him to be the Messiah, and this public feeling gradually took possession of the mind of Jesus until he boldly announced himself to be the promised deliverer of Israel. When he saw that he could not escape the fury of the priests, he began to speak about his death, according to the words of the Old Testament. He was at length taken and slain, cut off in his prime, without having worked any miracles, to the disappointment of himself and his disciples. But the latter were unwilling to have their dreams so suddenly ended. They began to contrive some way by which what had happened might be reconciled with what had actually taken place. To their excited minds their master, though not with them as of old, was not lost, he had gone to the presence of his God still to love and care for them. They believed they actually saw him two or three times after his death, and so they spread abroad the story of the resurrection. If he raised himself from the dead, surely he must have performed other miracles. So they invented others and gradually attributed to their master miracles like those they found recorded in the Old Testament. Then, too, they remembered some short, pithy sentences which their Jesus had uttered, these they wove into long conversations or narratives. Thus, the foundation of the New Testament was laid, and the structure was completed as writer after writer added to, or worked up, these materials, until the four extended narratives attributed to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, appeared.

Such is the fabrication which Strauss believes to be at the foundation of the Christian's hope of to-day. Surely if this were all true we have most wonderful proof in it "of the power of the religious idea, if this idea had really succeeded in inventing Christ." "If" said Herder, "the fishermen of Gallilee have invented such a history, God be praised that they invented it." It is not to be wondered at, when Strauss is asked 'how could such stories,' myths as he calls them, 'spread so extensively and gain such a wide-spread belief in the very country and very generation in which they took their rise,' that he finds

a difficulty in making plausible answer. How is it possible that, in a country which was in the very highway of the world's commerce, for these things were "not done in a corner," such things could be secretly prepared and successfully sprung upon the world, so deceiving the consciousness of men, so captivating the judgment of millions of people, among whom were many of the soberest judgment and the highest culture.

How, let us ask, did men of such obscure station obtain such an ideal. 'What is a perfect man,' was eagerly asked by the ancient philosophers, but they could not agree in their answers. No mortal knew or could know that. The ideal of the best philosophers falls far below the Christian ideal.

"The reality could not be an abstraction, it must be a person or the idea could never be definitely fixed in the human mind. Had Christianity done nothing more than this, it would have done more than all the world has been able to do, in showing in a concrete, living image what man should be. All that can be done by the power of an idea, (and much can be done in this way, when it is both elevated and distinct) has been done by the mere personal existence and historical character of Christ. All subsequent ages have been striving more or less, to reach it. The ideal of every philosopher, or artist, at the head of a school, has been reached and surpassed, if not by an individual, at least by a whole school of disciples, each one contributing his part. Neither in an individual, nor in all individuals, will it be pretended that Christ's perfection has been reached. The highest ideal perfection of man, if it is not merely abstract and speculative, must be either in one perfect individual or must be distributed among individuals of the race. But the race can produce nothing above itself, it produces no faultless characters, nor such approximations to it as to give us a perfect specimen or the means of conceiving of one."*

That the men who started into circulation such myths should have so compacted a system of religion that it changed the whole Roman empire, that a new moral history should spring from it, that its tendencies should be strengthened for eighteen

* Pres. B. Sears.

centuries; that this system, started by unprincipled men, should so have wrought upon the ignorant and the learned, that multitudes, feeling its power, should be willing to die rather than yield it up,—all this constitutes a phenomenon before which the hypotheses of Strauss and Weisse and their followers, are dissolved into an opposing medium thinner than air.

No theories appear in these narratives of the evangelists, no words of mere human boasting, the facts stand out and speak for themselves. If the apostles originated this story, they were superior to Christ and did vastly more for the moral improvement of the world than he did. Their sympathies do not even appear to us from their narratives, no reflections, even in presence of the cross, are obtruded upon us.

Weisse finds in animal magnetism, the explanation of the miracles of the Messiah. "No such a thing as a miracle is possible," is the assumption of Bauer, in common with Strauss, at the very beginning of his comments upon the gospel history. He listens to no historical statements, balances no historical probabilities, but out of his own mind finds the consciousness that a miracle is at once absurd and impossible. So, too, Schenkel constructs a life of Jesus, with contempt for all historical statement, out of his own brain. Bauer would have us believe that the writers of the gospels designed to deceive men; that they were composed with the design of aiding Paul in his controversy with Peter, or of establishing the teachings of Peter in opposition to Paul. There was, simply, at the foundation of these stories a Gentile prejudice, he says.

"To think," says Dr. Stowe, "of the apostle John writing his gospel as Weisse supposes—or the early teachers of Christianity inventing myths as Strauss imagines—what can be conceived more utterly inappropriate to the times and the men—more entirely beyond the limits of all inherent probability? Indeed, these German unbelievers do not intend to be probable, nor have they any serious purpose of discovering and advocating truth. They delight in a sort of intellectual gladiatorship, and nothing with them is too serious to be made a plaything of. They sport with God and eternity, with heaven and hell, with their own souls and the souls of their fellow-men; all the while

thinking only of the fine fruitful subjects they are getting for lectures and books—but when their speculations are imported into this land of serious purpose and earnest endeavor and practical results, they become immediately matters of life and death, of eternal life and eternal death to thousands. That which is a fashionable, though far from an innocent, amusement in Germany, is a deadly, death-dealing work in America.”

These, of whom we have just been writing, are the disciples of Hegel, these the representatives of that system of philosophy which finds its glorification in the rational literature of America. It is the development of Hegelianism which we constantly meet in the assaults upon evangelical faith in the publications of the hour, characterized, now by open ridicule and coarse blasphemy, now by polite, but significant, thrusts, and well-directed, polished sarcasms, such as abound in our *Atlantic Monthly*, now by gloomy forebodings, gratuitously uttered, over the imagined failure of evangelical faith, such as the *North American* expressed, when it declared the other day that ‘the churches are falling.’

If the increase of spiritual life, the quickening of activity, resulting in the spurning of mere magnificent forms and dead creeds, if the ceasing of prayers in Music Hall to “the infinite mother,” be indices to their fall, then the churches have, indeed, occasion to fear their end. Had the *North American* witnessed, with the eye of devout Christian watchfulness, the enthusiasm for a living Christianity, the spontaneous emphasis of the manly vigor of a continent, bursting out at Portland, a few days ago, over the resolution which knit the heart of that convention anew to the life and service of the great Master, its fears had given place to rejoicing.

In reference to the spirit of this wonderfully popular and insidious philosophy, let us quote here the well digested opinion of one who has lived amid its influences, weighed its claims and knows its worth; we refer again to Dr. Hagenbach. “It is not easy,” he says, “for philosophy to appear more abstract and arbitrary, than in the mouths of the haughty admirers of this system. No other has been more riveted and spellbound in a spiritless mechanism, than this which is continually speaking of spirit; none has more fully denied life as it is, and none is

more guilty of making just what it pleases of things, than this philosophy in these hands; none can play more deceitfully with words, none wipes away more fully the fragrance and lustre of reality, none so volatilizes the personal, actual, individual life, which it regards merely as a fleeting shadow, as a subsiding wave, as the 'vanishing property' of things: hence, before it vanishes also human personality in history, as the personality of God in the Universe."

The tendency of Rationalism, as of every species of infidelity, is to national disintegration and ruin. Its literature aided in a most signal manner, those revolutionary disturbances which, in 1848, brought even Prussia and Austria to the very brink of dismemberment. Then ample opportunity was given to all who hated church and state, to bring about a better order of things in each. But, under the lead of Rationalism, they strove in vain and ignominiously failed. When the national assembly at Frankfort, gathered for the regeneration of the nation, refused to open its sessions with prayer, studiously avoided all reference to the God of nations, expressed contempt for the work of the church, we find it breaking up in confusion and shame.

The teachings of Strauss, Renan, Parker and Emerson, may enter in, but with them the spirit of liberty departs. It is easy to lampoon the Puritans but it is difficult to place beneath men's feet a surer foundation for liberty than that they secured. The spirit of unbelief undermines love of country, for a true patriotism springs from a living confidence in God. The sanction of human government, and the guard that protects it, is from above. Lessen one jot from faith in the special nearness and concern of Jehovah and government is imperiled.

The cry for liberty has wonderful power to rouse men wherever and whenever uttered. It may swell forth when there is no real oppression; it may find utterance when men are merely seeking a lawless expression of their selfishness. But the cry always finds a multitude rallying to the destruction of some real or imagined despotism. In no way is society more likely to be misled than by the cry for religious liberty, raised by those who imagine that to throw off all restraint in religious things is to bring in the millennium. The arguments are specious, aimed

at the passions, and so lead captive many who easily believe religion to be their enemy, the faith of the cross only a bloody path, the judgment a fable, and punishment for sin but a chimaera. "There will be no real liberty until the religion of the cross is banished from the heart," is the voice that attracts and wins the unwary mind. But the liberty that endures the shock of opposing despotisms, the liberty that maketh the nation free, is that which catches its inspiration and its power from him who makes the soul strong for outer and inner struggles by binding it close to his wounded side of sacrifice. "*In hoc signo vinces,*" is the availing hope held out to every true patriot, as God shows him the cross. Warring with other inspiration than this, the soldier that bears the sword takes from it its power to destroy threatening ills, by the infidelity of the heart. Only for living principles do we struggle with hearty might, but a denial of a personal God, the rejection of an elder brother mighty to save, dims the eye and weakens conscience until the threatened destruction of those principles wakens little emotion, little desire to hasten to their support. There is no liberty where there is no overmastering faith, either in the individual or the state, in a personal God who is a rewarder of those who seek his service.

Principle is born from the divine mind. But we look in vain for principle, for law from on high, when anything robs God of his holiness, a holiness coupled with the infinite voice of authority, exercising a permanent influence upon the affairs of the world.

'Give us a more liberal Christianity, away with the religion of self-denial, banish the word judgment,' are demands that meet us from many quarters. Just here polite and easy-going Rationalism steps in with its balm for the consciences of men. It declares the gospel a brilliant tissue of legends; Jesus Christ is only a symbol of the divinity that belongs to every man. 'Behold,' is its language, 'not the Lamb of God, but the great social reformer; behold the Socrates of Jerusalem.' Reason is made superior to the Bible; our religious sentiment is pronounced truer than the lively oracles of God; "the pain of sin is only the condition of growth; sin, with its consequent pain, is transient as errors and mistakes."

So "the schools of unbelief have shaken their doubt into the

air which we breathe, and the impiety of pretended wise men runs through our streets." The young minister feels the influence of this rationalistic spirit and attempts to tell men of the Saviour in a manner which shall be agreeable to the unconquered heart. The poisoned mind endeavors to make the doctrines of the cross acceptable to men of culture by giving them a beautiful drapery of human invention. We fear too many are seeking to take away the reproach of the cross, to render it less objectionable to men, by carefully avoiding the use of such terms and expressions as savor of an old-time faith. They cast out the terms, repentance, new-birth, hell, cross, and substitute words or phrases which are deemed less offensive to polite ears. They hope to gain men, doubtless, but their hope is as flimsy as the gospel they preach. Men are won only by the living spirit of the doctrines of the cross. It is not a polite discourse upon the themes of religion that men need, or even respect for any length of time. The world does not need a philosopher, but a Saviour, preached to them.

Any shrinking from a bold, persistent preaching of Jesus as the sinner's only hope, is to be carefully watched and guarded against, or the steps will be rapid which lead to denial of the atonement and shipwreck of the faith once delivered to the saints. A minister may persuade himself that he is preaching Christ, when at the same time he does not preach salvation by Christ. He may delight in the theme of salvation by Christ and yet shrink from the doctrine of salvation only by the death of Christ. But still more it is possible that he may teach men that only by the death of Christ can salvation come, and yet hide from their sight the Saviour of men as their vicarious sacrifice, their propitiatory sacrifice. Ah, when the Redeemer, hearing the long sighing of his people, shall come to avenge them, how fearful will be his rebuke against those pastors of whom his faithful ones shall say, 'they strove to take away my Saviour from my soul with vain words of human wisdom, and would fain have blotted out his blood from the earth.'

There are those who would be called Christians, even while they deny the divinity of Christ. But no such intermediate position is possible. On this one point the separation is com-

plete and decisive. Is Christ divine or is he not, is the test which divides the world into two parties only. "It avails nothing to say, with a philosopher, 'the morality of the gospel touches me and penetrates me.' If Jesus Christ is not the Son of God, the gospel ought to be torn in pieces as an imposture. Jesus Christ spoke falsely all his life. He deceived his disciples the last night he spent with them. He knowingly suffered his adversaries to commit a fearful crime, which by a word he could have caused them to shun. . . . Let all those who are tempted to detract from the divinity of Christ weigh well these considerations. Let them consider that on the day when the church shall feel herself attacked on this vital point, though it were by the most seductive mysticism, her voice, her mighty voice, which has no need of councils to make itself heard, will sound forth as formerly in the days of Arius or of Socinus."*

We admire the pithy statement of this idea just alluded to, by a recent writer: † "Was it not affirmed," he says, "a few years ago that the seeds of Rationalism which some were sowing would bring forth a fearful harvest? But mark how deceitful the process. There is one thing in the old-fashioned Voltaire infidelity that one cannot but like; it was honest; it never stole the livery of heaven to serve the devil in; it was not ashamed to flaunt its own name; it preferred to be known as a downright hater of all that bore even the name of Christian. That was fair. We cannot help respecting it for that one good quality. If we go back many hundred years before Voltaire till we get to Hierocles in the fourth century, Porphyry in the third, Celsus in the second, then, too, we shall find an infidelity that never was ashamed of the name. It stood up manfully to its chosen work, not trying to shelter itself under the name of Christianity. That was fair. The current, most popular form of infidelity, in addition to the ancient characteristics, has also this: a pretty thorough shame of its own signature: It rejects the Old Testament, yet it is Christian; it rejects the Epistles, yet it is Christian; it rejects the Gospels, yet it is Christian; it denies that

*Pressense.

†Rev. N. M. Williams, in *Bib. Sacra*.

Jesus was miraculously conceived, yet it is Christian ; it denies that he raised Lazarus from the dead, yet it is Christian ; it denies him as a mediator between God and man, yet it is Christian ; it denies him the title of Lord, yet it is Christian ; it affirms that the Bible contains errors in doctrine and fact, still it is Christian. That is not fair ; it is undertaking to act Hamlet, not only without Hamlet, but without the king, and without Horatio and Polonius, and without the queen, without the ghost, and without Ophelia. It must be admitted that the old style of infidelity was low, coarse, vulgar ; but, as already said, we knew where to find it. The current rationalism must, therefore, be put a little below the infidelity of Voltaire himself, as Satan must be put considerably lower by all good judges of character for coming to Eve as serpent instead of Devil. That way of coming was mean as well as wicked."

This hour for American Christianity is one of hope, not of sadness ; one demanding earnest work, undaunted zeal, and unremitting watchfulness. The forces of error are on the alert, ready to bring in, with larger measure than heretofore, the infidelity of the Old World. The poison has begun its working, but we have faith that its course can never be disastrous like that in Germany.

Our safety depends upon the clearness with which we see, and the vigor with which we meet the issues of the day. A compromise is defeat, struggle is victory. No guilds of rhetoric, no claims to be Christian on the part of those who are not Christ's must blind the eye to the character of the contest into which we must enter without shrinking, to the upholding of the one great name before every form of assault. That contest is to be no feeble one ; it is between Christ and Anti-Christ, faith and infidelity, theism and pantheism.

In the history of Rationalism, as we have seen it in Germany, we find endless negation ending in annihilation ; we see whither a godless philosophy leads its votaries. In the struggles to find some other way of salvation, the most powerful minds exercised their utmost ingenuity. "There were giants in those days," may truly be said, as we look back to the efforts of the opponents of the faith. But how vainly did they strive to place one unfading,

victorious wreath upon their brows. System after system of infidelity arose, each dealing destructive blows upon its predecessor. When the land-marks of faith were once removed it was easy to wander downward, nay, the steps were inevitable, from Kant down to Hegel and Strauss and Heine.

Over all menaces, in the presence of the severest attacks, boldly before the most scurrilous lampoons, we find the living faith of the cross maintaining its God-given right and proclaiming to them all: "your night cometh." We need not fear, for the destiny of religion, the brightness of the all-sufficient name, the triumphs of the church, depend upon the rise and success of no school of philosophy; they fall with the fall of no system of human thinking. An energetic faith shall cause us to rise and sing, with the jubilant strains of a Miriam, on the shore of triumphant deliverance, the fall of the hosts that rise up against the Lord and his Christ. The spirit of the living God worketh hitherto and will work still, in the gift of revival energy, in the nearer union of Christian toilers of whatever name, in the outpouring of wealth in Christian benevolence, in the triumph of the missionary amid gross paganism. Then let us cry with exultant consecration, "In the name of our God we will set up our banners. The Lord of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge."

ART. V.—THE DOCTRINE OF SPECIAL PROVIDENCE.

BY REV. S. E. ROOT, GARDINER, ME.

As God has made only a partial revelation of himself, men must be satisfied with a partial and incomplete knowledge of him.

Idle speculation contributes nothing to our knowledge of the workings of his providence, and we can investigate properly, only what God has revealed of himself in his word, his works and in Christian experience. A mind ignorant of God tends

toward deism, and deism is only a denial of God's special providence. The heathen worshipers of the Great Original are exceedingly degraded because they are so ignorant of the divine mind as to attribute to it passions and appetites similar to their own.

Nominal Christians have less piety than real Christians because they know less of God. Among real Christians the most devoted are those who, by experience, have become best acquainted with him.

The denial of the doctrine of special providence comes from infidels, professed Christians who are unevangelical, and possibly from some converted persons who have lost the evidence of God's favor. No warm-hearted, thinking Christian, having the evidence of pardon in his heart, can question the doctrine of special providence, for pardon itself is a special intelligent act on the part of God. So also is every answer to prayer. Any person offering prayer to God, disbelieving in a special act of providence, evidently commits an act of avowed hypocrisy; since he says beforehand, that he does not believe in answers to prayer. Disbelief of special providence is an avowed want of faith in God, with which there can be no warm-hearted Christians.

So liberalism either denies the necessity of prayer altogether, or else teaches that the only influence of prayer is reflex, and that, as an exercise of study, prayer develops the spiritual nature, just as the study of mathematics develops the mental. This view, making the subjective exercise of the mind the grand object, would make it as profitable to worship an idol as to worship Jehovah and the same object would be gained and the same answer received, for, on this theory, God, no more than an idol, gives special answers to prayer. But, "Ye have not so learned Christ." The doctrine before us is exceedingly important then, because it embodies the fundamental doctrines of experimental religion.

The subject is a very extensive one and embraces not only Christian experience, but also God's government of the world, his fore-knowledge, his permission of sin, and of evil in general, the existence of idolatry, and the free moral agency of man.

A single article cannot cover all this ground, but must confine itself to the idea of special providence as opposed to the idea of an exclusive, general providence.

The Bible is not an obsolete book. Christian experience, nature and reason may impart light, but only as they catch it from the great sun of Revelation. No man can safely attempt to be wise above what is written.

The Hindus believe that God basks in eternal repose upon the back of an enormous sea-serpent which floats forever upon a sea of milk; and that he neither cares for men, nor holds them responsible. After some hundreds of years he wakes from sleep, looks about to see that the world moves on in its accustomed manner, satisfies himself that the machinery is all in order and working well, and then consigns himself to another long season of oblivious rest. So, age after age he sleeps, taking no cognizance of the thoughts or actions of men, hearing no prayers, dispensing no blessings, putting forth no acts of intelligence; but, trusting entirely to the machine-like workings of established order, leaves all things to move on according to the fixed laws of nature, without supervision or providential care.

Modern deism accepts this view of God as substantially correct, abating only the serpent and the sea of milk. Those who deny special providential care on the part of God, must deny any special providence in the long, complicated train of events connected with the giving, preserving, and distributing of the Scriptures. The hold of such persons on revelation and experimental Christianity is imperceptibly, but fatally, relaxed. Only a fitful, babe-like grasp upon truth, only a nominal Christianity, keeps them from gliding swiftly into the fearful surges of avowed deism. If God performed no intelligent, special acts in giving us the Scriptures, then the Bible is not the revealed will of God, but if the Bible is the result of the intelligent and well-planned acts of an all-wise mind, then his providence is special, and his care is over all his works. Providence, then, may be defined as "the special and intelligent care and supervision of God over all the works of creation, great and small, animate and inanimate, physical and spiritual."

Aside from objections which are openly deistical, only one is raised against the doctrine of special providence, and that one does not take the form of a well-defined argument against it. It simply asserts without proof, that providence is general and not special. It does not touch the arguments in favor of a special providence but skillfully withdraws the attention and fixes it upon a plausible substitute. The force of the objection is in the fact that the theory of a general providence is very pleasing to the natural heart, releasing it from strict responsibility, taking away its consciousness of being under God's eye. Any doctrine so soothing as this to the conscience, will find abundant advocates, even if it were plainly contrary to both reason and revelation. The answer to this objection, then, becomes really an attack upon a false position.

A general policy is the aggregate of specific acts. In that sense providence is general as well as special. But the idea of general providence, as opposed to, and independent of, special acts is a fallacy. A general act is impossible. Every act is an individual one and must be special. That the character of an individual is generally profane is untrue, unless there are special, well-defined acts of profanity so numerous as to constitute his profanity general. A general act of profanity without a special act would be a curiosity indeed.

A doctrine is said to be according to the general tenor of Scripture because that in many texts the doctrine is stated or implied. If it is not distinctly stated or implied, in texts that can be definitely pointed out, then it is not according to the general tenor of Scripture, and the assumption is a fallacy.

By definite, intelligent acts the scope of God's providence is both general and special, but in the nature of things it cannot be general except as the result of being special. If God's providence does not extend to the minutest portions of his creation, then his care is not over all his works.

The true doctrine of general providence is only the doctrine of special providence expanded, and is neither a substitute for it, nor an objection to it.

The testimony of the Scriptures is in favor of universal, special providence. The lilies of the field, the grass which to-day

is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, the sparrow falling to the ground, the young ravens when they cry, the lions wandering for lack of meat, and even the hairs of our heads, are all under the special protection of divine providence.

There was nothing miraculous in the destruction of the gourd by the worm at Nineveh, but there was something providential in it. God prepared the worm to teach Jonah a lesson and to produce certain states of mind in the prophet. So the Bible teaches, that not only worms and gourds, but hornets, flies, fishes, serpents, frogs, lice and other things, were frequently used providentially in carrying out God's intelligent plans. The event of finding the piece of money in the mouth of a fish of which we read may not seem highly miraculous, but it was highly providential. The same providence is traced in the finding of the colt on which Christ was to enter Jerusalem; in the procuring of a large upper room where the disciples were to make ready the passover; in the feeding of Elijah by the ravens; and in multitudes of similar cases. These cases are plain because our attention is directly called to them. If the veil could be taken away we should be able to trace the providential care of God as plainly in all our surroundings as in these things, but we walk among providences as a blind man among flowers. He cannot see them, not because they do not bloom in sweet profusion, but because his eyes are closed in perpetual darkness.

From the revealed character of God it is plainly to be seen that his providences are special. The Bible reveals him as an individual being possessed of individual attributes manifesting themselves in special acts. The view of God which denies him special acts of providence tends to take away his individuality, personality, and intelligence, or omniscience, and, sooner or later glides into pantheism, making God the passive soul of the universe and not the intelligent ruler of it. With the Bible view of God as omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, all-ruling, it is impossible to reconcile the pantheistic idea of the suppression of the activity of these attributes and with it the suppression of the idea of special providence.

God's revealed character as moral governor supposes special acts of administration. A government must have a policy, enactments, enforcements, and penalties. All this requires special

acts on the part of God, and it would be preposterous to suppose the success of his government without special manifestations and interpositions.

The treatment of criminals and others, according to their peculiar deserts, requires special judgments. These may be partially inflicted here, or the case may be referred to the general judgment, the final, supreme court above. But whether here or hereafter they take place under the eye of the omnipresent Governor.

God's revealed character as creator and upholder, teaches a special providence. Special acts of creating require special acts of upholding. It is objected that by the laws of nature God has superceded the necessity of any special care. If the objection is valid, then the laws of nature are self-sustaining. If they have power to exist of themselves, without the special help of God, then they are self-existing. If self-existing and self-sustaining then they take on attributes of divinity, and the heathen are right in worshiping sun, moon, stars, fire, water, and nature in general.

But if God gives power to nature's laws, the very giving of that power shows that they are subject to him and dependent upon him; and the moment they cease to depend upon him they cease to have power. So that if they run of themselves like a watch, as some argue, then a special providence is necessary to wind them up, and act as a constant main-spring, and if God's special care were withdrawn for a moment, like a watch, they would stop.

The illimitable vastness of God's creation, shows an imperative demand for a sustaining providence. The light of some of the fixed stars is thirty three millions of years on its journey to us. A telescope magnifying a thousand fold reveals only space,—space without any bound. Beyond the solar system are other systems, how many and how vast we cannot know. We may as well suppose that these systems are self-originating, as to suppose that they are self-sustaining. No created thing, whether engine or universe, can run on for ages without special intelligent care.

The complex and delicate structure of millions among the orders of being, shows the need and presence of special care. Take the five-millionth part of a drop of water and find the

living organisms contained in it. Note the delicate structure of the organs, the heart, lungs, stomach, the circulatory system, with its arteries, veins and capillaries, and the ramifications of nerve upon those delicate, infinitesimal capillaries, and if it seemed before as if the granite foundations of the earth could exist for ages without a special providence, does it seem as if these millions of beings, thrown unprotected upon its rough surface, could exist for a moment without this special care? There are orders of beings which are born, grow old with their children and grandchildren, and then die, all in the space of fifty minutes. Venerable sages in their way no doubt, but not independent of God's care.

Look at the vegetable mold. Suppose a forest of oaks, beech, maple, ash and elm, containing a dozen square miles to dwindle to miniature saplings, to plants, to fibres, becoming less and less, until the whole forest with its dozen square miles of organic matter is contained in an area of the size of a finger ring. But the microscope reveals not only trees and saplings, but underbrush and parasites creeping up the giant stems of miniature oaks, with grass-grown slopes beneath, and all coming to perfection in a few hours. Consider the entire earth with its myriads of forests of delicate frailty like this. If there be no special providence what attributes of power, let us ask, are inherent in those infinitesimal forests that they can defend, reproduce and preserve themselves, from age to age without the constant, superintending care of an infinite God.

The gradation and succession of animals and plants to meet the corresponding geological changes of the earth, shows the working of a special providence. Instinct teaches some things but it cannot teach a class of beings when to retire and give place to another class not yet in existence; instinct cannot originate a new class. Instinct cannot measure off the period for mammoth, mastodon, and saurian, nor teach the vegetable ferns when to become extinct. If it is objected that the various periods of the past have called out these orders of animals and plants, then we ask, who marked the periods, and arranged the primary and secondary and alluvial rocks, and ordered the deposits of the old red sandstone and the new?

Did not God intelligently watch the succession and extinction of whole classes of animals and plants, as the change went slowly on, until the earth became fit for the presence of men and the animals which we now find about us? If providence is only general machine work, like a watch, set in motion at the beginning, then as this period to which we have just alluded, is not the first, the creations of this period are not the special intelligent work of God, and man is the result, not of God's special act of creation, but of the workings of a machine set in motion a hundred thousand years or more ago. The complex and wonderful processes of nature show the necessity of a divine supervision. Instance the process of incubation, the yolk suspended by a fiber and surrounded by a guard lest it should touch the shell and be spoiled by contact with the air, the blubber adjusting itself to every position, the horny drill for breaking the shell, the yolk thrown into the crop for food until the young is strong enough to swallow food. Watch all this until it has been repeated thousands of times, with intervals of months and sometimes of years between the process and the production of another egg, and then decide whether it is nature without intelligence or God with providential care and intelligence, which has directed this mysterious and oft recurring phenomenon.

The bursting of a bud till it becomes a flower, a fruit, a seed, a mass of corruption, a shoot, a bud, and a flower again, a thousand times repeated is a process requiring special providence. Sunshine and rain, heat and cold, and other causes which nature could not adjust without intelligence, must work, and therefore special providence puts a bow in the cloud and becomes intimately responsible for seedtime, earing and harvest,—a useless covenant, if nature could do the work without divine supervision.

The whole experience of the Christian suggests a special, intelligent providence and not an abstract, general one. No doctrine is more clearly taught in the Bible than that an intelligent God holds us personally responsible for word, thought and deed.

In conviction, God is represented as reasoning with men, calling to them, inviting them, and offering them pardon. In conversion God is spoken of as receiving sinners, forgiving

them, adopting them as his children, making them his heirs, and giving them the earnest of the inheritance. When we pray, God is said to listen, to hear and answer. In our Christian life we walk, talk and commune with God.

Strike out the idea of vivid intelligence on the part of God, and all that is lovely or lifelike in religion vanishes and becomes like the counting of beads or the bowing down to idols. There is no sympathy, love, pity nor assistance left. All is machine-work, like the water-praying machines of the heathen. God is no longer our father, friend and lover. Religion is mechanical and its results mechanical. As it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps, and as intelligence on the part of God ceases, nature becomes fate and Christians become fatalists.

With the ceasing of special providence, all the operations of the Holy Spirit upon the heart would cease; prayer, praise, faith and all the exercises of the Christian life would become dead formalities directed to a being who makes no special interpositions on our behalf, and from whom we receive no special personal benefits; there could then be no growth in grace, and our evidences of God's presence and of communion with him would be purely imaginary; while the dying bed of the Christian could have no real light, for God presents no rod nor staff to him who enters the dark valley.

Thus religion, divorced from the idea of special providence loses its virtue and power, and becomes what false religions have ever been, a round of senseless formalities. This is contrary to all Christian experience. The dealings of God with the Christian are actual and his providence special.

An animalculæ, whose little drop of water is as stupendous to him as the universe to us, at the venerable age of fifty minutes, endeavoring to comprehend the nature, occupation and destiny of man, and professing to have solved the mystery, would be less presumptuous than men whose reason claims to have fathomed God and the mysteries of his providence. And yet presumptuous men sometimes claim to originate new doctrines, new philosophies, and new religions, but when they have done their utmost to out-vie divine wisdom they must fall back on revelation, and learn that God's tender mercies are over all his works.

ART. VI.—CHRISTIANITY A MISSION WORK.*

The establishment of Christianity in the several parts of the world is a missionary work. The Spirit of this work was manifested in its great Author. He saw the angelic hosts and the glorified ones in heaven safe and happy, beyond all fear, while the inhabitants of earth were sinners, suffering in guilt and exposed to a most fearful retribution. He could have continued to share the bliss of the former, but he chose to open a door of hope for the latter. His love and compassion led him to forego the glory he had with the Father, and incarnate himself for the redemption of man. And never was there an exhibition of love and compassion like this.

To appreciate it in any proper degree, we should lift up our conceptions, clear and strong, to the heavenly mansions, and contemplate the royal honors and profound adoration enjoyed by the king eternal. We must see him in council with the Father, enthroned in glory and ruling the universe. From this height of power and this serenity of peace, we see him come down to this sinful world, and become "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." He even died that we might live, and live in bliss forevermore. From the highest exaltation in heaven, to the lowest humiliation on earth, Jesus stooped to save our race.

When he exclaimed on the cross, "it is finished," he only transferred the work from his own personal efforts to spiritual influences working through human agencies. Though our "Advocate with the Father," he is still our ever-present Saviour. He said to the disciples, "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," but added, "lo, I am with you alway." He virtually says to every pious soul, struggling with convictions in reference to missionary duty, "come, let us go to the destitute, and save poor lost souls." Jesus really goes with all the thousands of his faithful servants wherever duty calls,

*The writer acknowledges his obligations in the preparation of this article, to the recent work of Dr. Anderson on Foreign Missions.

and sympathizes with them in all that they endure. It will thus be seen that Christianity was founded, and is still propagated on the part of its founder, in what has ever been regarded as a characteristic spirit of the mission work.

The apostles, as the original word (*Ἀποστέλλω*, to send away) implies, were messengers, or missionaries, who went wherever the interests of the Master required. Christ said to the Father, "as thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I sent them into the world;" and the record says, they "went forth and preached everywhere." Some of their number were constantly stationed at Jerusalem, the center of all Jewish authority and influence, the place of their frequent convocations, because there they could not only strengthen the local church, but address more strangers than by traveling abroad. Paul was pre-eminently the apostle (the sent) to the Gentiles, and Barnabas and Silas, Timothy and Titus, and many others were his co-laborers in missionary work.

It is true that no church nor society was pledged to their support, and Paul declined aid from the churches of Corinth and Thessalonica, though he received it from Philippi "once and again." He was inspired to teach the doctrine that "the laborer is worthy of his hire," and enjoined regular contributions upon the Gentile churches for "the poor saints at Jerusalem." The apostolic age was truly one of missionary labor; and pious women, as well as men, have a noble record in Bible history. Churches were probably planted in not less than fifty places mentioned in the New Testament; and at the close of the first century, the gospel had been successfully preached throughout the Roman empire, extending from the British isles on the west to India on the east, and from the deserts of Africa on the south to the land of wandering barbarians on the north.

When inspired men of miraculous power, had all passed away, the broad fields so illustriously sown continued to be cultivated by worthy successors. The results of their labors are but imperfectly known, yet all writers have admitted that converts were multiplied in the face of continued trials. Christianity is indeed a religion of self-denials and sacrifices. It was founded in the sacrifice of the Saviour himself, and was extend-

ed by the self-denying and self-sacrificing labors of the apostles and their successors. The persecuting Jews inflicted great suffering upon the early Christians till their dispersion as a people, in the destruction of Jerusalem about the year 70.

In ten distinct persecutions the Romans sought the extermination of the Christian faith, during which three millions of followers are supposed to have suffered martyrdom. Afterwards came the persecutions of the papal power, in which fifty millions died for their adherence to "the faith once delivered to the saints." Because they could not enjoy their simple rights of worship unmolested, many of them fled from place to place, telling the story and evincing the spirit of Jesus as they went. And their exhibition of his dying love and saving grace added to their number on every hand. The wrath of man was thus made to praise the Lord.

When Constantine issued his decree in 325, that Christianity should henceforth be the religion of the Roman empire, wonderful was the change that followed. Persecution ceased, the profession of Christianity was honorable, and only Christians were promoted to the highest places of trust and power. Before the close of that century one-half of the people in the empire were nominal Christians. But, sad to relate, as the church rose politically, it sank morally. The standard of piety was lowered, ignorance and superstition prevailed, bitter controversies, contradictory councils and increasing degeneracy characterized the nominal church. Pastors became lordly, metropolitan bishops grew ambitious, and after a long struggle the prelate of Rome was acknowledged universal bishop, or pope, by Phocas, the usurper, in 606. That gloomy twilight was followed by the long night of the dark ages. Piety and learning then retired to deserts, mountains, and isolated countries. Missionary zeal died out, or found exclusive employment in the home work of keeping alive the true spirit of the gospel in secluded churches. And during all that long, dark period of papal supremacy and Mohammedan warfare, the pure fires of Christian devotion were kept burning, in spite of the persecuting hand that sought their extinction.

Ireland was called "the isle of missions." The gospel was

first planted there by Patrick, a Scotchman, in the middle of the fifth century; and one hundred years afterwards, missionaries began to visit other countries in Western Europe, and so zealous were the people at home to prepare and send them abroad, that Ireland, degraded as it now is, was then noted for its pious and learned men and as the nursery of missions. Every effort on the part of the pope to subjugate the Irish church was resisted till the twelfth century, when a papal bull authorized the king of England to invade the country and annex it to his own dominions, for the purpose of "extending the boundaries of the church." Ireland then fell, and great was the fall. So wedded did it become to the Catholic church, and so intense was its hatred of England, that the spirit of the Reformation never reached its green shores.

When the light of our holy religion was extinguished in Ireland, the Waldenses had already begun to illumine the Alpine regions, and, with the help of the Albigenses, a light there continued to shine, amid the most cruel persecutions, till the dawning brightness of the Reformation appeared. Thus has there ever been a true church in Europe, while Iberia, Armenia, and Persia, were the most noted missionary fields in the East, though the Nestorians did something for Christ in China. It was the self-denying, self-sacrificing spirit, such as is now manifested in the mission work, that kept alive the vital spark, when gross darkness so generally enveloped the world. All that the little bands of true Christians, scattered here and there by the cruelties of an apostate church, could do, was to stand up in the name of their Master for the truth, as he originally proclaimed it. In doing this they did a noble work, though millions of them found a martyr's grave.

The great reformers saw the light of truth and felt the quickening power of the Spirit; and being themselves free from the bondage of the papal church, they were anxious only to communicate the rich blessing to others. No organized efforts were made like those of modern missions, but a great mission work was done by the early Protestants. Men of wealth went forth themselves, or sustained the labors of others who could not otherwise have gone. Kings and rulers expended money

gathered from the people, in defense of religion at home, and for its extension abroad. Various means, and almost every kind of effort, were employed to advance the work. As the true church is a mission church, as it was established, and has been perpetuated, and must be extended as such, the false church has resorted to missionary efforts for its preservation and extension, as a glance at the facts will show.

The discovery of America and the circumnavigation of the cape of Good Hope, opened new fields of interest both in the East and in the West; and the invention of printing and the revival of learning awakened new enterprise, so that many were ready to go and occupy these fields. The papal church is never delinquent when an opportunity for increasing its power is afforded. And the purpose to send missionaries to the Indies, both East and West, was strengthened by the loss of all those countries at home, which were saved by the Reformation. Of all the societies and institutions formed for this work, the order of Jésuits was the most famous, and the most efficient. Every member of this order was solemnly bound to go wherever he might be sent, and to use whatever means he could employ for the conversion of the people to the Catholic faith. Moral character and intelligent views of God's claims or of human duty, were of little account, so long as the converts acknowledged the church and followed the priest.

Multitudes of these emissaries went to India, China, Japan, to both North and South America, to the islands of the sea, and, indeed, to every part of the habitable globe. There have been Catholic missions in India for more than three hundred years and a well-informed resident there one hundred and fifty years ago, estimated the number of missionaries then in the East, at two thousand. According to its last reports, the Romish church now has more than five thousand missionaries in the field, and the amount of receipts two years ago was nearly one million of dollars, of which one-fifth was sent to this country. There is reason to believe that the grand object of the papal power now is, to gain the ascendancy in England and the United States, where the right of suffrage is so nearly universal. Papal missions in heathen lands have been on the decline of late.

Among the reasons for this decline the following may be assigned: converts are not regenerated, the Spirit's aid and the power of faith are ignored, the Bible is rejected, native preachers are not employed, the aid of civil power is invoked, and a compromise with paganism is always made.

In addition to all the self-denying labors of the Protestant church voluntarily assumed, there was a most glorious missionary work performed for nearly three hundred years involuntarily. The cruel hand of persecution, that would not suffer the most devoted and active Christians to enjoy their rights of worship at home, compelled them to go into exile; and as they went, the banner of the cross was always unfurled, and disciples of Jesus were everywhere made. And now, when religious toleration is almost everywhere secured, the church is not at liberty to rest inactive, after comfortably supplying its own wants. When the coercive work of missionary labor ceased, the voluntary work began. The rights of conscience and the fruits of Christianity, as we now enjoy them, call upon us all to go ourselves, or assist others in going, to destitute places with the glad tidings of salvation. The great work of the Christian church is now the evangelization of the world, and she may look forward to the future with large encouragement.

At the very time when the church began to enjoy peace and prosperity at home, God was preparing the way for successful labor abroad. The swarming millions of Asia were far away, and they were difficult of access at the time when their country was reached; China and Japan were long closed to foreigners, India and Burmah were obstinate and cruel, and Turkey and Persia enforced the death penalty of Mohammedan law. Fifty years ago, scarcely a solitary opening, free and inviting, was to be found in the heathen world. But Protestant England, in protecting the East India Company for two hundred and fifty years, found it necessary to keep an open, over-land highway between Eastern Asia and Western Europe; and thus has the grasping power of Mohammedans, Greeks and Catholics been essentially checked. And when that great selfish corporation could serve the interests of humanity no longer, its existence was terminated in the very year (1858) that China was opened,

by treaty stipulations, for the introduction of Christianity and the protection of Christians. Access to Japan is nearly free, all death penalties for the change of religious faith have been abolished, the power of caste is fast giving way, and the six hundred millions of earth's most debased people, in Asia, Africa and the islands of the sea, are all more or less accessible to missionary labor. Much might be said of the doors now open in Central and Southern Europe, especially in Spain, and of the four millions of freedmen in our own land, all intensely eager for Christian elevation and Bible religion. In contemplating the opening world for missionary labor, we can but exclaim, "What hath God wrought!"

While the Lord has been preparing the way for the introduction of the gospel into all lands, he has also been preparing his people to engage in this great work. A more liberal and fraternizing spirit has been awakened, and, as wealth has increased, new channels of benevolence have been sought, till now the charities and labors of the church are world-wide. Improvements in printing and book-making have brought the Bible within reach of the poorest individual, the multiplied facilities for rapid transportation take the missionary to his field of labor at a reduced expense, and the accommodating postal and telegraphic arrangements keep him in open communication with the Christian world. The literature, art and science of the present day, bear much of Christian impress, and commercial intercourse, national relations, and revolutions even, now often subserve the interests of Christ's kingdom. The spirit of Christian enterprise is becoming universal, caring equally for the destitute at home and abroad. Most glorious has been the preparation for missionary work, both in the field and in the church, and bedimmed must be the eyes that do not see in it the hand of the Lord.

Missionary work, in its modern development, had its rise in England in 1789, when William Carey proposed in a convention of Baptist clergymen, to discuss "the duty of Christians to attempt the spread of the gospel among heathen nations." The Baptist Missionary Society was formed in 1792, and since then forty other societies have been organized in Europe, not includ

ing those for missions at home. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was organized in 1810, and since then fifteen other foreign mission societies have been organized in the United States, three of them before the formation of the Freewill Baptist Foreign Mission Society in 1832. These fifty-seven societies in Europe and America expended in the cause of foreign missions alone, in 1868, the sum of \$5,355,698, of which \$1,726,788 were raised and expended by the U. S. At the same time these societies had in their employ two thousand five hundred and forty-four ordained missionaries, of whom six hundred and seventy-four were natives. There were also five thousand six hundred and sixty-six assistant laborers, three thousand seven hundred and seventy-two being natives. The whole number of communicants was 251,028, and the number of scholars was 204,905.

Many of the early settlers in this country, under the inspiration of the example of John Eliot and David Brainard, went into the work of converting the Indians, with a zeal that has seldom been surpassed in any age of missionary labor. Before the close of the seventeenth century there were in Massachusetts alone, thirty Indian churches, and more than four thousand Christian Indians. From the day that Eliot preached his first sermon in 1646, till the present time, there has been continued missionary labor for the conversion of the Indians.

In the year 1780, the first Freewill Baptist church was organized, and for half a century the denomination performed missionary work almost exclusively. Scarcely a church had a settled pastor whose entire labors were expended at home, but every minister was an itinerant, traveling and preaching more or less in other fields. A majority of the ministers were without any permanent engagement. They preached wherever a door was opened, with little or no compensation, and usually in rural districts, where the neglected people were without gospel privileges. For the last thirty-five or forty years, less missionary work has been done on the plan of the fathers, but the organized work through the Home and Foreign Mission Societies will constitute an important item of history, and may be given in a subsequent number of the Quarterly.

ART. VII.—THE DOCTRINES OF PAUL AND JAMES ON FAITH AND WORKS, COMPARED WITH THE TEACHINGS OF CHRIST.

When Martin Luther, freed from the bondage of a church where works without faith abounded, looked in upon the epistle of St. James, he denied its inspiration, calling it a chaffy epistle. It is easy to see how this champion of the faith could pronounce such a judgment as this. He saw every-where the blind superstitions, the senseless forms of the Romish church. There was machinery but no spiritual life. The rebound from the thralldom that once hedged him in was so complete that he could not look upon with patience, could not calmly consider, any teaching that seemed to his sensitive, zealous spirit to savor of the practices of Rome.

Released from the bondage of form by the coming of that truth: "The just shall live by faith," he entered into nearest sympathy with the apostle who uttered it, and went forth to preach the doctrine of justification without works, believing that James spoke by no divine authority, frightened from a declaration of a vital living truth by the appearance of discrepancy.

The example of Luther has been followed by some on account of similar experiences and for similar reasons; but many reject the doctrine of works as given by the apostle James, because it does not harmonize with the desires of the heart. Each class hopes Paul will exonerate it from condemnation, mistaking the spirit and misunderstanding the letter of St. Paul.

The data for fixing the time of composition of St. James' epistle are wanting. It may have been as early as A. D. 45, or as late as 62. We favor the later date because of the intent, the purpose of the epistle, which was to specially guard against a wrong use of the doctrine of salvation by faith alone, as well as to correct certain faults in the practice of those churches which were composed principally of Jews. It obtained full canonical authority and was received as genuine in both the Greek and the Latin churches.

The doctrine of justification by faith, previous to the writing of

the epistle of James, had been made the occasion of license in iniquity, the cover of gross sensuality. Men can be saved, said these perverters, by merely knowing the truth; by assenting to the doctrines of the cross, salvation is possible; this assent, they said, is faith, and the life need not be changed. It was surely the hour and occasion for the zealous brother of our Lord, to raise his voice and ask: "What doth it profit, my brethren, that a man say he hath faith and have not works? Can faith" such faith as this, "save him?"

When Paul declares that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law, we find the bulwark he raises strengthened and established by the seemingly conflicting language of James, that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.

We cannot read the apostle James without having the importance of works in our justification fixed upon us. He seems to give works the preference over faith when he says: "By works a man is justified and not by faith only." There is no warrant in the Bible for the statement which we sometimes hear, that a man is justified wholly by works. St. James denies it, for he admits in the passage quoted, the presence and power of faith: "and not by faith only." As if to say: While I speak to you of the importance of works, which you have been pushing out of sight, know that I admit the vital necessity of the presence of faith.

Nor does St. James give encouragement to the doctrine that a man may be saved partly by faith and partly by works, however much he may seem to the superficial observer to favor it. When he asks: "Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works, when he had offered Isaac, his son, upon the altar," the question is followed by the statement that exalts the province of faith to its proper proportions: "And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it," that is, his belief, his faith, "was imputed unto him for righteousness." The patriarch was justified, then, in St. James' mind by the act of faith which was exercised many years before he went forth to sacrifice his son Isaac. Thus St. James declares that Abraham found justification, not in part by faith and in part by works, but, by faith only. By faith in a vicarious sacrifice are we saved,

is the teaching of Jesus and his apostles. Justification is not a lengthened process. A man does not begin to be justified to-day and gradually have the work of justification completed as the years roll on. It is either complete or not at all. It takes place at an instant and at that instant when a man, abandoning his own works, clings wholly for salvation to the vicarious atonement of Jesus Christ. But he cannot be justified at once, if he is justified, saved, partly by works. When a man fully believes, he is justified wholly, not needing to perform a certain amount of works to fill up a certain measure of justification which faith leaves deficient. If a man can be saved partly by faith and partly by works, tell us if possible, in what condition would that man be who as soon as he believes should die, before he could perform any works. The thief on the cross would find that Christ had deceived him, for he had no title to works such as should enable him to enter on that day into Paradise. The word of life gives no variation in any of its parts, from the truth : that a man's justification is complete just at the instant he believes, and he is at that instant prepared for the presence of God and his holy angels.

When the apostle Paul says in Rom. 3 : 28, " a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law," we must remember his preceding course of language and argument. He means here works done in obedience to the law of Moses, by men who are unwilling to receive the faith of the gospel. In the eyes of the men to whom he is writing, that gospel was foolishness because they went about to establish their own righteousness, being under bondage to the law. The works of which the apostle James speaks are those done in quite a different position, namely, under the gospel and after the heart has professed its faith in the righteousness of Christ. The works are set forth as the necessary product and proof of belief in Christ. On the one hand St. Paul rebukes those who depended upon their works to bring them merit in God's sight ; on the other, St. James exclaims against those who continually cry out : " I have faith, I have faith," but who, when asked for proof of possession, had no outward signs of it in their daily walk and life.

The vital point in the teaching of the apostle James is this :

a man is justified by that faith alone which will cause him to perform works for Christ's sake ; it is useless for him to say, "I have faith"—something which he calls faith, but from which the vital power is gone.

A man is called upon to have works to justify his faith, as much as to have a faith which will justify the soul. If he have the one in reality he will the other. A mere profession is a useless thing ; the tree which the Saviour cursed was beautiful with leaves but not with fruit. "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit ; so shall ye be my disciples." "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." St. James pronounces upon the utter uselessness of mere assent to, or of opinion respecting, the salvation of Christ.

We are required not only to have religion, but to show that we have it. Feeling is not the test ; what do we work, as the result of feeling ? A living principle in the heart cannot be smothered, it will out and show its strength. "Men do not light a candle and put it under a bushel." Men may say we have religion in the heart, and we enjoy it there without letting any body but God know it. This is an absurdity. Multitudes have attempted it, but not one ever succeeded. As well may the magnet keep to itself its magnetism when near a bar of iron, as for a soul in unison with Christ to keep itself unfelt among men, in the possession of its new-found life.

The Scriptures bid us prove our filial relationship to God by forming a character like his. Christ may bleed, may be crowned with thorns, followed by scourging hands, pierced with the spear which ingratitude levels at his heart, yet if we never bleed with sorrow for our guilt, nor are willing to enter a service for him that will pierce our pride and wound our self-love, if we will not consent to wear the crown of pain meekly for his sake, nor practice the self-denial that roots out our selfishness, we can in no sense whatever be said to be crucified with Christ. The blessing we obtain in the Christian's lot is just in proportion as we put ourselves in sympathy with Christ's self-denying work and become a willing partner with him as he goes forth to conquer ; just as we say "Lord, Lord," only to enter into the ser-

vice of a servant in his vineyard, making labor wait upon faith, and faith give inspiration and worth to our labor.

“I ask no heaven till earth be Thine,
 Nor glory-crown, while work of mine
 Remaineth here; when earth shall shine
 Among the stars;
 Her sins wiped out, her captives free,
 Her voice a music unto thee,
 For crown, new work give thou to me,—
 Lord, here am I!”

Only as we thus sing and live shall we possess such a waiting heart of faith as shall be a fountain of unceasing labors for the Master of Israel. There were those in the days of the apostles who extolled faith at the expense of morality and virtue. St. John in his first epistle speaks of those who “went out from us but they were not of us; in the third chapter of this epistle, verses 6, 7, he defines the true nature of faith, and warns against the opinions of the enemies of true faith by reminding men that only “he that doeth righteousness is righteous.” Again he says, the true test of knowing Christ is, that “we keep his commandments.”

St. Peter, also, recognizing the presence of such a perversion of the spirit and letter of the gospel, entreats the disciples of his day to “put to silence the ignorance of foolish men, with well doing, as free, and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness.” (1 Pet. 2: 15, 16.) Also in his second epistle 2: 19, he mentions the strange course of those who, “while they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption.”

Nor does this tendency escape the denunciation of St. Jude in the fourth and twelfth verses, as he tells of “certain men crept in unawares, . . . ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you.”

The evil which every other New Testament writer noticed

St. Paul and St. James endeavored specially to correct. Both labored with Christ-like zeal to establish upon the firmest foundation, this fundamental doctrine of faith, and to set it forth in the clearest possible light.

St. Paul makes everything depend upon regeneration. The very faith men have, is the gift of God in regeneration, it is of no work of men. It "is not of works," yet by it we become God's "workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2: 7—10. The works to which St. Paul refers, as preceding the gift of God in Christ, are quite different from those "unto" which we are "created in Christ Jesus." "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things," i. e., the works which men have done with a hope to merit heaven, "have passed away; behold, all things are become new." "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision," nor any of the works for which these stand as an index, "but a new creature." 2 Cor. 5: 17; Gal. 6: 15.

So that, while a believer is one who renounces his own works, he is "created unto good works;" that is, that he may bring forth good works, show the fruit of his discipleship by his works, just as St. James urges. In no way, therefore, does the salvation which cannot proceed from works exclude the works which every heart of faith is called upon to perform.

We must remember the sense in which St. Paul uses the term "works," as in usual distinction from the sense in which St. James uses it. The works which the latter insists upon, as necessary to be joined with faith, differ from those works of the law which St. Paul puts in opposition to faith. Good works, St. James declares, spring inevitably from faith, and so, while recommending a living faith, he urges the vital importance of works as the sure evidence of indwelling faith. St. Paul pronounces upon the utter inefficiency of works to purchase salvation, and at the same time he urges those again and again who have been delivered from the bondage of the law unto the covenant of grace, to be rich in good works, to let their works abound to the glory of God. He condemns those who "profess that they know God, but in works deny him;" that is, those

who, like those mentioned by St. James, say they have faith, make a profession of love to God, and yet show no proof of their faith, their profession, in their works.

Though St. Paul explicitly declares, "that a man is justified by faith and not by the works of the law," yet he is not less explicit in his declarations that every man shall be rewarded or punished according to his works. "Who," i. e., God, "will render to every man according to his deeds." Rom. 2: 6. "That every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5: 10. In Rom. 2: 13, we seem to be reading after St. James, where we find; "for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified."

Besides, it will not do to forget the usage by the writers of the New Testament of the terms *αγαθὰ ἔργα* and *κακὰ ἔργα*; the former term, meaning good works, denotes works which the pious heart, the heart of faith, performs; works proceeding from faith. We invariably find the works which are called good works ascribed to persons who have faith, and to no others. On the other hand the second term, meaning evil works, is used invariably to denote the effect of a lack of faith, the consequence of unbelief.

St. Paul never opposes good works to faith, but makes works of the law antagonistic to real faith. When he contrasts, it is not good works with faith, but good works with dead works,—works which the flesh endeavors to do.

Christ varied the method of instruction and the form of presenting truth according to the dispositions and circumstances of those whom he addressed. So that his instructions vary as much, apparently, as those of St. Paul and St. James. At one time when Christ healed the sick, he declares that it is faith that brings the blessing. It is faith that is prominently set forth in the case of the nobleman's son; it is faith that wins the Saviour's blessing when the sick man is let down through the roof into his presence. "Dost thou believe on the Son of God," was the great question put to the man cured of blindness. At another time he demands a full confession of his Sonship, of the power of his blood, as the condition of discipleship. He speaks of

belief as causing a disciple to do works meet for the Master's cause. John 14: 12.

"What shall we do," inquired the Jews, "that we might work the works of God." John 6: 28. But these very Jews were placing their chief reliance upon works, and seem to suppose that favor with God is to be attained by these. According to their need, Christ replies, that the great work of God is belief: "this is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." Thus declaring that their chief and saving work was to give up all dependence upon works and cling by faith to him. The thief on the cross found justification through faith alone in the merits of Jesus, not because of any outward work of obedience.

But we find in other teachings of our Saviour that works are the conditions of eternal life. He declares in Matt. 7: 15—20, that a man is known by his fruits, and by these he shall be condemned or acquitted before God.

The figure used by St. James, ch. 3: 11, 12, seems to be borrowed from that of Christ in this passage. In Matt. 16: 27, the Son of man is represented as rewarding every man at the last day "according to his works." The heavenly treasures are promised, Matt. 19: 21, to the young man on condition that he sells his property and distributes it to the poor. The twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew describes the decisions of the final judgment as depending upon the works of the judged.

Compare with the preceding, these statements of St. James: "Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed." "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith and have not works? Can faith save him?" James 1: 25; 2: 14.

When Christ speaks of acceptance coming through works, he by no means recommends any works that do not spring from faith. Works are, in his representations, always as intimately connected with faith as the fruit with the tree. When, in Matt. 16: 27, it is said that "he shall reward every man according to his works," we are to understand *πραξις* to "denote not indi-

vidual *εργα*, acts, of this or of that kind, but the whole course of life which flows from faith or from unbelief, and shows itself in the fruits of the one or of the other."

Behind the works must be the element of genuine faith, for Christ never loses sight of the intents and thoughts of the hearts of men. The ground of all acceptance is found in the heart; the right foundation, the rock upon which the house is founded, is a living faith in Christ, upon which naturally and surely deeds, works are builded. While the sinner must come empty-handed, trusting, believing Jesus only; while he is assured that pardon will not stay at the moment he has faith in God, he is yet commanded to enter, immediately after believing, upon works of righteousness, to do valiant service for Christ. He is assured that only by such a course can faith be kept alive.

Many claim God's mercy on account of their supposed virtues. They find merit not in Christ, but in their own righteousness. To such, God says, you can be accepted only through faith in my Son. Until you sink self out of sight, until self-will is broken, until you learn to do well for Christ's sake and through faith in his name, you are yet in your sins and cannot see God.

By exhibiting works in a prominent manner, Christ would teach us how to decide upon the real nature and value of faith; he would show the difference between a mere feeling and a living principle. Men were ready enough to profess faith in him, but he replies: "he that doeth the will of my Father," not those who cry "Lord, Lord," shall be saved. He declares the widest difference between a mere profession, and a life of "faith that works by love." No man, therefore, who lives as St. James describes men as living, without the power of godliness, without works agreeing with faith, can receive any comfort from the words of Jesus. No faith is valid that is contradicted by the life, the conduct.

Duty, ability, opportunity measure a man's condemnation, or mete out his reward. In the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew it is written: "Depart from me, ye cursed, for I was an hungered and ye gave me no meat;" "Come, ye blessed, for I was an hungered and ye gave me meat." So saith St. James, ch. 2: 15,

16: "If a brother or a sister be naked and destitute of daily food, and one of you say: depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit."

There is, then, no real disagreement, no opposition, between these two writers. Each had a specific object to attain, and strove, under inspiration, in the best manner to reach it. Both upheld the teachings of the Saviour as they illustrated some one of his peculiar doctrines. Each borrowed his mode and spirit of teaching from the lips of the Master. They differ from each other no more than Christ differs from himself in his various utterances. Each has contributed strength to the bulwarks of a living faith; a faith which seeks expression in works of love abounding unto the glory of Him who came to do the will of his Father in heaven.

"Faith and works,—how difficult a matter rightly to balance. And how bold are the Scripture statements on either side. The object, doubtless, is to place each in the strongest relief, that each may be duly considered; that neither may be neglected by the soul honest and earnest to find the way to heaven. And yet it is a fact, that this very strength, fullness and completeness of statement have even been the occasion of practical error; not necessarily, but on account of the obtuseness of some heads, and the blindness of more hearts. The two features or aspects of the one doctrine lie apart in the Bible; and some cannot and others will not put them together in one structure of symmetry and beauty. The part that is congenial is taken; a part for the whole. Some take to the side of faith, and will have it dishonored by no works; justified by faith, without any works of righteousness. Such say, we believe, that is enough; believing, heaven cannot be missed. These claim to think a great deal of Paul and his teachings. Others prefer to go independently to heaven, if they go at all; not be beholden to another for their character and their title to the place. These profess to get their light from James. In the former case, the indolence of the heart operates, its love of ease, its self-indulgence: in the latter, its pride is at work; and between the two,—the self-indulgent

tendency, and the self-justifying tendency,—it is to be feared a great many souls come short and perish.”*

Says the dreamer of Bedford jail: “If thou wouldst be faithful to do the work that God hath appointed thee to do in this world for his name, then beware and do not stick when hard work comes before thee. The word and Spirit of God come sometimes like chain-shot to us, as if they would cut down all—as when Abraham was to offer up Isaac. Oh, how willingly would our flesh and blood escape the cross of Christ! With Ephraim, we like to tread out the corn, and to hear those pleasant songs and music that gospel sermons make, where only grace is preached, and nothing of our duty as to works of self-denial.”

ART. VIII.—GOD'S WAY OF SALVATION.

BY REV. A. H. HEATH, AUBURN, ME.

The subject of human salvation is one of deep and absorbing interest to all men. There is in the human heart, more or less distinct, a consciousness of being in a lost condition. And however subtle and powerful the agencies that may be working to destroy this true instinct of the soul, it is continually re-asserting itself and filling the mind with torturing anxieties, so that, while without there may be a philosophical calmness, within there is fearful tumult.

Concerning this great and vital subject the world is full of various announcements. On no point touching the welfare of man is there wider disagreement. It is said on the one hand, that this salvation is easy of attainment, that it is, indeed, hard to miss of it, that it is even impossible to come short of it. Whatever agency a man uses or neglects to use, whatever he does or refuses to do, whatever he believes or disbelieves, whatever his moral character may be, whether his heart is as pure

*Dr. Shepard's Sermons.

as that of the beloved John or as dark and perfidious as that of Judas, let him struggle in whatever direction he may, let his life be effortless and he be tossed passively about by earthly influences, yet as man is the predestined heir of salvation, whatever his character or condition, he is sure to obtain it. There are others who, with a shade of greater reasonableness, admit the proposition that method must be employed in securing this great treasure. They assert that a man must make efforts, that he must struggle for this heavenly boon. They declare, with almost an evangelical earnestness, that he must call in some agency whereby to lift himself into this glorious heirship to eternal life. But they make the way very broad, in fact, limitless. They draw no lines, they fix no boundaries, they specify no method, but leave man to follow his own inclinations. He may seek heaven in this or that way. He may walk in the well-trodden paths of the ages, or, ignoring them all, he may carve his own way to future bliss. He may call to his help any agency that suits his fancy. He may trust in the Christ of the Bible, or choose for his Saviour some other one whom he may fancy will be equally potent, or he may reject all outside helpers and trust to the strength of his own arm and the inherent goodness of his own heart. There is, they say, no specific method, no divinely appointed way, to the exclusion of all other ways and methods;—there is no single instrumentality which is alone efficient, powerful enough to lift man out of his sinfulness. They declare that, while there may be certain methods and agencies which are strongly hinted at by revelation and well approved by sound reason, these are really no better than a thousand other agencies which a man may choose at his own pleasure. Thus they seek to make the way of life a broad way.

God is so kind, so infinitely charitable, it is urged, that he would not put any limitations upon these things. He would not restrict men to a single method, nor bind them rigidly to a given instrumentality, therefore he allows every one to come in his own peculiar way; that for each and all, the door of heaven opens equally wide and a crown of glory equally bright is in waiting. It is not a difficult thing to make this broad announcement appear very plausible to the sin-loving heart of man.

Over against this liberal theory stands the declaration which shines with living light from every page of the New Testament, which rings to-day, and for eighteen hundred years has been ringing from all truly Christian pulpits, filling the earth more and more with its melody. It is to this effect, that there is a method of salvation, a divinely appointed method, which absolutely excludes all others; that there is an instrumentality of heavenly appointment, commissioned for this very purpose, endowed with power for this specific work, and that beside it there is and can be no other powerful enough to lift man out of his pollutions and give him back to purity; that there is a way of salvation, a definite way, a way indicated by the hand of Jehovah himself from the beginning, marked by the bloody footprints of his Son, spoken of by the prophets, sung by the angels, preached by the apostles, tried and proved by those martyrs and holy men of God, who, through fire and flood, amid great tribulations, have marched with steady steps and triumphant singing to their home above; that this way is strait and narrow and well defined, and besides it there is no other; that it is the only way from earth to heaven; that in it alone can the trembling soul find solid ground upon which to walk through life and through death to the shores of joy and hope beyond. This way, this instrumentality, this method, is Christ. Through his name alone we can be saved. The broad earth with its myriad voices speaks no other; the heavens reveal no other; there is, there has been, there can be, no other. This is the doctrine to which attention is especially called in this paper.

There is but one way of salvation. In the first place, we prove the proposition that there is but one way of salvation by the word of God. God has said so. He plainly declares: "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." There is no symbol here. The expression is not figurative. The words are plain and direct. Nowhere has God ever qualified them. There is not a passage in all the Bible that will allow us to interpret these words otherwise than literally. They mean just what they say.

Now to a man who has reverence for the Bible, who believes

that it is the word of God and that the word of God is true, this is enough. It is positive proof. There is no need to such a one of going beyond this. What God plainly speaks, such a man fully believes. He may not be able to understand it fully, it may be vastly beyond his comprehension, it may ruthlessly contradict all his usual thinking, and unceremoniously assail his idea of the fitness of things, but nevertheless he confidently believes it, for it is the word of God, and God's word is strictly true, however incomprehensible and strange it may seem.

If there are those who cannot believe the word of God, they will gain no light here. If they want eternal truth substantiated they must go to those who have time and inclination, and are foolish enough withal, to make such efforts. God forbid that we should attempt to prove that he has spoken the truth. God's word does not need the sustaining power of any human argument, it stands upon its own everlasting foundation. On this foundation we can stand and stand forever, for heaven and earth shall pass away, but God's word shall never pass away. If we cannot believe God, whom can we believe? If this is not a book of truth, where shall her sweet voice be heard? If inspiration has failed, who has told the truth? If we must prove the correctness of Scripture before we can trust it, is not our position a most miserable one? If the accountant must correct his ready reckoner every time he casts interest, he might as well throw it into the street and depend upon his own figures for the whole process. If the statements of the Bible must all be proved before they are used, then we might almost as well cast our Bibles into the fire and depend entirely upon our own reason. That point being settled, that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, it being settled that the Bible is the word of God, then, if consistent, we must believe it simply because it is the word of God; we should never go back of any of its statements for proof of their truthfulness; the greatest proof possible being this, that they come from the Source of all truth. Then we can believe the declarations of inspiration, although there may be much human testimony to the contrary. The general experience of men may sometimes be against it. Philosophy and science may be against it, but yet we can believe it, for it is the word

of God. Science may tell us that the bush upon Horeb could not burn without being consumed, but God says it did and we believe it. Science may tell us that the sun could not stand still upon Gibeon and the moon stay in the valley of Ajalon without throwing the whole solar system into chaos, but God says it was so and we can believe it. Science may protest that no power could have turned the water of the Nile into blood, or the water at the marriage feast in Cana into wine. Science may declare that no power could have opened the eyes of the man blind from his birth, nor have called the putrefying body of Lazarus from the grave and given it life. God says all these things have been done and we must believe His statement.

Having this faith in the Scriptures, it is the ultimatum of argument to us when anything can be proved from the word of God. Does God say it, then we cannot reply against it. Thus it must be conclusive proof to every one who believes in God, that there is but one way of salvation because he declares it to be so.

But in the second place, the proposition that there is but one way of salvation is proved from the character of the sacrifice which God has made for sin. God gave Christ to die for us, that through his wondrous sufferings and death we might be saved. He had no equal, there was none like him among all the heavenly hosts, bright and fair though they were. The mightiest angel before the Father's throne was infinitely his inferior. Christ stood alone in his glory and power, equaled only by the Father himself.

This matchless one, God gave to die for the salvation of men. This point no one will deny who has any reverence for truth. But why did God take that particular method? why did he not do something else? why did he give Christ in preference to any other of the heavenly host? Why not Gabriel instead of Christ? Simply because Gabriel could not meet the emergency. God adopted that plan because no other method would avail anything. Man was not within the reach of the archangel's arm. Christ alone had power to lift humanity out of its hopelessness.

Christ was not an arbitrary gift, but a gift demanded by the

exigencies of the case. God did not consign his only begotten and well beloved Son to that painful death merely that he might display his wonderful merey. He did not give him simply because he chose to do thus, when something else would have answered just as well. This is not his way of doing. He does not throw away heavenly treasure. He does nothing for display. In all of God's works he does nothing that is not absolutely needed. It is the same in the domain of matter and of spirit. If this, then, is God's character, it follows that he would not have given Christ if it had not been necessary. If he could have saved man by any plan involving less pain he would have done it. If any smaller sacrifice would have answered he would have given it, but this was the only possible way. No amount of human suffering and blood could have wiped out the guilt of man; ten legions of angels could not have saved a single soul. It was in the power of Christ alone to wash away the guilt of man in his blood and save him from his awful fate. If it be true that in all the universe Christ stands peerless, if it be true that God gave him to die for our salvation, then from the known character of God it follows that he alone could save us, and, of course, it follows that we can be saved alone through him. Therefore our proposition is established that there is but one way of salvation. Indeed, we have proved more than this, we have proved that it was not possible for Heaven to provide any other way. If Christ had any equal, it would have been possible to have another name given and another way of salvation opened. If there had been more than one Christ, there might have been more than one Saviour. But there was only one Christ. He was without a peer. In surpassing grandeur, in sublimest majesty he towered above all angels until lost in the unspeakable glory of the eternal God-head itself. And this peerless one, seated in the highest circle of celestial glory, this one, above all and over all, alone has the power of saving humanity from its awful doom. Through him alone God reaches men, through him alone can men reach God.

But not only by the word of God and the character of Christ, but by the character of God's visible works, do we prove our position. This last may not be positive proof, but, in view of

what has been said, it is a strong corroborative testimony to the truth of our doctrine.

As far as human thought has been capable of exploring divine workings, it has been found that this idea of one way stands out with great prominence, so that, as far as we can see and know, we are warranted in saying that God has a plan for everything, and for each distinct thing a distinct plan.

We look through the realm of matter and wherever we can trace the marks of divine workmanship, we find that method has been employed, a definite method, a method from which there was no variation. He made the world and covered it with its present beauty and glory according to a fixed plan. So also he made and beautified all worlds. The vast planetary systems moving in sweet and undisturbed order, filling the unmeasured depths of space with the music of their harmony, were arranged and set in motion in accordance with a definite plan. Had it been otherwise, chaos, and confusion the most terrible, would speedily have taken the place of the beautiful order which now reigns through space. Every planet has its one way to roll and is held to that one way by a rigid rule; so, also, the minutest particle that helps make up these massive spheres is bound to its place, its relations are fixed, its destiny determined, by a specific law.

While there are endless variety and infinite profusion, yet in the midst of this profusion every class, every species, and every distinct thing, is held by an inflexible law, a distinct and single method by which to fulfil its mission and work out its destiny. Every thing is brought to pass according to some rule. There is an appointed way for the grass to grow; a way for the flower to unfold; a way, a definite way, for all vegetable life to be sustained. Now reasoning upward from this lower order of unconscious things to the kingdom of conscious existence, animal life, we should say if the same hand works, it will here work in the same manner; that is, definitely and with method. Science abundantly confirms the supposition. All the conditions of the physical organism are distinctly appointed. There is a one way for everything in this department also. The relation of the body to its parts and to every other body, and the relation of

the parts to each other and to the whole are fixed. The hand, the foot, the eye, the ear, the stomach, the brain, the muscles, the nerves, all have their well defined laws, in obedience to which they act. The functions of the body, digestion, assimilation, the delicate machinery of circulation, respiration and combustion are governed by specific law; all have their distinct method of operation, all have their appointed channel through which to act. It is utterly impossible to conceive of a body which is destitute of this method; of one in which every member and faculty may choose between several methods of action. The body is fearfully and wonderfully made, delicate in its adjustments and complicated in its combinations, yet it is harmonious in its action because every member and particle has its appointment and is held to it by an unchanging law.

Leaving now the domain of inanimate matter and animal life, we go one step higher and pass into the realm of spirit, where dwells the image of God, where sweep the currents of immortality, where are felt the throbbings of an everlasting life, and we ask the question are there order and method here? Has the same Hand that with such precision appointed all the relations and methods of inanimate matter, carried out the same idea in this higher sphere also, or has he been definite in his appointments every where else but not here? Has he been definite in the arrangements that govern trees and dying bodies, and does he now leave the immortal spirit without sure guide, method, rule? Has he marked the fiery pathway of the sun; has he given the moon her course; does he hold every planet to a given track; will he not allow a star to deviate from its appointed way; has he been definite in the appointment of method and ways throughout his vast dominion, and has he now no method, no definite way in which to lead a soul from earth to heaven? Such a supposition would be opposed to all evidence and contrary to all reason and analogy.

God's dealings with his people have ever been in perfect keeping with this idea, showing that he loves order here, as every where else. Wherever his hand has been interposed in human affairs it has been in accordance with design. Wherever God

has directed the current of human events there are evidences of pre-arrangement indicating a plan in the divine mind. He has always had a way in which to lead his people. It has been clearly defined, its boundaries fixed, and his people have stepped over these boundaries only to perish.

Seeing these things we are prepared to assert that there is but a single way in which the soul may be redeemed and saved. How overwhelming is the testimony! The word of God on each bright page; the character of Christ, rising in lofty grandeur above all men and angels; God's revealed character declares this truth. But, in addition to these, the solemn voice of all created things chimes in with sweet accord. It is written in characters of living light on every material thing; rock, tree, stream and mountain, all unite with God's word in saying that there is but a single way of salvation for the soul of man.

But it is objected that this doctrine of one way of salvation is narrow and that it savors of bigotry. There are those who say that it is too restricted, illiberal, too much wanting in generosity for the present age. The broad and liberal culture so called, of the present day demands something less strict and dogmatic. The people of to-day, it is urged, have outgrown the system which the primitive preachers constructed for their hearers. But is this charge true? Is it not demonstrated clearly that there is and can be but one way of salvation? There is then, no way left open to us but to receive it whether it suits our liberalism or not, we cannot reject the truth simply because it does not agree with our feelings or thoughts.

Wherein is this doctrine illiberal? While proving that there is but one way of salvation, we have proved that that way is perfectly adequate to the wants of humanity. Man needs nothing that is not fully supplied by this one method. The human soul has not a want that is not met by this single plan. The way is one, the name is one, but it is in its adaptation as broad as the earth. There beats not a heart that is not embraced by this plan. There is no soul to whom this highway to heaven is not open and free. The grace and power of Christ, like the canopy of heaven, stretch around the world and lay their bless-

ings freely at the feet of every child of Adam. It is fitted to meet the wants of every living soul in the most perfect manner. Is this illiberal, is this narrow, is this ungenerous?

If Christ offers the benefits of his death to every man; if salvation is placed within the reach of every soul, what more can even liberalism demand?

In order to be liberal must one go beyond man's wants and offer him that which he does not need? If one way of salvation is enough, who can ask for more? Do men mean by liberal Christianity that God has gone beyond the wants of humanity and thrown away heavenly treasure? Do they mean to say that when one way of salvation is enough that God has provided a multitude of ways? Truly we find that terms have changed their meaning, so that liberality means looseness, benevolence becomes unmeasured wastefulness, and freedom means license to do as one pleases.

Such men complain because we insist on this doctrine of one way of salvation. They grow bitter and call us narrow-minded and bigoted because we tell men plainly that they can be saved only through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. They hate us, as they did our Master, because we will not admit, against all evidence and sound reason, that a man may be saved in any manner he chooses, through faith in Christ or without faith in Christ, in his sins or without his sins, by doing this or that, or by doing nothing; no matter how he lives, no matter how he dies, no matter what he believes, no matter what he disbelieves, there is no particular method of salvation, therefore, whatever method he may adopt, he is just as sure to be saved.

But men do not get angry with teachers in other departments because they give the world definite knowledge. The scholar does not despise his teacher because he gives him direct answers, pointing out the only way to solve a problem, the only way to explain a phenomenon. Men do not usually dislike their friends because in time of trouble they indicate the only sure way of relief. They are not declared illiberal because they insist that there is but one sure way of escape. On the contrary, he is counted most truly liberal and most truly the friend of man, who will give definite knowledge to his fellow mortals on

any point touching their temporal welfare. For instance, here is a man whose property is in danger. He goes to his lawyer and says to him, "Sir, how shall I save my property?" The lawyer answers, "There is no particular method, there is no one way that is better than any other way, the law prescribes no definite course, do anything you please, or do nothing, it will amount to the same in the end." Would he call his adviser a liberal man, would such legal advice please, would anybody trust such counsel? But if his counsel should say to him with evangelical strictness, "My dear sir, there is the law and that law says there is but one way to save your property, choose it and you are safe, neglect that specific way and your interests are lost, would he not feel, in this latter case, that his lawyer had dealt most kindly, generously, yea, liberally with him?

Or suppose he is sick; a violent fever burning up his vitality. He sends for his physician and asks, "What must I do to be healed?" He is answered, "Do anything you please, there is no particular way of dealing with fevers. Eat what you please, drink what you please, take any medicine you like, adopt allopathy, homeopathy, or the botanic system, or all three combined, it will make no difference. One method is just as good as another, and no method at all will do just as well as either." Would any sane man trust such a physician; would he believe that his physician had his welfare at heart? would he not much rather hear him say, "Here is a method which generations of medical practice have proved to be the best, follow this method and live, neglect to follow it and you die."

So, also, when a man feels that he is a sinner, a lost man, and goes to his minister with the question of the jailer, "What shall I do to be saved?" if he is in earnest to know the truth how would he prefer to be answered? In the loose, indefinite terms of modern liberalism, or in the definite terms of evangelical truth? Would it satisfy his heart to hear his minister say, "There is no particular way of dealing with souls, do anything you please, one thing is as good as another." He longs, rather, to hear him say, "There is but one way; the voice of inspiration declares it, the finger of Omnipotence points to it; there it is, it is Christ. There is power in no other to save you, there

is but one thing to be done, believe on him; do this and live, neglect to do it and you die." Is not he most truly the sinner's friend? Is not he the most liberal man who gives unto a lost world the most definite knowledge concerning its salvation, who points mankind to the surest way of escape? It cannot be denied that this is the surest. Let it be granted that all the methods which the sinful heart can desire or the fruitful imagination devise are good and safe, yet the most arrogant liberalist cannot deny that if there is any preference it must be given to the Christ of the Bible. He is the safest way. Whence, then, the charge of narrowness, of bigotry, of unkindness? Is it an imputation against the infinite generosity and kindness of God to suppose, that when man was exposed to the pains of eternal damnation, he provided a way of escape, and, that there might be no confusion, only one way; marking that way from beginning to end with the blood of His Only Begotten; kindling beacon-lights all along the road from earth to heaven; throwing upon that one way the light of inspiration, and making it to shine in the midst of earth's darkness with the very glory of heaven, so that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein?

Ought such a system as this, in its breadth and liberality, to be compared for a single moment with that promulgated by modern liberalism? Can we accept in its place a system having no central idea nor fundamental principle, which is like Hawthorne's palace in the clouds, without foundation or substance; its shadowy outlines dissolving into thin air? The religion, or the no-religion, of liberalism furnishes no solid ground upon which a man can stand, nor a substantial thought to feed the soul or comfort the heart. Most truly may it be said modern liberalism is a lie. It is not liberal, but most narrow and restricted. It is as broad and liberal as man can make it, but the evangelical system is as broad and liberal as God can make it.

The true liberalism, then, is that which binds men most strictly to Christ as the only way of salvation. The only narrow-mindedness and bigotry of the age is that which, rejecting Christ, restricts man to the narrow ways and methods of human

reason. The voice of mercy and love, of infinite kindness and liberality, cries: "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

On this ground only, the evangelical ministry of the world are standing. Let the young men who go forth from our seminaries to mingle in the battles of life take their stand only here. This alone is solid ground. Resting on this sure foundation, they need not fear the missiles which a reckless, godless philosophy may hurl. Let them stand upon this rock and the gates of Hell cannot prevail against them. Here will be their strength. Elsewhere they will find only weakness and confusion. Here is the source of all power to bless the world. The men who have made epochs, who have lifted humanity up toward God, have stood here; the apostles and primitive disciples rested here as they went from Jerusalem to the uttermost parts of the earth preaching Christ. Reformers and martyrs stood here, and from this one great truth derived their power. This living doctrine has been successfully preached from the stake, the gibbet and the rack. The light from this one truth banished the darkness that had brooded over Europe for ages, when Luther proclaimed it anew to the nations. Our fathers stood here as they went like flaming heralds through the land, swaying the multitudes, as the strong wind sways the forest. This was their inspiration and their power. It was unailing food to their souls, it was sure comfort to their hearts. They died triumphantly in the same faith which they had lived and toiled to spread. The voice of their triumphant singing floats through many generations of noble, self-denying toil. It is poured like a flood from the heavenly gates while all the glorified shout to the inhabitants of earth: "This is the way, walk ye in it."

Let this doctrine take possession of head and heart; let it breathe in sermons; let it throb in prayers, and whether men approve or condemn, God will say "well done."

ART. IX.—IMPEDIMENTS TO SELF-KNOWLEDGE.

BY REV. J. M. BREWSTER, DOVER, N. H.

The statement that self-knowledge is difficult of attainment implies no assumption, since the teachings of Scripture, the maxims of the ancient heathen philosophy and individual consciousness attest to its truthfulness. But while the difficulty is admitted it is proper to make some inquiries respecting the grounds upon which the difficulty rests.

Self-Knowledge implies continuous thought. Hence arises no small part of the difficulty of gaining it.

One need not give much attention to his mental habits to see how little of his time is devoted to the close and continuous application of his mental faculties. Indeed, the great mass of mankind is almost utterly ignorant of such application. Captivated by frivolities, amused with trifles, indulging excessively in pernicious day-dreams and extensive castle-building, they shrink from the effort required to contemplate realities. To draw conclusions from premises, to compare antecedent with consequent, to trace the connection between cause and effect, or, in other words, to think, is something foreign to their experience.

The repugnance of the popular mind to continuous thought is manifest in the eagerness with which works of fiction are sought; in the preference for illustration rather than argument, for the concrete rather than the abstract; and in the superabundance of criticisms and the paucity of inventions. That which is understood at sight is sought and devoured with alacrity, while that which requires thought and study, though far more valuable is rejected. Such is the fact, whether we search for its cause in the many cares and anxieties which crowd the mind, in habits of mental indolence, constitutional or acquired, in a want of intellectual discipline, or in the abstract character which thought often assumes, or in all of these combined.

Self-knowledge is impossible without self-examination. But self-examination is not a pastime, but something which involves severe mental exertion. But were continuous thought all that self-examination implies, or were the thought involved in it the

same, in kind and degree, as is contained in other mental processes, it must be pronounced difficult. But this is not all. It implies other things, in consequence of which its difficulty is in no small degree enhanced.

Self-examination is attended with no little difficulty since it implies continuous thought respecting the state of one's own heart. We are often most ignorant of those things with which we should be most conversant. Many who are well acquainted with history, are to a great degree strangers to the causes which are operating and the events which are transpiring in their own day and in their own immediate neighborhoods. The Copernican system of astronomy was discovered and understood long before it was known that man possessed a system within himself equally wonderful. The great majority of the race are far better acquainted with things exterior to themselves than with their own physical constitutions, so fearfully and wonderfully made. Men usually evince a similar comparative ignorance respecting themselves, the workings of their own minds and the motives by which they are governed. Whatever difficulties one may experience in the investigation of intricate subjects, or in pursuing trains of thought exterior to his own mind, he must encounter those which are greater and more perplexing when he turns his attention within and takes cognizance of himself; when the observing mind becomes the thing observed. The difficulty in which it becomes involved may, perhaps, be better understood by an illustration. The soldier on the battle-field who would observe the progress of the engagement at each step and in all its details, is at the same time, a participator in the scenes which he would inspect. Does he pause to witness what is transpiring around him, he fails to perform his duties as a soldier; or, is he eagerly engaged in the conflict, he has no time to observe what is passing. His situation illustrates the truth of the old adage, that the player does not enjoy the game so well as the looker on. The mind that would observe its own state and operations wastes its energies upon itself. When it would observe itself it is in a condition the least favorable to be observed.

The difficulty in question is also seen in the fact, that the work of self-examination is peculiarly that of the individual.

In solving difficult problems, in labored investigations, or in performing any severe task, he is often largely assisted by the suggestions and sustained by the sympathies of others. It is then that he feels the force of the truth expressed by the wise man: "As iron sharpeneth iron, so a man sharpeneth the countenance," or, more properly, the understanding, "of his friend." He, however, who would examine his own heart must do it by himself and for himself. He can call no one to his aid. The secrets of his own heart are things with which a stranger intermeddleth not.

These facts accord with individual experience. How often has it happened in this work of self-examination, when we have been intently observing the state of our own hearts, and have, as we thought, successfully pursued and gained the desired object that just then something came in unbidden to divert the mind while the object of pursuit vanished from our view. He who would look within, must maintain a steady eye, a firm grasp and a resolute purpose.

Such are the difficulties involved in the work of self-examination when considered from a purely intellectual standpoint. What are the moral difficulties which attend it?

We are attracted toward objects which are pleasing. The mind is delighted for hours in beholding some beautiful landscape, or in dwelling upon the genius displayed in some work of art. It often descends lower and amuses itself with mere frivolities. It even clings with excessive fondness to objects debasing in their nature and influence, if they only produce pleasing sensations, and flatter self-love and vanity. It prefers to remain in ignorance rather than listen to such disclosures of character and condition as will humble its pride. The business man who has fallen in arrears with his creditors, strives to console himself with the thought that every thing is safe, neglecting, at the same time, to examine his accounts, fearing that the balance shall prove to be largely against him. The same disposition was manifested in the conduct of a wicked king of Israel, who, on going to battle, declined to enquire of the prophet of the Lord respecting the expediency of doing so: "I hate him, for he never prophesied good concerning me, but always evil."

Christ referring to this same disposition, says, "For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved."

We possess faithful monitors in our consciences when they are allowed to have full and healthy exercise. By the aid of conscience, the hidden recesses of the soul are laid open and its motives brought into full view. The picture is not always pleasing. Is the conscience permitted to give its decisions untrammelled, it becomes a condemning judge. Does the individual faithfully examine his own heart and learn its secret lurking motives, he is led to abhor himself and to feel that in his flesh there dwelleth no good thing. So a man, especially in his sinful state, shrinks from the work of self-examination. He who views the corruptions of the heart, is almost instinctively repelled from them. The revelations of conscience are too appalling to allow him to look upon them with any degree of satisfaction. Self-knowledge opens up depths all unknown and unsuspected before the light of knowledge pierced them.

We would not be understood as asserting that the picture here drawn represents all minds, but that it is in accordance with the natural instincts and tendencies of the human heart. There are, doubtless, many who desire to be strictly honest in dealing with themselves, and who prefer to know even the worst depths of their souls. But the alarming fact stares us in the face that they whose hearts are the most corrupt and whose condition is the most fearful, are those who are the least inclined to turn their eyes within. The situation of that individual is deplorable indeed who prefers to remain in ignorance of his real condition rather than to comprehend it.

Self-examination is attended with great difficulty because the sinfulness of the heart cannot be fully seen in consequence of individual self-love.

The fact that an individual is a party concerned, disqualifies him to sit in judgment upon a particular case in court. However honest he may be in other things, there is danger that in this thing he may be swayed by his passions and prejudices, since his own interests are at stake. Such an individual would be likely to magnify all the points in the testimony which are in

his favor and under-estimate those which are against him. However partial and untrustworthy the judgment thus pronounced, would be, it is analagous to the judgments which the individual, in self-examination, is likely to pronounce upon himself.

Does a man recall the past? Memory presents the favorable side of the picture, charities bestowed, deeds of kindness done, hardships endured and temptations withstood; while it leaves in the background the numerous instances of faltering and fainting by the way, of remissness in duty, of cowardice in the hour of danger. The Christian is inclined to recall those seasons when his heart glowed with love to Christ and he was jealous of his honor; but that time of coldness and indifference, that hour when he was found wanting, has passed into forgetfulness. Is the verdict so strong that there is no escape from it? The mind, fruitful in invention, finds numerous palliating circumstances to attenuate its guilt. That which one would condemn in his neighbor as wholly unjustifiable, is passed over in himself with tacit approbation.

The injunction: "Meddle not with him that flattereth with his lips," cannot fail to be approved by the universal judgment of mankind. But there is a kind of flattery far more common than that which one receives from his neighbor. It is self-flattery, the most insinuating and dangerous flattery. It is with us when we go out and when we come in; and especially is it with us in the secret place, though unbidden, when he who would entice us by his words may be far away. We are constantly in danger from the snares which it has set to entrap us.

History informs us of a Russian queen, who, passing through her wasted country, caused painted villages to be erected along her route, that she might divest herself of the thought that her country was not prosperous. When we contemplate such an act, we smile at the folly which produced it. But how many, beguiled by self-love, pass through life amid delusions of their own creation, no less foolish but far more ruinous in their tendency.

But as we contemplate these difficulties let us not feel that self-examination is impossible. We have endeavored to present the subject in its true aspect. An attempt to quiet ourselves by remaining in ignorance of facts which intimately concern us, is

full of the most fearful dangers. When eternal interests are imperiled the worst should be known. But self-examination is not impossible. The greatest obstacles that encompass it, if attacked with patience and untiring zeal, yield the way to richest victory. Our strength comes to us as the day brings the heat and burdens of strife. The Master maketh a way for his zealous, earnest ones, so that out of the bitterness of *Marah*, the soul comes to sweet waters of refreshment and rest.

Let us, in concluding this subject, emphasize a truth that has already been implied. Since self-examination is so difficult, it may be inferred that there is a greater destitution of self-knowledge than of almost any other kind of knowledge whatever.

Man has, in his imagination, wandered into infinite space, measured the distance and magnitude of the stars and learned the laws by which their motions are governed. He has gone back to the time when the creative fiat of Jehovah was first uttered, and has witnessed each successive act of creation and marked each new development of animal and vegetable life on the earth. He has observed the progress of his race, the rise and fall of nations; he has been skilled in science and versed in philosophy, but he has been withal comparatively ignorant of himself. This very knowledge of external things promotes his pride and conduces to self-exaltation. A knowledge of one's own heart leads to humility and self-loathing and is, therefore, shunned. There is danger that we imagine our course of life to be correct, and, at the same time, fail to recognize the motives by which we are governed. If two of the disciples of our Lord, who were constantly with him and taught by him, were told on an occasion when they exhibited an excess of the selfish and vindictive spirit, that they knew not what manner of spirit they were of, should we be surprised, on strict self-examination, to learn that unworthy and, perhaps, positively wicked motives prompt us to the performance of that which we may imagine to be among our best and most praiseworthy deeds? "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." By means of this depravity of heart, the conscience is not allowed to render free and impartial decisions. Thus pride often becomes self-respect. A miserly disposition comes to be termed

prudence ; cowardice is dignified with the name of caution ; rashness takes the healthier name of zeal ; recklessness is interpreted as a free-hearted generosity, and the love of praise for its own sake, is made to appear simply the desire of approbation for the sake of the encouragement which it affords. We cannot be too faithful in self-dealing, nor too careful in determining the character of the motives by which we are actuated. There comes a time if not now, when our hearts will be laid open to us with all their deceitfulness and depravity.

Any rebuke, then, which is calculated to correct the life, may well be received in the spirit of meekness and thankfulness. The most unwelcome reproof may become of untold value. David after committing a most atrocious crime, was living in apparent indifference in regard to it, but when his attention was called to the wrong, he understood its true character, and unconsciously pronounced judgment against himself : "As the Lord liveth the man that hath done this thing shall surely die." And the prophet answered back with unswerving fidelity : "Thou art the man."

With subdued spirits over our waywardness and wilfulness, let us take up the cry : "Let the righteous smite me ; it shall be a kindness : and let him reprove me ; it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break my head." "Faithful are the wounds of a friend ;" but even the railings of an enemy may lead us to examine ourselves and ask if his views of us are not more correct than those which in our weakness we entertain of ourselves.

Socrates used to say that every man had need of a faithful friend and a bitter enemy ; one to advise with him, the other to show him his faults. When Plato was informed that one whom he greatly esteemed had spoken ill of him, he replied, "I am sure he would not have done so if there had not been reason for it." Many things which others have said, words that rankle and burn within us, have most truth in them. So that which was meant for evil may become a source of blessing.

We are often called to pass through trials that wither our brightest hopes, afflictions that tear away our sweetest joys. Let no heart regard God's dealings as too severe ; let it not push away the cup of bitterness in rebellion. Out of the darkness,

led by God's hand, we come into the serene, pure light of self-knowing. Nay better than all, we come to know, in ways of grief, not only the weakness of our own hearts, but the superabounding help of the almighty Arm. The comforts that had been else all unknown may flow with the sweetness of honey in upon the soul. With the constant prayer : " Search me, O God, and know my heart ; try me, and know my thoughts : and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting," the soul shall know itself only to flee to the perfect quiet and peace of the everlasting arms of refuge ; from weakness and self-worship we shall be led to rest in the strength of him who encampeth round about his beloved with eternal might !

ART. VIII.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THE OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY, From the creation to the return of the Jews from captivity. Edited by William Smith, L. L. D., classical examiner in the University of London. With maps and woodcuts. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869. 12mo. pp. 715.

Dr. Smith's services have been so large, varied and valuable in the field of sacred literature, that the Christian public needs at length no other assurance that a new book belonging to this department, is one of genuine worth, than the fact that his name appears in a responsible place upon the title-page. This added volume, a companion to that upon the New Testament history, will be especially welcome. There is crowded within it an immense amount of information of just such a sort as ordinary, intelligent readers of the Bible will especially desire to obtain and may properly prize. There is no affectation or parade of learning, but many of the latest and best results of a life-time of laborious and effective study are put within a comparatively small compass and arranged in a lucid and natural way. The work is divided into six books, with several appendixes and genealogical tables, and the numerous illustrative engravings constitute no unimportant part of the apparatus for giving clearness and impressiveness to the sacred text. For use in the family and the Sabbath school class, these two volumes of Dr. Smith are of the highest value; and there are not many theological students and clergymen who would fail to find these hand-books every day serviceable. They are bound in a style uniform with the "Student's Histories" which these publishers have been engaged in issuing for several years past, and which deserve a place in every library. They are well edited, well printed, eminently serviceable and cheap.

FOREIGN MISSIONS: their relations and claims, By Rufus Anderson, D. D. L. L. D., late Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 1869. 12mo. pp. 373.

The veteran Secretary has done a good service in giving the results of his extended observation, his large experience and his continuous and patient thought on the foreign mission work, to the Christian public who know him so well and confide in him so fully. The substance of what is found in this volume was delivered in the form of lectures before the students of several theological seminaries, and the hearers all joined in expressing the wish that what had been so effectively spoken to the smaller number might be put into the hand of

the whole church of Christ. The aim of Dr. Anderson is direct and obvious. He sees in the great project of carrying the gospel to all nations the very genius of Christianity, the proper discipline and increasing glory of the church, the correction of false and mischievous systems of religion, and the bringing of straying men home to God and redemption. And so he speaks with the faith of a thorough believer, with the fervor of a quiet enthusiast, and yet with the modesty, simplicity and discretion of a man whose chief work is to tell the plain truth which God will use for the accomplishment of his great designs among men. He aims to set forth the extent of the field which has been providentially opened for foreign mission work; the divine preparation of the church for the task thus assigned it: the peculiar nature of mission labor; the extent and success of the work thus far; the various hindrances to its prosecution and the method of removing them; and the special claims of this work upon the churches and young ministers of the gospel. In a style at once simple, calm, clear, dignified and not without the fervor springing from strong conviction and an intense longing for increasing effort he states his facts, unfolds his views and makes his appeal. Several valuable appendixes exhibit the various agencies that have been and now are carrying on missionary operations, set forth their fields of effort, and present a basis upon which the reader may estimate their actual and prospective success. The volume is timely, suggestive, trustworthy, and in every way excellent.

HYMNS OF CHURCH. With Tunes. New York. A. S. Barnes & Co. 1869. Square Octavo. pp. 495.

There have been many excellent selections of poetry and music for use in public worship offered to the Christian public during the last fifteen years. Another such compilation might, at first thought, seem needless and a waste of effort. But the ideal standard steadily rises with the efforts that are made to reach it; and as the limit of improvement is not yet attained, ambition struggles steadily upward, and each denomination generally prefers to supply its own psalmody. This new collection will at once arrest attention by its solid and beautiful appearance, even to a careless observer. The paper, typography and binding are thoroughly excellent, being rich and tasteful without ostentation or exquisiteness. And the hymns, taken as a whole, will not suffer in merit, variety and arrangement when compared with the most esteemed of the collections that challenge public attention. Few of the best old compositions are absent, and among

the newest specimens of sacred verse there are some that will have a long life and a high mission. The music is of the solid and substantial sort, as though it were meant for use rather than for ornament,—for the worship of Christians instead of furnishing an opportunity for the display of professional vocalists. There is room for question whether there might not have been a gain secured by inserting some of the lighter, more vivacious and exhilarating melodies that so effectually touch the popular heart; but, just as we find it, the collection is one that needs only to be looked over to prove its excellence, and it will be prized in proportion as it is used by those who prefer sense to sound, and who especially desire that the music of the sanctuary may kindle a true devotion and bear up the soul of the worshiper to the very seat of the divine majesty. We welcome the book with peculiar satisfaction, assured that it will help to interpret the meaning and nurture the spirit of Christian praise.

OLDTOWN FOLKS. By Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." etc. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co.. 1869. 12mo. pp, 608.

Mrs. Stowe's genius bears well both the drafts of service and the pressure of years. Her zest, her vividness of conception, her skill in portraiture and description, her exuberant play of fancy, her subtle, quiet and exquisite humor, and her sympathetic alliance of herself with whatever concerns the welfare of her kind, are scarcely less marked in her later than in her earlier efforts. This last volume is both able and admirable. Its aim is to portray the New England life of the past in its various phases, so that our ancestry may be fairly presented to those who are fast losing the opportunity to study it in the persons of its living representatives. Mrs. Stowe understands thoroughly the robust, manly, though somewhat unpolished life of previous generations. She heartily appreciates the sterling qualities of character that have done so much to make the nation what it is, and she has shown herself fully able to reproduce the by-gone life that was becoming somewhat dim in the distance, with a vividness and an interest that make her book appear like a splendid picture-gallery in which the life of other days stands forth illuminated and pre-Raphaelitic in distinctness of outline. The book will be very welcome to the many admirers of Mrs. Stowe, and the reader will lay it down with a fresh admiration for the genius and an increased appreciation of the heart that have done so much for the popular literature of the country and the day.

MEN, WOMEN, AND GHOSTS. By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, author of the "Gates Ajar," etc. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 1869. 12mo. pp. 334.

Miss Phelps struck a cord in the heart of the reading public in her *Gates Ajar* that vibrates even yet, and turns the deepest sympathies of multitudes toward her, and will secure purchasers for almost anything that she may send abroad in the form of popular literature. The title of this book hardly suggests its character. It is made up of ten stories of unequal merit, that have appeared in our magazines and elsewhere, and are here for the first time collected and bound into a common sheaf. They are marked by her leading characteristics, and will be read with genuine interest by all who enjoy the product of a rare mind and prize the fragrance of a devout and sympathetic heart.

THE GATES WIDE OPEN; or Scenes in another World. By George Wood, Author of "Peter Schlemihl in America," etc. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1869, 12mo. pp. 354.

This is the second edition of a book issued some years since under a somewhat different title. Miss Phelps's "*Gates Ajar*" having awakened the public interest in inquiries touching the nature of the future life, this new edition is sent out with the hope that it may meet a more cordial welcome than before. Its title may help sell it. It has interest and merit, though its style lacks simplicity; and is now and then both stilted and turgid. It is certainly bold in its speculations, and its imaginative features of the other world are thoroughly human, easily comprehended, and their hues are very familiar to those whose knowledge is chiefly of the earth, earthy. Life hereafter is made to appear the continuation of the life that now is, even more decisively than Milton, or Pollock, or Isaac Taylor has represented it. Its features are largely reproduced from Swedenborg and his disciples. The painting goes far beyond that in "*Gates Ajar*" in minuteness of detail, and there is an air of sensuousness about the associations which are portrayed that now and then reminds one of Mohammed and the Koran. The author seems to have accepted and applied the sentiment expressed by Archbishop Whately in his treatise on "*The Future State*," who says: "If we look on the highest and purest spots of human nature and human life, as it is here, we may be led to form, I think, no unreasonable conjectures as to some things that will be hereafter . . . All that is suitable to this world alone will be removed from that other, what is evil will be taken away, what is imperfect will be made complete, what is good will be exalted; but there is no reason to suppose that any further change

will be made than is necessary to qualify the faithful for that improved state, that their human character will be altered any further than it wants altering, and its dispositions and whole constitution unnecessarily reversed."

In point of literary merit, clearness of insight, effective portraiture of character, and power over the heart, this volume bears no comparison with the work of Miss Phelps; and where one reader will doubt and hesitate and protest against the liberties which she has taken with the hints and silences of Scripture, a score will accuse Mr. Wood of being irreverent and unorthodox and misleading. And he is somewhat fanciful and presuming, while she is humbly and adoringly teachable, and draws on her spiritual intuitions rather than like Mr. Wood on the affinities of a somewhat audacious and not very subtle intellect.

THE BRAWNVILLE PAPERS: being Memorials of the Brawnville Athletic Club.
Edited by Moses Coit Thler, Professor of English Literature in Michigan University. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 1869. 12mo. pp. 215.

If we do not have a generation of muscular men and women within the next thirty years, it will not be owing to the lack of effort on the part of the advocates of gymnastic training and development, nor to any want of skill and confidence in the presentation of their views. Mr. Thler is certainly one of the most interesting and taking of these preachers of a "Muscular Christianity," and in these articles, reprinted from the *Herald of Health*, he has brought out the most attractive sides of his literary qualities. He strings his various arguments, objections, illustrations, protests, pleas and witticisms on the thread of a narrative, and the whole thing is most exquisitely done. His characters represent several types of men, and the portraiture is done in a manner that allows no question to be raised respecting the ability of the artists. Judge Fairplay, and Doctor Druggar, and Rev. Mr. Bland, and Schoolmaster Henry, and Deacon Snipp, and Abdiel Standish, and Leonidas Climax are all products of genius as well as of imagination; and the method and style adopted in exhibiting them, and making them contribute in such diverse ways to the development of Mr. Tyler's theory of gymnastics and physical culture, are such as deepen interest instead of satiating the reader. There is not a dull page in the book, even when it is dealing with dull characters. Its learning and its logic, its originalities and its quotations, its colloquies and its set speeches, its seriousness and its careful discrimination and its extravagant caricature, its audacity and its piety,—all these are rendered entertain-

ing and made to help in bringing out the practical lesson which the author never allows either himself or his reader to forget. The book is sure of popularity, and it tells a large amount of wholesome and needed truth in spite of all its perhaps pardonable exaggeration. A neglected truth is apt to be overstated when at length it finds an earnest champion; but this volume as a whole will do great good by setting intelligent and Christian readers resolutely thinking on profitable lines of thought.

GOD'S THOUGHTS FIT BREAD FOR CHILDREN. By the Rev. Horace Bushnell, D. D. Nichols and Noyes: Boston. 12mo. pp. 38.

This discourse is every way worthy of the author's great genius and extended reputation. It covers in a masterly manner the mission and modes of Christian teaching, and is full of instruction and suggestions for every preacher and teacher. Treating of sermons to children, the arrangement of Sabbath services, the character of religious exercises for the young, and other points of practical and acknowledged importance, it forms an invaluable addition to the advanced Sunday-school literature of the day, which no lover of the children's cause can afford to be without.

SABRINA HACKETT. By Emily L. Saybrook. Boston: D. Lothrop and Co, Dover, N. H. G. T. Day and Co. 1869. 16mo. pp. 409.

This is the fourth volume of the \$500 prize stories which these publishers are issuing, and in point of tone, interest and merit, it is scarcely inferior to the best of its predecessors. The author uses her pen with skill and effect, and under the constant impulse of a high aim and a Christian heart. Life in the home circle is clearly portrayed, but the finest touches are reserved for the characters that are connected with or gather about the Revonah Female Seminary. Mr. and Mrs. Perry are sketched in shadow, and the animus of the managers of this seat of learning is subjected to some scathing criticism. But Miss Brigham, teacher of mathematics,—“the dear old fossil,”—and Lottie LeGru, the teacher of music, are fresh and admirable representatives of opposite extremes in the same sphere. Sabrina Hackett herself is manifestly a portrait, rather than a fancy sketch, and her well-told story will teach the highest lessons of life, while it attracts and impresses by the sharp and strong individuality which it reveals. It is a book full of genuine vigor, as well as of sacred lessons. Few who commence it will lay it down till it is finished, and the interest which it awakens is wholesome as well as deep.

THE PEARL OF PARABLES. Notes on Luke 15: 11—32. By the late James Hamilton, D.D.—New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1867.—16mo. pp. 274.

The parable of the Prodigal Son is among the most suggestive and touching of all the sayings of him who spake as never man spake. It is a story out of the throbbing human heart, true to all times and lands, and yet shot through and through with a divine element and meaning. It is alike adapted to stir terrible conviction and awaken triumphant hope. It is the dramatized life of the soul, covering its presumptuous departure from God, its guilty self-seeking, its sure and fearful descent to pollution and wretchedness, its waking to moral consciousness, its penitence, its self-reproach, its confession, and its return to find welcome and peace and life in the fellowship it had once rejected and the loyalty it had impatiently cast away. Dr. Hamilton deals with it in his own original and masterly method. He finds and unfolds the broader lessons of the parable, gathers up illustrations from the various spheres of life, and emphasizes the great truths which he has to impart by means of a style whose richness is seldom equaled. He is affluent, artistic, magnetic, and sometimes positively gorgeous in his rhetoric, and his appeal made to cultivated readers is one which touches at once the taste, the reason and the conscience. It is a volume which finely embodies the leading qualities of the eminent preacher who so long charmed and kindled the hushed and reverent congregation in Regent Square, and through it he, being dead, will still speak. The work is every way far superior to the discourses of Punshon written with similar aim, both in suggestiveness and immediate effect.

SEEDS AND SHEAVES: or, Words of Scripture; their history and fruits. By A. C. Thompson, D. D., author of "The Better Land," etc. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1869. 12mo. pp. 323.

Dr. Thompson has made himself well known by his previous publications as a pleasant, graceful, instructive and eminently religious writer. A tender, sympathetic and truly devout spirit runs all through his productions. He brings a reverent heart to his study of Christian topics, and ever aims at the spiritual profit rather than at the mere intellectual quickening of his readers. This last volume seems to us his best. The plan of the work is somewhat like that of the author of "Pivot words of Scripture." He selects some striking and suggestive word or phrase or sentence,—such as "Behold the Lamb!" "Seek first," "God be merciful!" "Cleanseth from all sin,"—and illustrates and enforces the thought by fervid and familiar exposition, or impressive incident, or touching narrative, or poetical

quotation. It is a volume meant for spiritual guidance, encouragement, consolation and culture, and to all who use it in accordance with its design, it can hardly fail to carry the peace and blessing of Christ the Lord.

THE DOGMATIC FAITH: An Inquiry into the Relation subsisting between Revelation and Dogma. In eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1867, on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M. A., Canon of Salisbury. By Edward Garbett, M. A., Incumbent of Christ Church Surbiton. Rivingtons: London, Oxford and Cambridge. 1869. 12mo. pp. 307.

The fund left by Mr. Bampton for the support of an annual course of Lecture Sermons on some branch of the Christian Faith, has been well managed and has brought forth most excellent fruit. The successive lecturers have been men of rare ability, and the volumes containing their discourses take very high rank among the theological literature of the time. They deal with living issues. They grapple with the very difficulties which skepticism is bringing forward, while resolutely defending the old faith, they avail themselves freely of the latest methods and weapons. They meet unbelief on its own chosen ground. They are courteous toward science, and they never forget what we really owe to modern scholarship and criticism. They pay proper deference to new teachers while standing firmly by the old Bible. They perceive the high office of logic and admit the progressive movement of thought, but they insist on the supreme authority of revelation and deny that humanity is really outgrowing the need of Christ.

This series of discourses by Mr. Garbett fully sustains the high reputation gained by his predecessors. His special aim is to meet the plea, now more and more frequently heard, that dogmatic theology is not essential to Christianity; but is, instead, a hindrance to its work and a neutralizer of its best influence. We are told that religion is one thing, but that theology is quite another. Creeds are indiscriminately condemned. A general religious consciousness or sentiment is made to take the place of a positive and well-defined faith. Looseness in opinion is often accounted a merit. Doctrines are pronounced dry and destructive to the religious life. Men call for the spirit of Christianity in such a way that the call implies a contempt for almost everything that involves an attempt to state the facts which underlie and the specific beliefs that enclose it. They would banish all dogmas, while professing to be the special guardians of the gospel.

The book before us is a masterly exposure of the fallacy underlying

ing this specious and prevalent style of argument, and a thorough vindication of the claims of a positive and dogmatic theology. The opponents of dogma in religion are wont to insist that in the production, progress and results of Christianity in the world, there is not needed as an explanation any divinely-given and dogmatic faith; but claim that the influence of a priestly class, the force of the religious sentiment, the discoveries of the intuitional faculty, the conclusions of the speculative intellect, the power of a progressive civilization, and the instincts of the natural conscience, are adequate to the production of what Christianity already exhibits, and competent also to supply whatever of religious influence may be hereafter needed by the human race. Mr. Garbett considers those alleged sources of religion conscientiously and in detail, showing that they have no such power as is attributed to them; and he then proceeds, in a positive way, to prove that the church and ministry are simply trustees put in charge of the truths taught in the Scriptures,—that religion never has lived and never can live and be a power without a positive creed,—that influential belief rests on revelation, and not on intuition,—that speculative philosophy has always failed and must always fail when usurping the place and function of theological science,—that revealed religious dogmas can alone give to civilization a true character and an abiding life,—that the natural conscience is an inadequate teacher and guide; and, therefore, that positive religious beliefs, founded on the supernatural revelation given us in the Bible, are essential to meet the wants of the human soul, and save us from the anarchy of ideas and the moral chaos of unbeliefs.

The argument is as full of vigor in substance as it is of courtesy in method. The style is pure and scholarly, the learning abundant, though never thrust needlessly into notice, the spirit is both kind and dignified, and the whole work shows the firm believer, the ripe thinker and the resolute defender of what is vital in the Christian faith. It deserves a wide circulation, and will richly reward a careful and studious reading.

WOMEN SUFFRAGE, the Reform against Nature. By Horace Bushnell, M. D.
Issued by Scribner & Co. New York. 1869. 12mo. pp. 184.

This is a volume that can not fail to make a good impression. The author is one of the strongest and most marked thinkers of the country; his rhetoric is thoroughly unique and taking, even when it abounds in glaring faults; he has gained a wide and deferential hearing by his previous utterances, and has here squarely and boldly

grappled with one of the most prominent, exciting and significant questions of the day. The book is entirely original in plan and teaching. It will thoroughly suit no class of partisans or extremists. He concedes far too much in respect to the wrongs under which women labor, to please most of those who refuse to endorse any movement for enlarging essentially the sphere of woman's effort and the play of her powers; and then he protests so vigorously against the whole idea of giving women the ballot and a direct share in the government of the state, that Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony, Mr. Curtis and H. W. Beecher can hardly help looking upon him as the champion of the conservatives. He has certainly written a suggestive and characteristic volume, one that will be likely to draw the very heaviest fire of which the opposing batteries are capable, and one, too, that must operate to bring out more of thoughtful logic and less of vehement declamation from the advocates of female suffrage. It will do good by calling out abler writers, and it must elevate the plane upon which the discussion is to be conducted, as well as dignify the discussion itself. The rhetoric of the book, though unique and captivating, and often exciting surprise and admiration over the mastery of language which Dr. B. exhibits, is open to not a little severe but still just criticism; and the terrible pictures of domestic discord, social turbulence, political rancor and moral antagonisms which he paints, we cannot help thinking sprang much more freely from his imagination than they are likely to spring from the bestowment of the ballot upon women. He confesses that he was shocked when he heard that there was a plan to unite the two sexes in common studies and common college life; but that the spending of a single Sunday at Oberlin cost him the total and final loss of "a considerable cargo of wise opinions." An inspection of the process of voting by a company of females might perhaps modify, at least, the views which he now holds respecting the terribleness of the pandemonium that he sees about every ballot-box into which women drop slips of printed paper.

But we have no space in which to deal at length with this somewhat remarkable book. It is the product of a great mind, it gives evidence of much study and reflection, it is underlain by a deep and serious purpose, it abounds in reverence for the simplest human rights, the homage which it pays to the grace and sanctity of womanhood is of the highest sort, and it lifts up the question of female suffrage to the grandest level of philosophic thought, and associates it with the best interests of morality and religion. The book will gain attention and be eagerly read; and though it may fully satisfy very few readers, it can not fail to aid in solving one of the most important problems with which this century has to do.

THE
FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY.

No. LXVI. OCTOBER, 1869.

ART. I.—SKETCHES OF LIFE AND LABOR IN INDIA.

BY REV. JAMES L. PHILLIPS, MIDNAPORE, INDIA.

Previous efforts have been made to set forth in these pages some of the familiar features of missionary life among the heathen of India. Perhaps the present paper would not have been prepared, had not the writer received pleasing assurances from true friends of the missionary enterprise, that former papers have served to bring the condition and the claims of the pagan world oftener to the thought, and closer to the heart of the Christian communities in which the Quarterly is read. This time, as before, nothing is attempted beyond the simple recital of common occurrences, such as may fall in the path or drop into the experience of any foreign missionary at any time.

It was often said to us in America, and has been oftener written to us since coming away, that our most ordinary work possesses the attractiveness of novelty to our friends across the sea. If this be so it may not be altogether amiss to make another record of our experiences in this most interesting field. Of one thing there can be no doubt, that the degree of personal effort and sacrifice for the heathen must depend upon the depth of love for Christ and His work. Still may it not sometimes be

the case that we love less because we know little of the actual state of the pagan world? Surely a converted and consecrated soul must love, and hence, must seek to save those of whose deep depravity and dreadful danger it is fully apprised. In all charity, be it said, that the reason why multitudes of our church members do no more for missions, is that they keep themselves so grossly ignorant of the vast extent, the definite localities, and the special needs of the several foreign fields for which they are from time to time asked to contribute. In proof of this, any man who visits the churches of Christian America and Europe can bring both facts and figures, that might look incredible. Experience and observation have long ago determined that a mighty impetus would be given to the great benevolent enterprises of our day, could people be persuaded to read more concerning the miseries of those sitting in the region and shadow of death, and thus acquaint and impress their minds with what duty is and what Christian obligations require.

The short statement then is just this: to help my neighbor I must love him; to love him I must know him; and to know him I must learn who and where he is, and what are his real wants. If, then, by any writing of ours any one can be led to perceive more clearly his own personal obligations to the benighted heathen we shall unfeignedly rejoice and thank God. It has been with such a hope, and a prayer that the hope might be realized, that the following pages have been written.

THE COVENANT MEETING.

Nothing heartens a missionary so much as the faithfulness of his converts from heathenism. To see these walking in all the ordinances of the Lord's house blameless, puts fresh hope into his heart, and new life into his body. I have just come home from our monthly covenant meeting and are much encouraged about my people. They seem to be "following on to know the Lord." Our little church, planted in June, 1863, now numbers thirty-eight souls. Two of the members live in Calcutta, and six belong to the "branch" in the jungle to the west. The remaining thirty were all present and reported themselves. It

was good to be there. Men, women and children spoke "one to another" concerning the things of the kingdom, even such as "accompany salvation." "And the Lord hearkened and heard it."

A young brother had spent the month in traveling among the Santals. It was sweet to hear him tell how his soul had been fed and fattened while trying to feed the poor ignorant jungle-people from out of the Scriptures. In one village several had expressed a desire to become Christians, and our brother asked the church to pray earnestly for these inquirers, for whose salvation his own soul was burdened. This young man is exposed to many temptations when on the move among these Santals, but it is very cheering to see that he feels his own weakness enough to keep him close to Christ. He is not a Santal himself, but has a very ready command of their language. This he ascribes to the power of prayer. We have often heard him pray God to give him the ability to preach and pray in Santal, and he has many times asked the church to pray for the same thing. This brother is one of the few saved to the mission and to Christ from the Balasore Khand school of fifteen and twenty years ago. He is a working member of our little church, and delights in doing good.

A sister spoke with deep feeling about her Sabbath school class. "I long to see these dear boys come to Christ"—this was the burden of her heart. O, how the tearful eye, the quivering lip and the choked utterance of profound emotion move such an assembly! And there is no emotion so pure and so powerful as that which is born of love for souls. Would that we had more of it in our church!

The dear children told of their joys and sorrows, and their simple, earnest utterances cheer and comfort us. It is difficult for some, thank God the number is growing less, to believe in the conversion of children. For this reason these tender lambs of the fold are sometimes met with a chilling distrust, that would be quite enough to dishearten mature Christians. We shall not soon forget an old lady in America, who was forever saying that the children could "never hold out" and that it "only made little hypocrites of them" to take them into the church. In the

church to which she belonged she made more trouble than all the children together. We have no hornets of this kind here. All of the brethren and sisters are in full sympathy with the children. Some of them became Christians themselves in childhood, and know the sweets of early piety by experience. No one is given to taunting the little ones with their religion upon some trifling, wayward outbreak, which a few gentle, loving words would quell in a moment.

The language of one child impressed us much. She is an orphan, and the youngest member of our church. "I wish to work for Jesus and I am praying him to give me something to do." This child is a bright and shining light among her associates. We have several times heard of her personal efforts for the salvation of sinners. Her young life has already begun to be a blessing to theirs.

There seemed to be something remarkably fresh and fervent in the testimonies of many who spoke in this covenant meeting to-day. These disciples are surely drawing nearer to God. They speak out of the fullness of their hearts. Our form of church covenant is read by the pastor. It sets forth, in clear and concise language, the duties and obligations of church members. The reading of it does us all good. Every member has a copy of it at home to be sure, still the public reading is an advantage, because it gives an opportunity for calling attention to particular points.

After all have spoken and an item of business quickly disposed of we sing the doxology and part. This is Saturday afternoon and to-morrow is communion day, when all these beloved disciples will come to the Chapel again, and, seated around the Lord's table, will commemorate in common with Christians of other lands, the wonderful love that brought salvation to our lost race. But this covenant meeting has been a true preparation for the Sabbath.

BEATING THE BUSH.

Out among the people we have to resort to many expedients to secure an audience. Sometimes, to be sure, the multitude

comes uncalled, but at other times we have to beat the bush. A good lively tune works admirably for this purpose. Among the Oriyas, and particularly among the Santals, nothing could do better than music. But the Bengalis are less impressible in this direction, so that we rarely try singing in this district. In Calcutta, instrumental music is used to some extent for drawing people together. Here we have never seen it tried, but think it might do well.

Attention to the sick is an excellent way of getting a congregation. Be it a leper by the roadside, a paralytic on his cot, a case of acute disease, or a broken limb, you are sure of an audience by standing a moment and saying a word to the sufferer. Is it because heathenism knows no pity, that mere surprise at our consideration for the suffering brings so many people together? One day I was galloping past towards a market, when suddenly my horse halted before the huge body of a buffalo that lay prostrate in the road. These animals are very useful in India both for labor and for milk. This one had met with a serious accident. His right hind leg was out of joint, and the immense beast was in great pain. A native or two were trying to help the poor creature, but to no purpose. These people have very little idea of anatomy and less of surgery, and they are fearfully rough in all their manipulations. Upon my arrival the villagers began to gather and after showing them how to relieve the distressed buffalo, I found a fine audience to preach to standing thick all around us. The poor patient beast lay in the center of the crowd and served for a text, and it was easy talking to ready listeners.

A child was brought to camp with a large tumor of the lower lip. It was in one of the hardest places we visited and the people were none too willing to receive us. But the crying of the baby brought the people to the tent door. The operation of removing the tumor was rather tedious, and the blood flowed freely. A little artery spurted right into my face, and gave me and my dress rather a high-colored sprinkling. But all this was working admirably. The people were rushing to see what the *Sahab* was doing. When all was over, the wound dressed and the baby quietly helping himself from the mother's full breast,

then was the time to preach and be heard. No one could ask for a better congregation. Everybody was respectful and attentive. The very wonder of a surgical operation has done these jungle-people good. The look of the case of instruments that lay on the grass while I was at work helped subdue and soften hearts; and the simple act of relieving a suffering child, by God's blessing, prepared the people to listen to the word of life.

It is sometimes both amusing and painful to mark the strange confidence of the common people in the power of a white doctor. We have frequent illustrations of this. One day a little party of Santals came to the tent bringing an infant who was born without either arms or legs. "What can you do for this child?" asked the sad mother, as she reached out the fat and smiling boy for me to take. The father, the fond grandmother, and others of the party, pressed the same question, all intent on learning whether by any skill the wanting members could be supplied. And then at last when after much talking I succeeded in making the anxious people understand that I could do nothing to help the poor child, I shall not soon forget the distressed countenance of the parents as they both so earnestly asked, "Why was our child born thus? Do tell us this." The old grandmother had more of an eye to business. "What can this boy ever do, how can he earn his bread?"

We had quite an audience before this party arrived, but now the multitude came, and we had no lack of hearers for several hours. It is always a pleasure to minister to the sick, but in many cases they are brought to us when it is too late. After a score of native quacks have been trying their hand at a bad case it is frequently made over to the missionary. By stupendous lying they often succeed in getting us to wait upon a dying person, represented as "just a trifle out of sorts" as we should say. Many a sad case of this kind now comes to mind. A boy in the last stage of cholera was brought to us, and died on our verandah. A young man had received a shocking wound on his right arm by the bursting of a gun-barrel. Though help was quite within reach, the friends cruelly neglected him until he was moribund. By favorable representations they got us to walk to a distant village to see the case. We told them that

the patient was too far gone to justify any surgical interference, but that there was barely a chance for him should they carry him at once to the Midnapore hospital where, if he gained strength, an operation might be undertaken after several days. What could they do but catch at this mere straw? Off they started with the poor fellow in a duli or cot swung to a pole and carried on men's shoulders, but as we feared, it was all in vain. Before proceeding many miles the sufferer expired and we saw the men return with an empty duli. They had buried or burned the corpse beside the road.

A cock-fight once beat the bush for us admirably. Close by camp was a Santal settlement. These wild people are excessively fond of cock-fighting. Liquor is frequently brought into the scene, and then intoxication abounds. The men and boys indulge freely. There are no women here, not even a girl. Now and then, when the demon of strong drink takes the field, men get to fighting also and the excitement runs high. Not more than twenty rods from the center of this noisy cock-fight we find plenty of people ready and even anxious to hear what we have to say. The scene is itself suggestive of the proper topics to be introduced and we draw ample illustrations of the truth from surrounding sights.

Another illustration of beating the bush must suffice for this sketch. We were camped for a week in a mangoe grove. There was a number of fine villages round about, but for some reason it was difficult to secure an audience in the morning. The native preachers were complaining of this and proposed a move to some better place. But we obtained a congregation one morning in the following manner: just at sunrise we were breakfasting, when a couple of young men put their faces in at the tent door and asked us to shoot some troublesome monkeys. We protested against doing what frequently harms rather than helps missionary work. The Hindus worship the monkey, and in many places the shooting of one would make great disturbance. Hence we carefully avoid running counter to the popular sentiment or wish, wherever we go, for such a course would only prejudice the people against us. It is reasonable and right that we should take care to prove to the heathen that we are their

friends and seek only their good. But in this case the way was open to shoot the mischievous beasts. They had been plundering all the gardens, robbing the fruit trees and committing various unwarrantable depredations. The village was of one accord to have them killed. Under these circumstances we could no more hesitate than to shoot a bear in a sugar-cane patch, or a leopard in a cow-yard. So the guns are caught up, and soon the ugly beasts begin to drop from the tops of the tall tamarind trees. Having killed seven or eight of the huge fellows, we were about shouldering our empty gun for camp, when several villagers came rushing towards us and with loud entreaty begged us to shoot one more monkey. "He is such a savage one that he not only robs our gardens but actually chases the children, so that we are afraid of him." After thorough search we discovered his monkeyship in the dense foliage of a tree-top, full seventy feet from the ground. Soon the grey old culprit that chased the children fell heavy through the crashing boughs down to the earth. Shouts of joy went up at his death. The people were truly thankful for what we had done.

After that ten minutes shooting, we were not obliged to beat the bush for hearers. Men, women and children had assembled and, one by one in turn, missionaries and native preachers all addressed them. The bloody carcasses were dragged out upon the open plain to be devoured by jackals and vultures, and the people, grateful and glad, stood long around our tents eagerly listening to the words of life.

In these and many other ways do we get the people together. But sometimes they go as suddenly as they come, and in a moment not a man is to be seen at the preaching stand. Once, just as we got fairly at work, it happened that an aged invalid expired in the house close by. The first wail that went up from the inmates broke us all up. Loud lamentation is the fashion here and the women are well practiced in the art. Beating the breast, pulling out the hair and giving a succession of shrieks, with muffled sobs for an interlude, is the common way of mourning for the dead. You can never mistake the sound. It resembles nothing else on earth. There is a peculiar tune and tone about it. The company quickly scattered, some to prepare

wood for the funeral pyre, some to notify the household priest, some to summon relatives, and some to care for the corpse. It was death's solemn call, and be he savage or sage, every one must heed it. "But thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

BAZAR CONTROVERSY.

These Hindu bazars call for wide-awake preaching. Prosy sermonizing, drier than the remainder biscuit after a voyage, would hardly meet the demand here. The fact is, there is no chance for consecutive discourse in such a crowd as collects at the preaching stand in the bazar. Interruptions of all kinds are frequent and sometimes fierce. This is very annoying to a new comer, but one soon gets used to it. Indeed a talk of even ten minutes at such a place without a jog or two in the time, would seem remarkably dull to an experienced teacher. We must go prepared to meet anything that may come along, be it wind or wit, brass or bombast, modest ability or bloated emptiness. As we go every day, and address all kinds of people, of course the variety is great and the discipline grand. 'T'o-day we have to face Young Bengal, to-morrow the devotees of hoary-headed superstitions; this time it is hand to hand with some pretending atheists, next time it is tearing down the showy strongholds of a Universalist; sometimes one talks to earnest and considerate men, and at other times to fools glorying in their folly. No man oftener than the bazar preacher has occasion to act upon the Scripture directions comprised in the fourth and fifth verses of the twenty-sixth chapter of Proverbs. A specimen case or two will illustrate this bazar work.

One day a young Brahma, or Hindu Unitarian, did his best to break us up. He found the people listening attentively to our words and could not long be quiet. First he asked a question in English, which at once gives a man prominence in such a company. "What is your worship of Jesus Christ but a kind of refined idolatry?" For some reason this man dislikes to enter into an argument in his own language, still our standing rule is not to talk English to one or two in the presence of a

large Bengali-speaking audience. So we take to Bengali, and hold on to the Babu until he is disposed to keep still for want of something to say. Of late there have been a couple of young Englishmen, this way in the Bengal Civil Service, who have cheered these native deists a good deal. One of the two claims to be a Unitarian, and is notorious for his gross immorality. The other professes to be a positivist of the school of Comte and is the most conceited man in India for aught I know. The Brahma Babus take heavy stock in these two white men, who publicly and proudly affirm their disbelief in the Bible. The name of one is constantly on the lips of these free religionists. He is their patron saint and they are proud of him. In company with these two names, we are often greeted with those of Paine and Parker, Gibbon and Hume, Renan and Voltaire, Newman and Colenso, and several others. These natives have heard and some of them have read about American and English free thinkers, and French and German infidels, and we have to be ready to answer them.

Let no one fancy that to accomplish this is always the lightest task. There are men in the ranks of Hindu infidelity who are something beside empty declaimers and venders of other men's wares. The ablest missionary in India will not unfrequently meet men who will make him hesitate and gird himself anew for the conflict. It may be easy enough to dispose of pretenders and upset the dwarf-on-stilts gentry, but to join battle with a strong man amid the confusion of the bazar, and, holding him close up, one by one expose his errors, and thus for an hour, it may be, deal heavy blows fast,—this is not exactly gala-day parade, nor does it belong to the province of ordinary preaching.

The opponents who meet us more frequently in the bazar, are men of less caliber than the class just alluded to, still they are not slow to appear in defence of their ancestral faith. The more consistent of this class readily admit that Hinduism is a failure, so far as virtue and purity and peace are concerned, still, notwithstanding this serious disadvantage, it is the true religion for man. These are they who are themselves vile and delight in leading others astray. Many young men are of this order. They shamelessly advocate every form of vice. "Were we to

leave the brothels and the dram-shops, who would support all the harlots and liquor sellers?" This is a question often asked by these devotees of Bacchus and Venus. It is one of the saddest sights to see multitudes of young men in these ranks of sin. They die off fast. The Bengali of the present generation is weak, sickly and short-lived. We are surprised to see how quickly they pass away. Young Bengal is in a bad way, and getting worse. Ashamed of his father's idols, he still clings to his father's vices. And we candidly believe that in many cases that the giving up the idols has made him the more openly and hopelessly dissolute. Directly opposite one of our best stands in the bazar is a long three-story brick building, belonging to the richest Hindu in Midnapore. He is a thorough Hindu and holds fast to Krishnu, despising the Brahmos and frowning on all attempts at reform in religion. He never uses strong drink, it is said, and in other respects he has the reputation of being quite an honorable man. He is a large land-holder and noted for oppressing the poor ryots, but this is almost too common a thing to constitute a crime in Hindu eyes. He has several sons, the eldest not over fourteen years of age, and a deliberate effort is now on foot to corrupt these boys so as to reach and squander the father's wealth. There is a small tank across the way from this Babu's residence, and Young Bengal has predicted the day when drinking will be so frequent on the house top that the empty bottles flung into the tank will fill it. To this end the boys are being led into all manner of vicious indulgences. The anti-idolatry party is bent on their ruin and the tearing down of the rich man's fortune. This case goes to show how terrible after all may be the fate of thousands in this pagan land who have forsaken their idols and are now adrift. Nothing short of the gospel can ever help and save their souls. And this gospel we carry to them at morning and evening of every day.

In this connection it should be remarked that bazar controversy has essentially changed its base of late years. The pioneer missionaries used to hear much of the Shasters, and great efforts were made to understand these in order to be able to refute them. The Brahmins, whenever caught or cornered in debate, invariably took refuge in the Shasters. But this is seldom the

case now. Indeed it may with truthfulness be said that the Shasters have quit the field, and the same is true of the Koran. The Bible now stands alone, and the controversy turns upon its claims to be received as the only true book. Now the Brahmins attack Christ instead of defending Krishnu. Hinduism is past apology. It is only a very ignorant priest who now and then lifts his lone voice in its defence. The people are dumb and the idols dead. "On against Christianity" is the war-cry now. Every man and every boy deems himself happy if he can bring even the semblance of an argument, if no more than the sublimated shadow of a reason, to bear against the oracles of truth. Satan, who has in all ages forged weapons against the Bible, is busy enough in India just now. But not one of all these weapons can prevail.

The most gratifying feature of bazar controversy is the fact that now and then people seem to so far assent to the truth as to frankly admit that every objection has been fully met and every argument completely refuted that the opposition has brought forward. There is to-day, all over India, a sort of passive assent to Christianity. Whether this will work for good or evil time will show. But of one thing there can be no doubt, the free and even fierce discussions of the bazar are opening up the way of the Lord in the minds of these benighted people. We devoutly rejoice that the contest now turns on the sole merits of the Bible. Against this holy Book, our only hope, Hinduism and infidelity combined are now planting their batteries and ranging their guns. But "why do the heathen rage? . . . He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision."

SELLING BOOKS.

For many years it has been the rule to give away our tracts and books. In this way many tons of printed matter in various languages have been distributed among the heathen. But an effort has been made of late to affix a price to each of our publications so that they may be more valued by the people, better preserved, and more carefully read. An arrogant Brahmin one

day sang out to us in a great congregation, when something had been said about our books, "Who cares for your books? They are cheap things that anybody who chooses can pick up in any quantity. Your preachers scatter them broadcast over the land. But our Shasters are very valuable. They cost many rupees. They can't be had for nothing. Nobody gets one for the asking." No particular attention was paid to this speech at the time, but after our later the Brahmin came along to our bookstand. He was surprised to find us selling instead of giving away our tracts and volumes, and more surprised still to learn that even a Brahmin could not get so much as a four-page tract without paying for it. The haughty priest was quite crest-fallen. In the days of giving these men would sneeringly turn away, saying, "Who wants your books?" Now under the new dispensation, they come round the stand and beg hard and long for a tract. But none are given away. Now it is our books that are "very valuable. They cost many rupees. Nobody gets them for the asking." No one who has not known these Brahmins can have any just conception of their conceit and arrogance. "These rich Babus will bow down before me, and they will lick the dust from my holy feet. They will feed me with every good thing, and dress me like a prince. At my bidding they will do any service I desire. I do not need to work for my living like common men. God has made me Lord over other men, and they all are my servants. This sacred thread is my badge of office." These are almost the exact words of a young Brahmin whom we chanced to meet in a petty court in the country. Strutting about, proud as a peacock, this born tyrant looked down most patronizingly upon the hard working business men of the office, not one of whom dared dissent from the sentiments so defiantly expressed. If the Hindus are not a priest-ridden people, where on earth such a people to be found?

We have had ample proof that selling is an improvement on the old plan of giving away books. The prices to begin with range very low, but the design is to raise them by degrees to cost. The Hindus are given to prizing everything by its money value, and they are too fond of their money to part with it without sufficient cause. When books were given away there

can be no doubt that many were destroyed. The boys made kites of our tracts, the women used them for doing up spices, and the men lit their pipes with them. A bright youngster came to the missionary's tent one morning and begged for another tract, very honestly remarking that two tracts make a fine kite. And we have no doubt that the priests have destroyed many of our publications which they found in circulation among the people. Several times these priests attempted to break up our book sales, but they never quite succeeded. "These books will do you no good. You ignorant people can never understand them. Reading these Christian books will destroy your caste." Such are some of their words to the multitude, that always crowd about the bookstand. But the people care very little for them or their advice. Once a company of a dozen or more of these insolent Brahmins rushed right into the center of a fine, large congregation, where after preaching we were selling books. They did every thing but force the people away, but all to no effect. Nobody heeded their threats or cared for their curses. And their coming drew more people still around us, so that we actually accomplished more by reason of the interference.

Another way of disturbing our work is to demand the market tribute. Every stand or stall is taxed by the proprietor of the bazar or market. So, as we occupied a place among the traders, tribute was demanded of us. Without making any objections we found it to be the best policy to pay the tribute, and like all the other traders we paid with what we had for sale. Usually a gospel constituted our tribute, and this quite satisfied the parties, and sometimes proved a decided help to us. One day we attended a Mahomedan market. The owner was quite a gentlemanly man, and very modestly asked for his tribute. We gave him the gospel of John with which he was so much pleased, that he stood by for nearly an hour and invited his acquaintances to come and buy our books. Being a prominent man, he had an influence upon many of the market people, and we sold a fine lot of tracts and some gospels to the Mahomedans.

It has been an encouraging feature of our book-selling that the children have taken such an interest in our publications. Many times the boys have been the first to buy at a market.

We have seen these boys plead with tears for money to buy a tract, and it is seldom that the bigoted father can refuse them. How rejoicingly they have come with the requisite number of shells or the copper coin to take what they wished. And when one boy in a large market has bought a book he is pounced upon by a crowd of curious questioners, who wish to know all about where and how he got it. In this way the children have often brought us customers. And what is remarkable, women and girls come to our stand and buy. "I have a boy who can read," says an old woman as she presses up to the stand to select a book. May God bless your son, is the prayer the heart lifts up as the hand passes out the book. A father comes with his two little daughters, and takes a book for each. Thank God, the girls are learning to read, and the next generation of mothers will be wiser than the present.

There are far less books disposed of by selling than by giving away, as one might readily suppose, still when we consider that by the giving plan many books necessarily fall into the hands of those who cannot read and many more are taken by people who destroy them, and that the selling plan is calculated to steer clear of these disadvantages, we cannot but decide in its favor. No Hindu who cannot read himself, and has no one at home who can, would ever buy a book, whereas multitudes of this most ignorant class used to beg them, and get them in the promiscuous distribution according to the old plan.

Another idea in favor of selling is that in many places people who have received our books, but never read them, will not get a new supply. Often has a man said upon our asking a price for the book he wished, "O I sha'n't buy it, I have a number at home now that cost me nothing." All right, we say, you should read what you have and we don't care to give you more until you have done so. The Lord's blessing, we cannot doubt, will attend this effort to attach value to Christian publications, which even in India have come to be regarded as too cheap.

DARK DAYS.

Every missionary has his dark days, seasons of depression,

and it may be of sorrow. Perhaps laborers are more prone to discouragement in a foreign field than at home, from the fact that there are no sympathizing and counseling friends at hand. How many times the heart craves the sympathy that is denied it, and longs for the cheer and comfort that cannot come. But it is a most blessed experience that the want of human help only tends to press the trusting spirit closer to the Heavenly Father's arms. When there has been no human ear to listen to our suffering, then have we the more eagerly and heartily poured our complaint into the ear that is ever open to hear. And when no brother's hand could come to our relief, then has the strong arm of the beloved Elder Brother been leaned upon with surer and sweeter confidence. However it may be elsewhere, every missionary can testify that trials have been his truest helps and dark days have brought him his very brightest experiences. Thank God for suffering! It is his own meet message to call our wayward, wandering souls back to their only rest.

It was such a dark day when famine was in the land. Thousands of famishing poor were filling our streets. Hundreds of corpses were carried to the pits. The land stank. The city was filled with the starving multitude, and the country was desolate with its barren fields. Our regular duties were greatly interrupted, and the relief of the sick and starving became our daily work. Books, schools, and even preaching had to be often put aside in the presence of sterner, sadder tasks. And, mingling in the reeking mass of corruption, we were inhaling death. Our strongest man fell, and the grave at Dacca tells the sad, silent tale of suffering born and bred of famine. Several of our number were sick, some brought low by acute disease, but these were spared. God raised them up again and gave them new strength to work on. O how the dense darkness of those famine days pressed on our spirits! Could light come from heaven to pierce a cloud so dense? How our work was impeded. How little those excited people cared for the gospel. How hard it was to bring men in famine times to feel their need of heavenly help. How our school children were neglected on account of out-door work. And how hard it was to work at all in this pestilential air. These are some of the things we felt during those

dreadful days. As for our daily rice that was sure, for we found the promise of God concerning his people—"In the days of famine they shall be satisfied," and we called to mind the words of inspiration, "Behold the eye of the Lord is upon them that fear him, upon them that hope in his mercy; to deliver their souls from death, and to keep them alive in famine." We stayed our souls on the sure promises and found strength sufficient for every day.

It was a dark day when so many of our school children were dying. One by one the little sufferers passed away, for the seeds of the terrible famine had sunk deep into their bodies and all help failed to uproot them. For months it was our sad service to watch beside the sick and to carry the dead to their burial. Whenever memory reverts to those gloomy days a shadow, at least, of the great grief falls on the spirit. "Little Champi is dead," said the children as the sun was setting. Poor famine victim! She was our sweet singer and everybody loved her. But that fearfully depraved appetite for dirt killed her. Soon the rough box is made, the deep grave dug, and in the clear moonlight of a January night we carried her lifeless form to its last resting place. Six of the larger girls were the bearers and all of us were mourners for the dear orphan departed. In a week her elder sister went to join Champi in heaven. One beautiful May day our precious Allie was taken sick—our first famine orphan, nearly two years a happy child of our happy home. Her dearest playmate had just gone to the angel choir and she longed to join her. "Mamma, come sit close beside me for I want to talk with you. I am going to heaven where Priscy has gone. I can't stay here without her. Jesus is coming to take me. And you all will come by and by." O God, why could not this sweet promising child be spared to us? But his will be done. The children brought fresh flowers and green leaves for the coffin. Several Santal lads acted as bearers and we hid away the form of another precious child beneath the sod.

So here and there through life come our dark days. We are always the better for them if they serve to bring us nearer the Lord. In the foreign field there are many and serious obstacles to the progress of Christianity and these are at times very dis-

couraging. But never yet has the day been so dark that we could not believe there was a glorious sun just behind the cloud ready to pour on us its gladdening beams.

BRIGHT HOPES.

The missionary is the happiest man that lives, not because he deserves to be, not because he is a better Christian than his brethren who stay at home, but because he has the best work in the world and loves to do it. No happier experiences are on record than of those men and women who have spent their lives among the heathen. No class of persons have to live so constantly by faith in order to live at all. Such is our work that unless we have faith, and strong faith too, we cannot keep at work. In a land so completely given over to Satan as this, amid influences so adverse and obstacles so great, unless the eye is fixed on the things that are unseen and eternal, hope will die and help will fail. We have bright hopes for even India, whenever we call to mind the precious promises of God. Besides these it has often pleased him, who created us creatures of hope, to grant us signal tokens of his blessing upon our labors. While his spirit in our hearts leads us to pray with Moses, "Establish thou the work of our hands upon us, yea, the work of our hands establish thou it," his presence cheers us, and his power to save sinners is displayed in our communities. Were one to ask us to-day what it is on which we rest our hopes for India's evangelization, we should of course answer, above all else on the un-failing promises of God. Of these we need not speak further, save to say that they are abundant, direct and sure of fulfillment. On these we found all our hopes of the better day yet to dawn on this benighted land. But it may be asked what are these bright hopes and what the signs of their fulfillment? We proceed to cite some of them.

First, we hope that the Bible will soon be generally known and read throughout India. Already have the entire Scriptures been translated into all the principal languages of this country, and the New Testament or portions of it have been translated into many of the other languages, such as are spoken by the hill

tribes or more secluded sections of the people. Manifold means are now employed by all evangelical sects to circulate the word of God in the cities and villages. Many foreign and more native missionaries are now diligently endeavoring to carry the inspired volume into the homes of all classes of people. For this purpose thousands of copies of the Bible are yearly printed at the several mission presses, in the different tongues of India. And a most cheering circumstance is, that as knowledge increases the people become more eager to possess and peruse the sacred Scriptures. Many Hindu and Mahomedan scholars now feel bound to read the Bible, because they cannot with self-respect remain ignorant of the book which has exerted such an influence upon mankind in the past; a book whose very history is in fact the history of the human race, and which is to-day the accepted law-book of every civilized nation on the globe. Any man who does not read the Bible cannot now enter intelligently into religious controversy. And it is pleasing to perceive that these people are beginning to feel the force of this firm fact. The word of Jehovah is now fast entering the long barred and bolted doors of the Zenanas. It is a most significant and cheering fact that the women and girls of India are to-day reading the Scriptures. A Babu has just moved away from this city whose wife has been for four years a constant and careful reader of the New Testament. She has bought two copies and taken them with her. The mothers are learning of God, of salvation and of heaven. The daughters, no longer ignorant, are daily studying the blessed pages of inspiration. God is working a great work in our time. Mightiest lever for lifting the nations, the holy Bible is entering the homes and the hearts of these degraded heathen. What matters it that the edict of the English Government keeps this sacred volume out of the public schools? It passes by the schools and goes directly to the homes of the people. And soon its accumulated strength will break down all prohibitory legislation, and the natives of India will compel the government to introduce the Bible into the public schools.

We cannot well over estimate the importance of the fact that all opposition to Bible reading on the part of both Hindus and Mussulmans has now almost died away. It has been

said on a previous page, that the common people are not afraid to buy and read the Scriptures in the presence and beneath the frown of their priests. The light is spreading and the darkness flees before it. The Brahmin is doomed and priestcraft moribund. The Bible advances to the rescue of the millions long enslaved by cruel superstitions. The light, long departed that it might break the dismal night of Europe and America, is fast returning to the awakening lands of Asia. No power of man can check its glorious coming, nor shut the peoples' hearts against it, for it is the word of the Lord God, concerning which he has said, "It shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

Secondly, we hope that idol worship will soon cease. This will be the natural and irresistible result of a general knowledge of the Bible. Whether they become Christians or not, these people cannot long remain idolaters. Just as at sunrise the bats and owls disappear, so it will soon be too light in India for such personages as Jagannath and Ram and Durga. During these four years we have often been impressed with the rapid decline of idolatry. In all our tours we have seen but two new temples building for the gods. But we have seen scores and hundreds in ruins. It hardly pays to repair an idol temple in many places, for the people give so little to support the worship. The Brahmins are waking up to the dread reality that their craft is in danger. Many are forsaking bigotry and beggary for the useful vocations, such as school-teaching, clerkships and the trades. Very few, comparatively, of the boys in the families of the priests are learning the Shasters. Only here and there will one be found devoting himself with zeal to the sacred books of his ancestors. Young Bengal sees that this will not pay. One night, close by our tent, an old man was chanting the praises of Krishnu and his little son repeating the lines after him. That child's voice alternating with the heavy bass of the father, powerfully impressed me, and I thought how quickly the boy would fling those musty palm-leaves aside when that parent's voice is still.

In January we were addressing a large school of Bengali boys

in a country village. It was during a festival week and the idols seated on a rude car were being dragged about the streets. In plain language we spoke to the boys of the progress of knowledge in their native land and of its inevitable influence upon the prevailing customs and established institutions of the people. We said to them that as, in a dark night, one might mistake a bush for a bear, so in the gross darkness of ignorance their fathers had mistaken wood and stone and metal and almost every other created thing for God, but as at daylight no one can fear a bush, so in the light of knowledge no one can do homage to a lifeless thing. They perceived my meaning, and when we asked them the short, sharp question, "Boys, can you ever bow down to dumb idols?" the deep silence was really impressive. They could not say, Yes, and they feared to say, No, but their faces told the story. The Hindus often repeat the saying: "We do as the fourteen generations of our ancestors have done before us," but these boys, all over India, shall yet trample this sentiment in the dust beneath their feet, for idolatry is rapidly loosening its iron hold on the masses. One by one are the stones falling out from this mighty stronghold of Satan. Caste is dying out, hoary superstitions are vanishing into thin air, the heavy rod of priestcraft is melting away, the temples are crumbling, the lethargic land listens to the word of the Lord through the mouth of his holy prophet; "Woe unto him that saith to the wood, Awake; to the dumb stone, Arise."

Thirdly, we hope that many from among the heathen will become sincere believers in Christianity. Of the number of those who must soon abandon all idol-worship some will seek for the truth and find it in Christ. Even now the missionary meets with those who are searching for light. We believe that ultimately not a few of the advanced Brahmos will become Christians. There is certainly a tendency in this direction on the part of the more devoted and sincere men of this society. Some have already embraced the Christian religion and others secretly believe, but fear to publicly profess it. But in India, as every where else, our chief hope is in the work of grace among the common people. The leaven of the gospel is at work in the country towns, and in the homes and hearts of the

masses. Here and there in the little villages more than in the great cities, do we look for the speedy coming of the kingdom.

In November last we were camped for several days in a small village. There were several families of potters in it and one of these encouraged us much. The father and son frequently visited our tent and received instruction. They believed Hinduism to be a failure and a farce, and they intellectually believed in Christ. But fear of persecution kept them back from a full confession of their faith. But, thank God, this fear is daily decreasing and will soon be unknown. Among the potters, the weavers, the smiths, the carpenters, the farmers and the day-laborers, in short, among the working classes generally, is the gospel to triumph. The merchants and the scholars have more knowledge, but with it more prejudice also. They too will believe, but the common people, who centuries ago as now, heard Jesus gladly, will press into the kingdom before them.

The Coles, the Garos, the Santals, and other hill tribes are welcoming the gospel. These simple-hearted, wild and ignorant tribes manifest a deeper desire for the truth, and are more ready to accept it than their more cultivated countrymen. And much is now doing for these people of the jungles by the missionaries and native preachers. But our hope for the conversion of souls in India is greatly strengthened by witnessing the growing zeal and true missionary energy of the native church. These Hindu Christians are beginning to put forth right earnest efforts for the salvation of their countrymen. In some places the members of the church give one-tenth of their income for the work of carrying on schools, meeting the expenses of the chapel and sending preachers to the towns round about. This awakening of the native church to diligent endeavor for souls and cheerful sacrifice for the good of others may justly be regarded as a token of the better day coming. No foreign agency can evangelize India. It must be done by her own natives. Missionaries must devise and direct the plans of operation, but the burden of the undertaking in all its magnitude must rest mainly upon the native ministry. First of all, these men need the spirit of God to qualify them for their work, and next they need to be trained in the proper methods of doing it.

This constitutes a prominent part of the duty of the foreign missionary. And it is very cheering to see young men, for the love of Christ and the salvation of souls, entering upon so glorious a work. Each year, more and we trust better men are coming forward to devote themselves to the arduous labors of the ministry. Their hearts are moved, we hope, by the same impulse which puts good men into the ranks of the ministry in other lands, and their reward is sure.

Such are some of the bright hopes we cherish for India. Her complete evangelization hastens apace. The heralds of the cross are running to and fro, and the Bible is being read by the people. A new era is soon to dawn upon this land deep buried beneath the accumulated superstitions of centuries. A voice from heaven has bid the dead arise, and already the moldering dust begins to quiver with returning life. The Lord hath said, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee."

THE MISSIONARY PRAYER MEETING.

It is Friday evening and our little party are together for prayer and mutual consultation. This is a precious hour, and missionaries who have left the field often revert to it with peculiar and perpetual pleasure. Away from home in a stranger land it is sweet to commune together. And this weekly interview serves to bind our hearts in one and to draw us all nearer to Christ. We sing the dear old hymns of the land across the sea, we read the blessed Bible of our fathers, we bow around the gracious mercy seat and lift our prayers to him, whose ear is ever open to the cry of his chosen ones. In this meeting there are many petitions. The missionary has many souls to bring before the Lord. The beloved friends forsaken for Christ's sake on a distant shore, are always remembered here. Who can think it strange that sometimes the tears fall fast when prayer is made for some wayward one astray from the Good Shepherd's fold, that the "still, small voice" may woo him back to security and peace? And in every prayer perhaps you will hear words like these: "Lord, keep our precious ones from all sin, help them

to love thee and do thy will on earth, so that, should we never meet them again in the flesh, we may all meet in heaven." Fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, and sons and daughters are never forgotten at this Friday evening meeting. And when by the slow course of an ocean mail the sad tidings come, as come they do, that some loved one has heard death's stern summons and passed away,—some tender and doting parent or a darling child, then the grief brings our hearts closer together and we gather comfort from each other's sympathy. We have often thought how happy our home friends would be, could they look in upon our quiet evening service and could they listen to our petitions in their behalf. No persons on earth are more faithfully remembered at the mercy seat than the little circle of dear ones whom the missionary has left behind in his native land. Thank God for the comforting assurance that he too is remembered at the same mercy seat by those for whom he prays. This assurance he would not part with for all the world.

There are other features of the Friday evening meeting which make it a precious season to our souls. Here we are wont to talk over the bright side and the dark side of our work, to praise God for all of success in the schools, the native church, the Zenanas and the bazar preaching, and to pray over our special needs. Has a weak member stumbled in the way, or is another refractory? Here we speak of them in our own council and seek our Heavenly Father's help ourselves, in order that we may help these erring disciples. How can we bring this man to feel that he is doing wrong and setting a bad example unworthy of a Christian? What is the right way to reach the proud heart of an offended sister, who, to sting an enemy, keeps herself away from Christ's work and his holy table? May we not be doing more for the spiritual wants of the neglected Europeans of the station? These are some of the questions we ask one another, and then we all kneel down and ask our Father in heaven to teach us just those things we most need to know in order to do his work aright among these poor people. And the reader may be assured that after drawing near to God in earnest prayer, and receiving from him true help and cheer for our labor, we feel as Peter did on the mount of transfiguration, that it is good for

us to be here, where we lay off the burden of the week past and take on that of the week to come. Many a time have we gone carrying a burden and come away bringing a blessing. This weekly gathering has been truly a Bethel where we have met the Lord. At every station of the mission this season of special prayer is regularly observed on Friday evenings. We are thus all praying together for the coming of the kingdom of purity and peace in this dark land and throughout the whole earth. Blessed place of prayer! "Sweet hour of prayer!" From its glad refreshing we go forth to easy conquests for Christ, because we have caught afresh the sacred significance and felt anew the bountiful benediction of the Lord's last, loving words to the disciples as, from the slope of Olivet, he ascended into heaven: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

ART. II.—SPECIAL PROVIDENCE AND FREE MORAL AGENCY NOT INCOMPATIBLE.

BY REV. S. E. ROOT, GARDINER, ME.

In attempting to grasp a mighty truth, the position from which we view it is all important.

A small article may be taken in hand, analyzed, dissected, compared with other articles, or viewed in contrast with them, weighed, put under a microscope and magnified, its color, form, size, characteristics and adaptations particularly noted and definite conclusions reached with ease and dispatch.

Not so with objects of stupendous size. A giant crag, when seen from the distant plain below, presents far different aspects from those caught by a bird's-eye view from the balloon above. Distance may hide beauties and defects alike. From one point the prospect may be grandly sublime, from another, the glory may have departed and the view be tasteless and insipid. The glass may restore some of the beauties by bringing the objects nearer, but we can never be so familiar with nature's giants as

with her pigmies, and the old crag still stands vast and grand against the illimitable blue above and beyond.

So it is with greater or lesser truths. The piercing, all-embracing glance of Revelation alone, can bring within the range of our vision the deeper truths of religion; then they beam like fixed stars from out a sky of inscrutable mystery,—stars whose glory we cannot know in fullness except in the light of the new heavens of the glorified spirit.

Distance and the defects of our vision modify, in our own minds, important truths, and we lose the benefit of what God intended for our good. A coral worker in the deep must be poorly prepared to judge of the vastness of the universe. If the angels vainly desire to look into some of God's mysteries, much less can we comprehend them from our narrow stand-point.

We draw general conclusions from too few facts. A foreigner, landing in New York and seeing a man shot in a fray, would not be warranted in a general conclusion that all Americans were murderers. But we, in our narrow-mindedness, draw conclusions based solely upon a few matters, half understood and partially seen, and so prove ourselves to be no less erroneous in our conclusions. We need a spirit of deference for God's word of revelation, and, on account of our feeble reasoning powers, we need to accept our own conclusions with modesty and humility as well as with cool deliberation.

The compatibility of the doctrines of special providence and of free moral agency, as a subject of thought, stands majestically in the distance, towering above our unaided flight, inaccessible by human climbing.

Men have been accustomed to treat the matter as if, like a sea-shell, it might be taken into the hand and examined until it becomes as familiar to them as a child's play-thing. Assuming such familiarity, they have assumed to give light to others, and when a difficulty has presented itself they have failed to explain it. Some have taught that, if God's providence is special, men are not free moral agents; others insist that, if men are free moral agents, God's providence is not special. Men are accordingly left in doubt whether to believe in special providence or in free moral agency, in both or in neither; and if they believe in

both, are utterly mystified in endeavoring to reconcile the two.

Many who are mere novices in religious truth, who have scarcely learned the alphabet of the Bible, assume authoritatively and familiarly to settle matters into which angels desire in vain to look, and which God has not revealed. We may not examine Mount Washington as if it were a foot-ball, nor can we put these great doctrines under a microscope, but if, with the telescope which revelation supplies, we can discover the salient points of the grand outline, we must be satisfied until God shall give us a nearer vision. The doctrine of free moral agency is not to be proved but taken for granted, and, whether true or false, may be shown to be consistent with the doctrine of special providence.

Two circles of unequal size can touch each other at but one point or, at most, at two. Special providence is the exercise of God's free agency. Man's free moral agency lies within the circle of God's special providence, a smaller within a greater circle, and the interference, if any, can be in no more than in one or two points. The assumption that there can be any great clashing, is based upon a narrow conception of the vastness of God's providence, whose mighty circle sweeps so far outside of ours as to make it almost certain that there is no contact at all, and quite certain that any point of contact must be exceedingly minute. To discover these points of contact is practically to solve the difficulty. In what particular points, then, is it possible that these doctrines should be incompatible?

1. In the vast conception and execution of God's general plans and policy, there can be no incompatibility with man's free moral agency. The breadth of creation, the extent of the wondrous systems which no human eye has seen, nor imagination traced, nor telescope revealed, the plans and purposes of Deity in all these, we may never know, much less can our free agency interfere with them. In position, the point in this great universe in which there might be any clashing dwindles to a mere point.

We cannot reach forward to interfere with God's plans and purposes or in any way break up the established order of the

ages, whether free moral agents or not. The past is as mysterious and unchangeable as the future. Roll back the panorama of historic ages over the eras of Napoleon, Columbus, Cæsar, Alexander, Moses, Abraham, Adam, to the time when the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy, and we find the dim light growing more dim, the scroll ends in illegible lines, and still, beyond all that, an undiscovered eternity is buried in rayless night to us. The point of duration at which there could be any incompatibility is reduced to a single moment,—the present, and in all eternity past and eternity to come, divine providence and human agency are entirely removed from contact with each other.

The general purpose, order, and destiny of creation are beyond contact with man's moral agency. Who inhabit other worlds? Have they sinned? Are they redeemed? What is their destiny? These are questions unfathomable to us. Stretching over all this is God's great plan. How to create, when to create, how long to continue in existence, what disposal to make of these worlds and their inhabitants, are questions that we cannot affect or be affected by, whether God has given us the free exercise of moral power or not. In God's general management and control of the universe there is no incompatibility with man's free moral agency.

2. In God's general plans and workings, in the moral government of this world, there can be no incompatibility with free agency.

God is the moral governor of the world equally, whether men are free or not. The constitution of his government and the peculiar forms and methods in which it would be administered, were all settled long before men were created, and, if there is any clashing at all, it must be in the after-work of individual creation and constitution, and not in the general constitution of the moral government itself.

The nature of right and wrong we look upon as fixed and settled, and, even when we question the freedom of the will, we never question the fixedness of those eternal pillars on which the moral world is built. Right and wrong are immutable. Whether we conform or not to the fixed principles of right, becomes a

simple matter of individual experience, and in no way interferes with those general principles that underlie all our conceptions of moral government.

So, in the general treatment of his subjects, the plan was perfected and entered upon before men were created. Right was to be approved and wrong condemned. Fallen angels were to be expelled from paradise and obedient angels to receive divine rewards. God's plans, with which nothing could interfere, were already fixed and revealed, and man must have been created in harmony with God's other works of creation. If he is not now in harmony with them, then his abnormal condition is a matter of personal experience peculiar to a fallen state. If there is any defect in the beings created long ages after God's moral government was harmoniously working, and created in harmony with it, then the defective constitution of man interferes only with itself, and does not interfere with the general principles of God's moral government which existed previous to it and independent of it. It may be a question whether the fall interferes with free agency, but cannot be a question whether free agency is incompatible with God's moral government.

3. It is just as evident that God's general plans concerning us as a race, are beyond the possibility of collision with our free moral agency. All action of moral beings must be individual in its conception, intention and execution, but the result is the product of fixed law and, in many instances, of law above our control or foresight. Adam's sin was an individual act. The fall was in the constitution of the race and not in the individual act of Adam. If God for benevolent purposes gave a constitution capable of transmitting characteristics and tendencies, thus bestowing capacity for indefinite improvement, that capability is not changed whether elevated by holiness or depraved by sin. Without capability for misimprovement, there could be no capability for improvement. Whether fallen and depraved or not, the capability for improvement or misimprovement remains the same, the power of transmitting our tendencies remains the same, and we are responsible for our individual act only and not for the individual acts of our fathers. The moral state in which we find ourselves is entirely independent of our moral

agency and purely providential. God determined the actual state of the first man and the mental constitution that should determine the actual state of every other man. No man's act has any thing to do with the question whether he should be born blind and depraved or not. "Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents that he should be born blind." The results of the act, outside of the individual experience of the parent, are entirely providential and independent of man's moral agency. Adam did not intend to deprave the race. Depravity is the result of perverting a most benevolent principle.

As moral agency has nothing to do in determining the character of our moral constitutions, so moral agency has nothing to do in determining whether or not there should be an atonement.

The giving of the Bible, the strivings of the Spirit, the invitations to be accepted or rejected, the salvation of those who accept the gospel and the damnation of those who reject it, are revealed details of God's plans concerning us as a race with which our moral agency has nothing whatever to do. Providence deals with the race, as well as with individuals. If we are free, we can choose the right or the wrong as a matter of personal experience, but the general plans of the gospel are fixed and revealed, whether we are free or not.

There is, then, no incompatibility whatever between the free moral agency of man and God's government of the universe, either physical or moral, nor yet in the providence of God as touching the race in their origin, fall and redemption. In all the vast round of eternity, in the past and in the future, only the single point, now, can be found in which there can be any collision. In the mighty breadth of God's creation, in this world or in any other world, can no place be determined in which there might be a point of contact, except in the individual act of some individual being. In all the government of God, moral and physical, can no state or condition of existence be pointed out in which there might be any incompatibility, except in the single condition of depravity.

If, in a million points, Providence and human agency are perfectly compatible, and if in only a single point here could possibly be any incompatibility, and if God is perfect, then it is utter-

ly improbable that in that one point there can be any incompatibility; the circles must be concentric.

The only real difficulty is this; If God's providence is special and immutable, how can an individual act be varied by choice? This difficulty is solved by the Bible doctrine of contingent providence.

1. Individual providence is originally an unmingled good, but men, in order to be moral agents, must have the power to do wrong, and Providence, unbaffled, has not neglected even this emergency but has provided contingent action for contingent wrong. Providence may be absolute in ruling a world and contingent in governing moral beings. The Bible every where recognizes the distinction between absolute and contingent providence.

2. But the question is raised whether the idea of contingent providence would not destroy the doctrine of God's immutability. This objection springs from a false conception of God, making God more limited than men themselves. No consistent parent can be found who does not promise rewards for obedience and punishments for disobedience, and who does not act accordingly. Nobody accuses those persons of changing though they punish one child and reward another, or reward and punish the same child at different times for different actions. Their immutable rule of government requires this contingent action, and without it the parent would be, mutable, sometimes approving the right and sometimes the wrong. Neither do we consider the power of choosing to obey or to disobey at all impaired, on the part of the child, in consequence of the parent's unchangeable rule of contingent rewards and punishments.

No more is man's free moral agency impaired nor his power of choice taken away by God's authoritative voice, "Do this and live, or, do that and die." God is not a blind machine meting out good and bad alike by indiscriminate rule, but an intelligent ruler governing the world by immutable law, punishing vice and rewarding virtue. But vice and virtue are contingent with men, and men change, not God, though providence is discriminating and contingent by immutable law.

3. Again it is asked; "How can providence be contingent if

God foreknows every thing; must not all things come to as God foreknows them?"

This difficulty comes from confounding foreknowledge foreordination. To foreknow is not the same as to decree act. Men foreknow many things which they do not avoid nor purpose, and which they would avert if they could. God foreknows many things which he does not purpose nor decree, and which he would prevent if he could do so consistently with the principles of his moral government.

"I would have gathered you . . . but ye would not." Men are free to sin, but God is neither pleased with sin nor has decreed sin to be committed. On the contrary, he forbids and punishes, though he permits it. Knowledge or ignorance of fact beforehand does not alter the fact. God foreknows facts. They are not facts because he knows them, but he knows them because they are facts. They are facts none the less because we are ignorant of them and none the more because God knows them. If, instead of being foreknown, they were unalterably decreed, the case would be essentially different. The decree is unalterable that each individual does right or wrong as he chooses, and it is also unalterably decreed that contingent providence shall discriminate between vice and virtue in bestowing rewards and punishments, but it is not unalterably decreed that one person shall do right and that another shall do wrong.

4. The true doctrine is this. Contingent providence ramifies itself into all the possible acts of life, whether right or wrong, so that, of a hundred possible acts, a hundred possible providences are ready to meet them one by one.

David said: "If I ascend up into heaven thou art there. If I make my bed in hell behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me and thy right hand shall hold me." David could choose his own direction, but he could choose no direction where God was not. He could even choose a direction which it was not possible for him to pursue, for "it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps."

If a right act is changed to a wrong one, then a propitious providence is changed for a retributive one. For every possible

there is a providence, and providence gives power to perform either right or wrong. We go east, west, north or south, we choose; we sleep, wake, work, and rest, but providence is always there. If we turn in one direction, we live, if in another we lose an arm or our life, and all these providences are hid from us on purpose that we may be free to act. In one direction only has providence revealed itself. If we do wrong, we are miserable, if we do right, we are happy; but even this result is, temporarily, kindly modified so that it shall not interfere with our freedom, and that the goodness of God may lead to repentance. "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself." It is as if a person were walking up a stream fed by a multitude of fountains. He can follow whichever branch or rill he chooses, but whichever branch he takes he finds a trodden path before him. In the circulatory and nervous systems every blood vessel is accompanied by a nerve even to the minutest capillaries. Dissect whatever blood vessel you please, dissect all or only one, but whatever one you select a nerve is found there. So with all possible acts of life, performed or unperformed, a contingent providence accompanies even to the minutest capillary.

5. The doctrine of contingent providence is emphatically a Bible doctrine. "Not a soul on board shall perish," but "except these abide in the ship, they cannot be saved." Every promise to the Christian rests upon a contingent providence, and an "if" is expressed or implied as a fundamental condition in every assurance of comfort. "If ye continue in my love" and "if ye are faithful unto death," ye "shall receive a crown of life." So every word of threatening: "If ye will not hearken unto my voice;" "If ye shall deny me before men, I also will deny you before my Father and the holy angels." In many instances God states a variety of supposable cases and gives the results contingent upon each, and then leaves men free to act, and He acts accordingly. The Bible doctrine is plainly stated; it gives providence as contingent, and thus solves the difficulty.

The Bible asserts that man's "bounds are fixed that he cannot pass," and the question arises whether such limitations are compatible with free moral agency.

1. It is evident that mentally, morally, and physically some things are utterly impossible to men. Whether these impossibilities limit their choice as well as their power, is an important question. The absolute impossibility of raising the tower of Babel higher than the highest mountains, did not hinder the old world from choosing to try it. It was not their choice and agency that were circumscribed, but their power and their resources. Insane men often undertake the most absurd impossibilities, and men perfectly sane undertake things as utterly impossible but apparently not quite as absurd.

2. The limits within which men are fixed are not, then, limits of intention but limits of result. Men can decide on courses of action but it is for God to say whether these courses of action shall be carried out, or not. Providence in this does not affect man's choice, or agency, or intention, or the exercise of free moral power.

3. The effect of free moral agency is reflex and does not interfere with God's plans and purposes at all. To dash the head against the rock of Gibraltar cannot move it from its place, but may have a terribly reflex influence upon him who becomes thereby the agent of his own destruction. Julian, the apostate, burning to disgrace the Saviour whom he had denied, and fighting to prove prophecy a lie, endeavored to lay again the foundations of the temple written desolate forever. His workmen were scorched and blasted by balls of electric fire, and driven from their places by earthquakes. Afterward, when he received his death-wound from a lance thrust by the hand of a Persian, he caught the flowing blood, and hurling it wildly toward heaven, acknowledged Providence and cried; "O Galilean, thou hast conquered." The reflex influence of the exercise of the free moral agency of Julian, the apostate, upon himself was terrible, but the purpose of God expressed prophetically long before, which Julian so ruthlessly assaulted, remains to this day.

4. God's immutability is undisturbed by man's free moral agency and man's power of choice. Men are like pebbles in the stream. The gurgling waters ripple over and around them upon every side, and though they are not displaced, the waters are not turned from their channel. The two rails of the rail-

road in the distance appear to approach each other and finally to terminate at a point and to defeat effectually the object of a railroad, but upon examination, contrary to appearances, the rails are found to be perfectly parallel to the very furthest point. So providence and our moral agency are perfectly parallel and their apparent interference is because we cannot pierce the dim, eternal distance; they can never clash.

It remains only to gather up and adjust the results of this investigation.

1. Man's agency does not go beyond the sphere of his own individual action. In all else, providence stands peculiar and alone.

2. Inside the sphere of his own action, man's choice is unlimited and his action undisturbed except by the limit of his own power and resources.

3. God does not come inside the limit of man's agency to dictate. He comes only to present motives.

4. God treats men as responsible beings, according to their free unbiased choice of good or evil.

5. In the order of sequence, man's act comes first and God's knowledge of the fact follows. In the order of time, God's knowledge is first. Truth is a mirror from which the actions of men are reflected.

As in a mirror one may see the face of a man when it is turned directly from him without interfering with that man's own chosen position, so foreknowledge finds, in the mirror of truth, the future acts of one who is discerned far down the stream of time, without interfering with that man's free moral agency.

6. God furnishes the means by which man can determine whether to obey him and be saved, or to disobey him and be lost. Choosing the course which leads to either destiny is equivalent to choosing that destiny.

ART. III.—THE DISESTABLISHMENT OF THE IRISH CHURCH.

BY REV. WILLIAM HURLIN, ANTRIM, N. H.

The early religious history of Ireland is involved in much obscurity. Some writers think that Christianity was introduced there in the time of the apostles. But whenever introduced, it does not appear to have made very great progress till Patrick, a Scotch minister, born A. D. 372, landed there as a missionary about A. D. 432. He and his associates were the means of doing a great work in the spread of Christianity in that island. Although he is now called by the Roman Catholics the patron saint of Ireland, thus appropriating him to themselves, it is affirmed that he did not hold the doctrines now held by the Roman Catholics, but preached a pure Christianity. In the process of centuries errors gradually crept in, and were received in Ireland as in other places. In 1174, when Henry II., of England, had conquered Ireland, and had received the submission of her kings, a general synod of the Irish clergy was held at Cashel, and the Irish and English churches were assimilated.

In 1535, Henry VIII. established the reformed religion in Ireland; Elizabeth and James I., each in their turn, used means to confirm it. But the great majority of the people remained attached to Roman Catholicism, and the established church was regarded by them as a tyrannical imposition and the badge of their conquest. James II. was a Roman Catholic, and therefore very popular in Ireland, and after William and Mary had been proclaimed king and queen of England and Ireland, a stand was made to retain that island for James. Both the civil and military power there were then in the hands of Roman Catholics. James went from France to Ireland and held a Parliament. The struggle was desperate, and the result for a time uncertain; but on July 1, 1690, the battle of the Boyne was fought and won by William. James retreated to France, and although his friends kept up the contest for some time, Limerick, the last fortress in their hands, was surrendered October 3, 1691, and the war was ended. But hatred of the English and of all their

institutions remained, and among these institutions was the Established Church.

The king of England was also king of Ireland. Yet he held a separate Parliament in the latter country. At the end of the eighteenth century, an act of union was passed by the parliament of both countries, to take effect January 1, 1801, by which Ireland became an integral part of Great Britain and entitled to be represented in its Parliament. From that time there has been a growing party in England disposed to do justice to Ireland. In 1829, an act was passed by which Roman Catholics throughout Great Britain were admitted to the same civil privileges as were enjoyed by Protestant dissenters; and as a very large majority of the Irish were Catholics, this law was what it was intended to be, a special act of justice to that country. The first reformed Parliament, which commenced in 1833, enacted a law by which the tithes in most of the parishes were commuted and thus made less onerous; and another, reducing the number of archbishops and bishops from four to two of the former and from eighteen to ten of the latter. The money thus saved was to be appropriated to the building of churches, and glebe houses, and to other church purposes by a Board of Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

But the fact remained, that while more than three-fourths of the people were Roman Catholics, there was in existence a universal Protestant Episcopal Establishment for the benefit of less than one-eighth of the people. The census of 1861 showed that the total population of Ireland was 5,798,957. Of these there were in round numbers, Roman Catholics, 4,505,000; Episcopalians, 693,000; Presbyterians, 523,000; other Protestants, 76,000. The Irish were no worse off in this respect than were the Protestant dissenters of England and Wales. But there was this difference: the disparity of numbers was greater in the former than in the latter case, and this made the anomaly more conspicuous, and the dissenters of Ireland being mainly Roman Catholics, they knew that many of the churches used by the Established Church, were built by those of their own faith, and that a portion of the revenues by which that Church was supported came from the same source.

A recent report of a Commission of Inquiry, shows that the total revenue of the Established Church in Ireland is £613,984, per annum, and that of this sum the bishops receive £58,000. There are six parishes in which there is not a Protestant, yet each of the clergymen in these parishes receives from £200 to £500 per annum. There are twenty parishes in each of which there are less than ten Protestants; and one hundred and ninety-nine in which there are less than forty. The total clerical incomes of these parishes is £45,000, or about £10 per head for each Episcopalian found in them. The parish Templeree has a population of 9 Episcopalians, and 493 Roman Catholics. There is no church, but the Episcopal clergyman has an income of £156 a year. Clashmore has a population of 27 Episcopalians, and 2,148 Roman Catholics. The clergyman has £153 per annum, and a residence. Garryclone has 38 Episcopalians, and the rector receives £1,253 a year, and pays a curate £100 for doing the duty.

Lord Macaulay wrote of the Irish Establishment, "It is admitted, as indeed it could not be denied, that this Church does not perform the functions which are everywhere else expected from similar institutions; that it does not instruct the body of the people; that it does not administer religious consolation to the body of the people. Did any other set of bishops and priests in the world ever receive half as much, for doing twice as much? And what have we to show for all this lavish expenditure? What but the most zealous Roman Catholic population on the face of the earth? Is there anything else like it? The world is full of ecclesiastical establishments, but nowhere from the Arctic Circle to Cape Horn do you find the Church of a small minority exclusively established."

Lord Brougham once said, "I well remember a phrase used by one not a foe to Church Establishments—I mean Mr. Burke—'Don't talk of its being a Church! It is a wholesale robbery!'" His lordship continued, "I have heard it called an anomaly of so gross a kind that it outrages every principle of common sense; and every one endowed with common reason must feel that it is the most gross outrage to that common sense

as it is also of justice. It is a thing wholly peculiar to Ireland, and could be tolerated nowhere else."

"The British Anti-State Church Association, for the liberation of religion from all State interference," did much to keep the subject before the public; and Mr. E. Miall, one of the founders of that Association, delivered a speech in Parliament on this subject in 1858, as did others at different times.

On June 24th, 1867, Earl Russell moved in the House of Lords, "That an humble address be presented to her Majesty, praying that her majesty will be pleased to give directions that, by the operation of a Royal Commission or otherwise, full and accurate information be procured as to the nature and amount of the property and revenues of the Established Church in Ireland, with a view to their more productive management, and to their more equitable application for the benefit of the Irish people." In the course of his speech, Earl Russell said there were four ways of remedying present evils in connection with the Irish Establishment. 1. Leave the present endowments of the Protestant Church untouched, and make an additional grant for the support of the Catholic priesthood. 2. Transfer all those endowments, with due security for vested interests, to the Church of the majority. 3. Disendow the Protestant Church, without endowing its rival, and appropriate the income to education and other secular objects. 4. Divide the endowments between Protestants and Catholics. He expressed his preference for the last plan, and suggested that two-fifths might be kept by the Episcopalians, and two-fifths be given to the Roman Catholics, and one-fifth to the Presbyterians. The resolution was carried and a Commission of Inquiry was appointed.

But the public mind was aroused to the importance of the subject, and the opinion was general among the liberal party that something must be done, without waiting for the report of this Commission, which was regarded as an excuse for delaying the matter. For their report was sure to be a long while in coming, and judging by past experience, it was not likely to produce any practical results when it did come. Parliament assembled for its last session on February 13th, 1868, and the general inquiry was, "Will anything be done with the Irish Church?" There

could be no doubt that a Reformed Parliament would decree an alteration, but would this one take the initiative, and seek to pacify Ireland? Lord Stanley, the secretary for Foreign Affairs, said that his party would not touch the question, and it appeared doubtful if the liberals would, for, in addition to other difficulties in their way, they had to take care that the Church Rate Abolition Bill should be passed. Still it was hoped that Mr. Gladstone, as leader of the party, might announce some line of policy which would serve as a watchword, and lead to future decisive action.

In March, a resolution of inquiry into "the state of Ireland" was introduced into the House of Commons. The debate commenced on the 10th, and continued four evenings. On the part of the government, Earl Mayo gave notice of some measures which were proposed for the benefit of Ireland; but he said they did not believe that the Church question was of pressing importance, and they did not propose to do anything about it until the Commission had reported, that policy and justice might demand the equalization of Church Establishments in Ireland, but it must be done not by a levelling, but by an elevating process; that is, if any change was made, they were prepared to leave the Episcopal Church in possession of its present revenues, and appropriate monies from the national exchequer to endow the Roman Catholics. Mr. Disraeli declared himself decidedly in favor of endowments. Mr. John Bright said that public opinion was against the establishment of new state churches, and the Irish Established Church must be disestablished. He expressed his willingness to give the churches and the parsonages to those who now hold them, on condition that they would keep them in repair; and that he would also provide an equivalent for the life interests of the clergy, for the *Regium Donum*, and for the annual grant to Maynooth Roman Catholic College. Mr. Gladstone announced his opinion to be, that there was a necessity for establishing religious equality in Ireland by the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church. He admitted that there were formidable difficulties in the way of doing this, but he believed there were sufficient courage and statesmanship in the legislature to overcome them. This settled the question as

to Mr. Gladstone's views, and it was said that this debate rang the knell of the Irish Church Establishment.

Mr. Gladstone followed up his speech by introducing, on March 23d, the three following resolutions :

1. "That in the opinion of this House, it is necessary that the Established Church of Ireland should cease to exist as an Establishment, due regard being had to all personal interests and to all individual rights of property.

2. "That, subject to the foregoing considerations, it is expedient to prevent the creation of new personal interests by the exercise of any public patronage, and to confine the operations of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of Ireland to objects of immediate necessity, or involving individual rights, pending the final decision of Parliament.

3. "That a humble address be presented to Her Majesty, humbly to pray that, with a view to the purposes aforesaid, Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to place at the disposal of Parliament her interest in the temporalities of the archbishoprics, bishoprics, and other ecclesiastical dignities and benefices in Ireland, and in the custody thereof."

The discussion of these resolutions commenced on the 30th, and continued four nights, exciting much public attention. Mr. Gladstone gave a general sketch of his plan for disestablishment. He was met with an amendment from Lord Stanley, which, "while admitting that considerable modifications in the temporalities of the United Church in Ireland may, after the pending inquiry, appear to be expedient," opposed any present action in the matter. The arguments against the resolutions were numerous. Some said they were contrary to the Act of Union for uniting England and Ireland, others contended that they were in opposition to the coronation oath of the sovereign, and still others that in yielding the Irish Establishment, the English must follow. Others asserted that the Episcopal ministers in Ireland spent more money than they received, and were generally respected; while some agreed that an alteration must be made soon, they urged that the matter be laid over for the present. Among those who spoke in opposition to the resolutions, were Lord Stanley, Viscount Cranborn, Mr. Gathorne Hardy,

Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Henley, Gen. Peel and Mr. Disraeli. On the other side were Mr. Gladstone, Mr. John Bright, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Latham, Mr. Stansfeld, and others. The amendment received 270 votes; against it, 330; majority for Mr. Gladstone, 60; and the resolutions of the latter were immediately carried, Ayes, 328; Noes, 272; majority 56. The difference in the two votes was accounted for by the statement that two liberal members went by mistake into the wrong lobby, and thus were counted on the opposite side.

The principle of disestablishment was thus settled, and according to usage, Mr. Disraeli and his colleagues should have resigned, or have dissolved the Parliament, that the constituencies might be appealed to. But they did neither. They remained in office with the plea that the decision of Parliament was contrary to the opinion of the country, and Mr. Disraeli gave as the reason why he did not dissolve Parliament, that such a step would interfere with public business, and that therefore he decided to remain in office and contest the measure in its further stages. The House now adjourned for the Easter Holidays, and in the meantime numerous public meetings were held to give the people an opportunity of expressing their opinion, and the subject was freely discussed in the newspapers. The Episcopalians saw in Mr. Gladstone's and Mr. Bright's propositions only the minimum of what they might obtain; while nonconformists spoke of the danger of leaving a large endowment in the hands of the church, when they should be freed from national control. Two Episcopal newspapers came out against the Irish Establishment. The *Guardian* took the ground that the Irish Establishment was a dead weight and an injury to the Church of England, and spoke of it as "this unique anomaly, which has no parallel in Christendom." The *Church Times*, another Episcopalian newspaper, in the interest of the Ritualists, said, "The Irish Church is an abject and disgraceful failure. Its clergy do not work, do not think, do not write, do not keep their flocks from rushing off into the wildest dissent, and that is what the Church of England would become if the Puritans were to get the supremacy which they desire. Whereas if the Irish Church were disestablished, and the clergy had to fall back

on the voluntary principle, it is barely possible that they might begin to earn their bread honestly by doing a fair day's work for their wages, a thing certainly not attempted by fifty ecclesiastics out of the two thousand who occupy the Irish Clergy List."

The House of Commons having re-assembled, went into committee on the resolutions on April 27th, and after several nights' debate the first resolution was carried by a majority of 64, and the others were passed without a division. Still Mr. Disraeli held his office, but announced that Parliament would be dissolved as soon as the public business permitted. It must be admitted that he had some show of reason for the course he pursued. The Reform Bill of the previous year provided that an election should take place preparatory to the reformed Parliament meeting after Jan. 1, 1869, so that if he had dissolved Parliament now, the new Parliament would have continued in existence but a very short time. On the other hand, it was contended that he was fairly beaten and ought to resign, and that his continuing to hold office was only in accordance with his previous course, a determination to continue in office as long as possible.

When the resolutions were first passed, Mr. Disraeli suggested that the Queen might withhold her consent from the prayer of the third; but on calm consideration of the matter, the Queen's gracious consent was given. On May 14th, Mr. Gladstone introduced a Suspensory Bill, to carry out the principles of the second and third resolutions, by preventing any further appointments in the Irish Church for one year. This was read a second time on the 22d; the numbers being, Ayes, 337; Noes, 283; majority 54. This bill went through committee, and was read a third time and passed on June 16th, without a division.

And now all eyes were turned to the House of Lords. That house usually musters in very small numbers, and its daily sittings are generally short. But it was all along understood that the great fight would be made there. Among the noticeable things in this stage of the bill is the fact that a petition in its favor was presented to the House of Lords signed by two hundred and sixty-one clergymen of the Established Church, including the Deans of Canterbury (Alford) and

Bristol, the arch deacon of Coventry (Sandford,) the Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, Professors Jowett, Maurice, Kingsley, Plumptre, and Cheetham, and other leading men in the Church of England. In taking this course, however, they differed from the thousands of their brethren who held on to the principle of establishments in Ireland, lest they should shake the foundations of establishments in England.

The debate on the second reading, which is usually the great battle-ground of a contested bill, occupied three nights, and on the last of these, June 29th, the session occupied ten hours. The number of peers at that time was 458. Of these 287 voted, 44 paired off, and several who were present did not vote at all. Of the thirty bishops who have a seat in the house, twenty-one voted against the bill, two were hindered from being present by age and sickness, and the others did not vote at all. The numbers were, for the second reading, 95; against it, 192. The result was not unexpected. The majority was against the bill, and it was thrown out. Nine liberal peers voted with the majority, and two Conservative peers with the minority. Among the principal speakers in favor of the Bill, were Earl Granville, the Duke of Argyle, and Earl Carnarvon. The last named is a conservative, but he said "he was forced to say that the Irish Church had failed in her mission," and that "the worst enemies of the Church could not say a more cruel thing of her than that which had been said by some of the opponents of the Suspensory bill;—'that if State aid were taken away, the Church would perish.'" Among the speakers in opposition to the Bill, were Lord Cairns, (Chancellor) Earl Derby, the Bishop of Oxford, and the Archbishop of Armagh, the primate of all Ireland. Some of the speakers contended that the inefficiency of the church was the result of the control which the State had exercised over it; others that the Suspensory Bill would be found inconvenient; while still others urged a compromise by endowing the Roman Catholics; and some asserted that the disestablishment of the Irish Episcopal Church would certainly tend to the strengthening of the Roman Catholics. But none of them ventured to affirm that the Church had fulfilled its purpose, or accomplished that which it might be expected to accomplish.

But the vote settled the matter for the time being, and led all parties to look forward with increased interest to the approaching election. The Church Rate Abolition Bill was still before Parliament, but it was in its last stages; and having been passed by both Houses, the Parliament was prorogued July 31st, with a view to its dissolution at the proper time, that is, a week or two before that which should be fixed for the elections.

Every thing now depended on the coming elections, and from the time when Parliament was prorogued, extraordinary preparations were made to prepare for them. The conservatives professed to believe that they should secure a majority of the new voters, while the liberals as confidently believed that the majority would be with them. This election was supposed to be of immense importance, not only because of the principal issue that was before it, but also from the fact that it was the first reformed Parliament, in which every householder in cities and boroughs was to be entitled to a vote.

Almost immediately after the prorogation of Parliament, the report of the Commissioners appointed in 1867 to examine into the condition of the Irish Established Church, was published. But it was altogether behind its age. It gave a statement in detail of the present income of the Church and of its distribution. It stated that the revenues of the Church were badly managed and unequally distributed, and furnished abundant proof of this statement. It recommended, among other things, that there be a further consolidation of dioceses, a reduction in the number and in the incomes of the bishops, a corresponding reduction in the number of cathedral establishments, so that they shall not exceed the number of bishoprics, a reduction in the number of archdeacons, the suppression of all dignities and offices in the dissolved cathedral corporations, a re-arrangement of benefices, to meet the exigencies of the Church population, a more equitable adjustment of income to services, and more stringent and summary powers of enforcing the residence of the clergy in their parishes to be given to the bishops and the ecclesiastical courts.

More specifically, the Commissioners recommended that four out of the twelve bishoprics should be abolished, leaving

eight; that six of the bishops should have £3,000 a year each, (\$14,520) that the bishop of Dublin, if he was to be merely a bishop, as some of them proposed, should have £4,500 a year, (\$21,780) but that if he continued an archbishop, as some thought he should, his salary should be £5,000 a year, (\$24,200) and that the archbishop of Armagh should have £6,000 (\$29,040). They further recommended that an extra allowance of £500 a year be given to each of the archbishops and bishops whose turn it should be to sit in Parliament; that the number of deans and chapters should be reduced from thirty to eight; and that one hundred and ninety-nine benefices, which contain fewer than forty persons connected with the Established Church, should be abolished. But they give not the least hint that they believed the Establishment, as a whole, received too much money, hence they recommended that what was saved by the alterations they proposed, should be applied to the augmentation of the smaller salaries. They thus proposed to take from the smaller congregations to give to the larger, and left the crying evil, the principle of a Church Establishment for the minority to be supported by the majority, untouched. But the time had altogether passed when such measures as this report proposed, could be of any use, and the advocates of disestablishment and disendowment claimed that this report gave additional strength to their position.

Meantime the question was fully discussed in various ways. Ministers referred to it in their sermons; various speeches were delivered with reference to it; and the press teemed with pamphlets, as well as articles in the newspapers, magazines, and reviews. Of the speeches delivered at this time, we may refer to two. Sir Roundell Palmer, who separated from the liberal party on this question, although continuing with them on others, said he did not feel compelled by any "principle" to resist disendowment, but "when the claim of the Protestants had been undisputed for three hundred years, when they had done nothing to disqualify them from the future use of that property, and when, even if it were taken away, there was no recognized body on which to bestow it, he was certainly inclined to think that it ought to remain in its present hands."

On the other hand, Mr. Coleridge, now Solicitor General, said, "Churches without congregations, clergymen without parishioners, the religion of the minority forced upon the whole people by external power, and wealthy bishops enthroned in the cathedrals and seated in the House of Lords by the mere will of England; an Establishment founded on cruelty and on bloodshed, and now supported by an injustice which has had no parallel since the days of Adam. If any man can show me in history any parallel to this Establishment, let him tell me what it is, and where it is to be found."

The titles of a few of the pamphlets issued, may interest our readers and give an idea of their character. Among those in favor of disestablishment, were, "The Irish Church question calmly considered.—A book of facts, testimonies, and arguments." By Rev. W. H. Dyer. "Is there not a cause?" By Rev. M. McColl, M. A. "Disendowment: Is it safe?" "Be just and fear not." By Rev. C. H. Spurgeon. "An examination of the report of the Royal Commissioners." By H. S. Skeats. On the other side, there were, "Union of Church and State the source of national religion." By Canon Lee. An historical survey of the relations between the Church and State of England and Ireland, and the See and Court of Rome." By Rev. J. Briggs. "The Disestablishment of the Irish Church—a leap in the dark." "Disestablishment or disendowment." By A. H. Foster. "The Church of Ireland: Her history and her claims." By Archdeacon Wordsworth.

The Parliament was dissolved by Royal Proclamation Nov. 11th, and the writs to the counties, cities, and boroughs, were issued on the same day; and the elections were nearly all held within the month. The No-Popery cry was largely used during both the canvass and the elections by the conservative party, as was also that of danger to the Church of England. Mr. Gladstone was accused of changing his mind on this question. And if he had, what of that? Who is there, who has a mind, who has not in the course of his life, changed it on important subjects? But it appears from the testimony of Mr. Coleridge that the change in the mind of Mr. Gladstone has neither been sudden nor recent. He stated that in 1847, when Mr. Glad-

stone became a candidate for the representation of Oxford University, a deputation waited upon him for a pledge that he would, under all circumstances, stand by the Irish Church, and he refused to give it. And in 1863, when he was about seeking a re-election, he voluntarily told Sir Roundell Palmer that his mind was made up about the Irish Church, and that if questioned, he must avow his conviction that it ought to be abolished, and he made this avowal for the purpose of giving them an opportunity to seek another candidate if they wished to do so.

When the returns from all the elections were in, it was found that the majority against the government had nearly doubled, having increased to 112; they therefore felt the hopelessness of further resistance, and bowed to the decision of the people, and placed their resignation in the hands of the Sovereign. This was an uncommon course, as resignations usually occur when Parliament is in session, but it was so distinctly understood that the elections were to decide the question as to which party should hold office, the verdict was so decisive, and public business would be so much furthered by this course, that no one was disposed to find fault with the government for taking it.

As a matter of course, Mr. Gladstone was entrusted with the formation of a new ministry, and this was soon accomplished. The new Parliament met on Dec. 10th, but some delay in proceeding to business was necessary because of the law which decides that any one taking office under the crown thereby vacates his seat in Parliament, hence he must present himself to his constituents for re-election. This law was somewhat inconvenient on this occasion, as it was important that Parliament should proceed to business as soon as possible. It has been called in this country, a "relic of old-fogyism." But it is a good law and serves a good purpose in limiting the powers and influence of the Sovereign, and in preventing a member of Parliament from becoming an officer of the government contrary to the wishes of his constituents. Mr. Gladstone and his associates, including Mr. John Bright, were all re-elected by their several constituencies; but as the government needed time for consultation and preparation for the important business before them, the session was adjourned until Feb. 16th, 1869.

There was much interest to know the precise character of the measure which Mr. Gladstone would introduce, and the speeches of the members of the government who were seeking re-election, were carefully scanned. Not much definite information was obtained, yet the country became satisfied that a comprehensive and satisfactory measure would be introduced. It was also evident that there would be difficulties in the way, which would need to be carefully considered. It was further contended that some modifications of the generous offers of Messrs. Gladstone and Bright would be necessary, as, if so large a portion of the ecclesiastical property as had been indicated was left in the possession of the Episcopalians, who numbered only six hundred thousand, the Roman Catholics, who numbered four and a half millions, would certainly claim a much larger sum as an equivalent.

Parliament assembled Feb. 16th, and the Queen's speech was read. The all-engrossing topic was referred to in the following words: "The ecclesiastical arrangements of Ireland will be brought under your consideration at a very early date, and the legislation which will be necessary in order to their final adjustment will make the largest demands upon the wisdom of Parliament.

"I am persuaded that, in the prosecution of the work, you will bear a careful regard to every legitimate interest which it may involve, and that you will be governed by the constant aim to promote the welfare of religion through the principles of equal justice, to secure the action of the undivided feeling and opinion of Ireland on the side of loyalty and law, to efface the memory of former contentions, and to cherish the sympathies of an affectionate people.

"In every matter of public interest, and especially in one so weighty, I pray that the Almighty may never cease to guide your deliberations, and may bring them to a happy issue."

This did not give much information, and the people had still to wait. But at length the grand day arrived when the plans of the government were to be known. This was Monday, March 1st. There was a great rush to obtain places in the small galleries appropriated to the public. The House of Lords

adjourned at an early hour, and a number of the peers went to hear Mr. Gladstone's speech. At ten minutes to five, Mr. Gladstone rose to move "that leave be given to bring in a bill to put an end to the Established Church in Ireland." The bill contained sixty-three clauses, and Mr. Gladstone spoke three hours and twenty minutes; in this speech he explained and gave the details of the measure.

The bill provided that on Jan. 1st, 1871, all connection between the Irish Episcopal Church and the State, should cease. This included the abolition of the ecclesiastical courts, and of all ecclesiastical corporations in Ireland, and the cessation of the right of Irish bishops to sit in the House of Peers. But, previous to that date, the bishops, clergy, and laity of the Church are to organize themselves into a religious body, with such rules and regulations as they may see fit, and the crown, on being satisfied that the governing body, so formed, fairly represents the Episcopalians of Ireland, is to grant them a charter of incorporation; and to this body is to be transferred, in trust, all property which, since the Restoration of Charles II., in 1660, has been given by private persons to the Protestant Episcopal Church in Ireland. Mr. Gladstone estimated this property at £500,000. Taking the position that vested rights were to be respected, he thought that the best way of carrying out that principle was to estimate the present value of those interests to their owners, and to pay that amount without delay. In this way, the connection between Church and State could be sooner dissolved, and all causes of irritation be allayed. He thought this would take about £4,900,000.

The churches and the burial grounds were to remain in the possession of the Episcopalians, if they would accept them and agree to keep them in repair; but any churches which they did not choose to take were to be sold, and the proceeds added to the general fund. Twelve of the principal churches were to be retained and kept in repair by the State, as national memorials. Mr. Gladstone claimed that the glebe houses and lands, (parsonage houses and farms) are rightfully the property of the State; but as he found that the houses were largely in debt for building-charges, he proposed to hand over the houses to the

Church on payment of the debts upon them; and to take possession of the lands and sell them in small lots, on easy terms, to those who might wish to buy them, and thus create in the country a class of small landed proprietors. Mr. Gladstone also decided that the tithe charges, which had been hitherto paid to the Church, were a legal charge upon the land, and should henceforth be paid to the State. But in order to do away with this tax, the bill proposed the option of one of two plans. Land owners were to be at liberty to redeem this tithe charge at twenty-two and a half years purchase. Thus a man now paying ten pounds a year, might relieve himself of this tax for ever, by paying the sum of £225. Or, if this was declined, an addition of three per cent. should be added to the regular annual payment for forty-five years, and then the payments should cease, and tithes in Ireland be finally abolished.

The Presbyterian ministers in Ireland have been accustomed to receive annual grants from the State treasury, under the name of *Regium Donum* and the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth has also, for a number of years, received an annual grant of money. As both these payments were understood to be perpetuated, Mr. Gladstone thought that compensation should be made for their discontinuance; hence, he proposed that £1,100,000, should be appropriated for this purpose, two-thirds to the Presbyterians, and one-third to Maynooth.

The income of the Irish Church was reckoned at £700,000 a year, and Mr. Gladstone estimated that the tithe rent charge would yield a capital of £9,000,000; the lands and perpetuity rents, £6,250,000; money £750,000; making a total capital of sixteen millions. Of this, the bill disposed of about eight and a half millions, leaving about seven and a half in the hands of the government. Mr. Gladstone claimed that this should be used for the benefit of Ireland, but not for ecclesiastical purposes, and that it should be appropriated forthwith, so that it should not come up again as a matter of contention and embarrassment. He therefore proposed to use it as follows:

1. For the support of infirmaries, hospitals, and lunatic asylums, in exoneration of the grand jury cess, or in lieu thereof.
2. The support of Reformatory and Industrial schools.

3. The salaries of trained or skilled nurses for poor persons, or for women in labor.

4. The suitable education and maintenance of the blind, and of the deaf and dumb poor, in separate asylums.

5. The suitable care, training, and maintenance in separate asylums, of poor persons of weak intellect, not requiring to be kept under restraint.

Mr. Gladstone estimated that the surplus capital would yield £311,000 per annum, and he proposed that of this, £256,000 should be devoted to the first of these objects and the remainder be distributed among the others. In closing his speech, Mr. Gladstone said :

“ I do not know in what country so great a change, so great a transition, has been proposed, and has been embodied in a legislative provision, by which the ministers of a religious communion, that have enjoyed during so many ages the favored position of an Established Church, will no longer remain in that position. I can well understand that to many among them such a change appears to be nothing less than ruin and destruction. From the high on which they now stand to the apparent abyss into which they think they will have to descend, there is something that recalls the words used in *King Lear*, when Edgar endeavors to persuade Gloucester that he has fallen from the cliffs of Dover,

‘ Ten masts on each make not the altitude
Which thou hast perpendicularly fell.
Thy life's a miracle!’

And yet, but a little after, the old man rallies from his delusion and finds that he has not fallen at all. And so I venture to trust, when, stripped of the fictitious and adventitious aid upon which we have too long taught the Irish Establishment to lean, it shall come to place its trust in its own resources, in its own secret wisdom, in all that can draw forth the energies of its ministers and its members, and the high hopes and promises of the gospel that it teaches, it will find that it has entered upon a new era of its existence, an era fraught with hope and promise. At any rate, I think the day has certainly come when an end has finally to be put to the union, not between the Church as a

religious association, but between the Establishment and the State, which was commenced under circumstances little auspicious, and which has continued to bear fruits of unhappiness to Ireland, and of discredit and scandal to England."

The speech gave general satisfaction to the liberal party, and was listened to with respectful attention by the conservatives. Sir Stafford Northcote, a leading member of the last conservative Cabinet, spoke of it as "one of the greatest efforts of one of the greatest orators, not only of the present day, but of the present century." And the *John Bull*, a conservative newspaper, bore willing testimony . . . to the eloquence and lucidity of Mr. Gladstone's great speech."

But it stirred the State Church party to new life, and led to vigorous and determined efforts to counteract its influence. Meetings were held in various places to protest against the bill. At a conference of the clergy and laity of the diocese of Down and Connor, held at Belfast, Ireland, at which nearly two thousand persons attended, every congregation in the diocese being represented, the bishop, who was in the chair, recommended that they should regard the verdict of the country as pronounced, prepare for the future, and confer with Mr. Gladstone to procure a modification of the bill. But the clergy rose up, shouting, No! No! and a resolution was passed, condemning the bill *in toto*, and a petition was prepared protesting against its passage.

Mr. Gladstone moved the second reading of his bill on March 18th, and Mr. Disraeli moved, as an amendment, "that it be read a second time that day six months." This is the usual mode of attempting to defeat a bill, as at the time named the Parliament would not be in session. As no bill holds beyond the session in which it is introduced, if such a motion is carried, the measure fails. Mr. Disraeli objected to both disestablishment and disendowment; to the former, because he thought the connection between Church and State an arrangement of the highest value, and to the latter, because it was either spoliation, or confiscation. He objected to the provisions with reference to the *Regium Donum* and Maynooth College, because the funds appropriated belonged to the Episcopal Church, and he expressed his belief that, if the measure passed, it would

produce such deep discontent, that either there must be restitution or the same principle must be applied to the English Church. He concluded by saying, "My view of the measure of the right honorable gentleman is, that it is a most dangerous measure, and I leave its consideration with confidence to the prudence and patriotism of Parliament."

The bill was supported by Mr. Shaw, an Irish Episcopalian, Mr. C. Fortescue, the Secretary of State for Ireland, the Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. E. Miall, one of the founders of the "Society for the liberation of religion from State Control," Mr. John Bright, Sir J. D. Coleridge, Solicitor General, Mr. Lowe, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. H. Richard, a Welsh Non-conformist, and many others. It was opposed by Sir G. Jenkinson, Dr. Ball, late Attorney General for Ireland, Sir F. Heygate, Sir Roundell Palmer, a leading lawyer of the liberal party, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, late Home Secretary, and others. The debate occupied four nights, and on the division, the votes were, Ayes, 368; Noes, 250; majority, 118. Six liberal members voted against the measure, and four conservatives in its favor. The intense interest excited is evident from the very large attendance. The total number of members is 658. Including the tellers, there were 622 took part in the election. The Speaker, as the presiding officer, did not vote, there were fourteen vacant seats, and one double return which had not been adjudicated. This leaves only twenty absent members, and of these, fourteen paired. Of the remaining six, two could not vote because the validity of their election was disputed, two were sick. Sir Robert Peel did not vote, it was said, because he had not received a place in the government, leaving only one, a conservative, unaccounted for.

On April 12th, Mr. Disraeli laid on the table of the House the amendment he proposed to introduce: 1. Striking out the clause decreeing disestablishment. 2. Bishops and deans to retain their present titles and precedence during life. 3. Delaying action till Jan. 1st, 1872. 4. A more specific statement of the new constitution of the Church. 5. The appointment of the late Irish Lord Chancellors, Brady and Brewster, and Judge Keatinge, as unpaid Commissioners, in addition to the

three paid Commissioners to be nominated by Mr. Gladstone. 6. No deduction to be made from the amount of a rector's compensation on account of the amount he had been accustomed to pay a curate, but these curates to have the value of their life interests paid to them in addition. 7. Giving to each congregation fourteen times the amount of their average annual outlay for repairs, heating and lighting, and the salaries of clerks and sextons. 8. The payment, to the corporate body which is to be formed, of a sum equal to four times the aggregate amount of the net annual incomes of all the incumbents of benefices, and £200,000, in addition, for the expenses of the representative body which was to organize the corporation. 9. Parsonages and glebes to be given up to the Church without any deduction or payment, and also all lands granted since the second year of Queen Elizabeth. 10. All private endowments which can be traced out by historical evidence, to be given up to the Church, although a legal claim cannot be established. 11. Striking out the compensation for Maynooth College and the *Regium Donum*. 12. The representative body to have power to appoint the bishops, or to call upon the Sovereign to appoint them. 13. Fourteen times the amount of the present yearly income of the Church to be paid to the representative body in lieu of compensation to the holders of Church dignities and benefices.

From this sketch, it will be seen that Mr. Disraeli surrendered nothing except the exclusion of the bishops from the House of Lords, and the nominal severance of the Church from the State; indeed, could he have carried his amendments, he would have established the Irish Church on a firmer footing, so far as funds were concerned, for it would have taken more than all the Church revenues to have secured what he asked for. Of course, he had no idea of carrying all these amendments; in asking for much, he hoped to secure something.

The House went into committee in April, a futile attempt at delay being again made by Mr. Whalley moving that the bill be committed that day six months. Amendment No. 2 was added to clause 13, and carried. Mr. Gladstone withdrew the original proposal to keep up twelve principal churches at the national expense, and also the clause obliging the Episcopal

Church to keep in repair the churches which were accepted by it. The Commissioners to whom the winding up of the affairs of the Establishment was to be committed were appointed ; viz. : Viscount Monck, Mr. Justice Lawson and Mr. G. A. Hamilton. The bill passed through Committee on May 8th. For three weeks it was exposed to the keenest criticism of the opposition, and it came out unscathed. Mr. Gladstone had shown himself willing to make such alterations in the details as seemed just, but no important alterations were made in any of its provisions. It was read a third time and passed on the 30th, after another debate in which Messrs. Disraeli and Gladstone were the principal speakers. The numbers on this division, were, Ayes, 361 ; Noes, 247 ; majority, 114.

The bill was carried up to the House of Lords, and read a first time without debate, on May 1st, and as it was known that a majority of the Peers belonged to the Conservative party, there was intense interest to know how they would deal with it. The debate on the second reading commenced June 14, and continued four nights. The report of the first night of the debate occupied nearly eighteen columns of the *Times* newspaper, and that of the second about the same. Earl Granville moved the second reading in an excellent and conciliatory speech, and Earl Harrowly met this with the amendment that it be read that day three months. Among those who advocated the second reading were Earl Clarendon, Lord Romilly, the bishop of St. David's, Lord Penzance, Viscount Monck, the Lord Chancellor, and the Duke of Argyle. On the other side were the Duke of Rutland, Lord Chelmsford, the Earl of Derby, the Archbishop of Dublin, and the Bishops of Derry, Peterborough, Litchfield and Ripon. Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Earl Carnarvon and the Marquis of Salisbury, favored the second reading with the hope that amendments might be introduced in Committee. When the division was called for at ten minutes to three on the morning of the 19th, the numbers were, for the second reading, 179 against 146 ; majority 33. The Bishop of St. David's was the only bishop who voted in its favor, but the Archbishops of Canterbury and York abstained from voting, and nine bishops were absent.

The bill went into committee on June 29th, and it was immediately evident that it was to be materially altered. Notices of about seventy amendments were given, and a number of the peers announced their intention to vote for giving glebes to the Roman Catholics and Presbyterians, in order that they might thus retain a larger share of the surplus for the Episcopalians. Among those who favored this course were the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of Oxford and Gloucester. For a number of years there has been an influential party in England in favor of paying the ministers of all denominations, who would accept it, from the funds of the State, but as the feeling of the large majority is against this course, they also fell in with this proposition, as being a step in the direction in which they wish to go.

Now for the alterations actually made. The date for disestablishment was postponed to July 1st, 1872. The existing bishops of Ireland were to be allowed to retain their seats in the House of Lords. An extra amount of £200,000 was appropriated to the clergy, on account of certain charges which are now paid by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The salaries of clergymen who employ permanent curates to be reckoned without the deduction of the salaries of those curates. (And as the curate also gets compensation, the compensation would be paid twice over. For instance, if the rector gets £500 a year and pays out of this £100 to a curate to do the work, instead of the rector getting compensation for his balance of £400, this amendment gave him compensation for £500, and the curate receiving an equivalent for his £100 a year, a compensation on £600 would be paid for a salary of £500.) Additional compensations were granted to curates, organists, and chairmen. Instead of calculating the actual value of the life interests of clergymen, it was voted to pay for them a uniform allowance of a capital, equal to fourteen years' salary. (As many of the larger incomes, and as those of the archbishops, bishops, and deans, are received by old men, this arrangement would give about £1,200,000 more than by Mr. Gladstone's plan to ascertain the actual value of the life interest.) The glebe houses to be handed over to the new church free of all charges. (This was carried by a vote of 213 to 69.)

Many voted for this with the idea that glebe houses would also be given to the Roman Catholics and Presbyterians, but when this proposition was voted on, it was lost by a majority of 33, causing considerable dissatisfaction.) The royal grant of Ulster lands, worth a million pounds, was voted to the Church. The disposal of the surplus was deferred, (evidently with a view to the making of future claims upon that surplus,) and the provision that no part of the surplus shall be applied to ecclesiastical purposes was struck out. The government conceded that the private endowments to be given to the Church, should be reckoned as half a million pounds, instead of putting the date from whence they are reckoned one century earlier.

After rescinding the vote allowing the present Irish bishops to sit in the House of Lords during their lives, the bill with these amendments was read a third time on July 12th, and was returned the same evening to the House of Commons, for their consideration. When the matter was brought up on the 15th, Mr. Gladstone expressed the determination of the government to disagree with the eleven principal amendments, but expressed their willingness to modify the bill on three points: 1. He would grant from one to two hundred thousand pounds additional for the compensation of curates. 2. He would add seven per cent. to the amount of the compensation in cases where it was thrown into an endowment fund. 3. He would give half a million for the private endowments of the Church, instead of the two or three hundred thousand pounds which would be given by the original form of the bill.*

With these alterations, the bill was returned to the House of Peers, and was considered by them on the 20th. They showed no disposition to recede. The Earl of Shaftesbury, who had not previously taken any part in the debates, and who is a staunch Episcopalian, warned the House of the danger they were incurring, told them that by their vote, looking to concurrent endowment, they had seriously injured themselves and the church, and assured them that by rejecting this bill, they could

*This was originally stated at £500,000; but we suppose was afterwards found to be less than that.

not save the Church of Ireland. He added, "I fear, my Lords, that we shall in future have a cry, not against concurrent endowment, but one that will arise universally in Ireland and in England for concurrent disendowment, throughout the whole of the United Kingdom." When the vote was taken on the words in the preamble of the bill prohibiting the use of the surplus for ecclesiastical purposes, the government was beaten by a majority of 78. Earl Granville then said he must have time to consult his colleagues, and the debate was adjourned to Thursday, July 22d.

There were now two days of suspense, and the country was much excited. People asked, "Of what use is the House of Peers except to hinder the progress of the country?" The *English Independent*, a paper usually very moderate in its tone, although decided in its principles, inquired, "How long will the country, for the sake of old traditions, endure this anomaly, in its nature absurd, in its action every year pernicious? The next great reform of its institutions that the people of this country will contemplate will be, beyond a doubt, the abolition of the senseless principle of hereditary succession among its legislators." It was further said that, before the year closed, another bill of a more thorough character must and would be carried in the House of Commons, and that, if the Peers did not engage to pass it, there would be sufficient new Peers created to carry it through; and further, that as the compromises which had been offered had been refused, the government were now free to withdraw them.

The evening of July 22d was to decide what, if anything, could be done to ward off the impending crisis. Some days before this, the writer had obtained an order from the Earl of Shaftesbury for admission to the gallery of the House of Lords on that evening, and hence had an opportunity of being present at the final debate. It appeared that some of the Peers had become alarmed at their own success, and thought it best to take steps to undo what they had done. Hence, Lord Cairns took the responsibility of consulting with the government on behalf of the opposition, and before this Thursday evening, made an arrangement with them by which the dead lock could be removed,

the bill be passed, and the question and the country be set at rest. When the question was introduced to the House, Lord Cairns stated what terms he had made with the government on behalf of the Peers on his side of the House, and said that under the circumstances, he thought this was the best arrangement that could be made, and he therefore advised them to accept these terms. This arrangement decided that the date of disestablishment should be the same as that originally fixed by the government, viz., January 1st, 1871. That where curates (assistant ministers) have been employed less than five years, the sum paid them for commutation of income is to come out of the general fund, instead of from the commutation of the incumbent by whom they have been employed. Where three-fourths of the clergy of any diocese, (instead of four-fifths, as before,) desire compulsory commutation, it shall be so decided for that diocese; and twelve per cent., instead of seven per cent., shall be added to it from the general fund. That any residence and land in the actual occupation of an incumbent, shall be exempted from this rule of compulsory commutation. That the stipulations in the preamble of the bill, as to the employment of the surplus of the Church fund, shall be omitted, and, instead thereof, a provision be made in the body of the bill, that the surplus shall be expended for the relief of unavoidable calamities in such ways as Parliament may hereafter direct. On this question, we heard Earl Russell, the Duke of Cleveland, Earl of Malmsbury, Earl Grey, Lord Halifax, Earl Harrowby, Lord Athlumney, Duke of Marlborough, Earl Stanhope, Lord Lyveden, Lord Cairns, Earl of Fingall, Earl Granville, Earl Bandon and the Bishop of Tuam. All but four or five of these were Conservatives, but they all assented to the arrangement as the best under the circumstances, except the Earl Bandon and the Bishop of Tuam, who are brothers. They expressed their most violent opposition, entered their solemn protests against it, and predicted all sorts of terrible things as likely to arise from it. The bill, however, with these alterations, was passed without a division.

The bill went to the House of Commons on the 23d, when again it was the good fortune of the writer to be present, having some days before obtained an order from Charles Reed, Esq., M.

P. for that evening. Mr. Gladstone opened the business by moving that the House accept the amendments of the Lords, i. e., those agreed upon between the government and Lord Cairns. Mr. Gladstone is an excellent speaker, and he gave a very clear and distinct account of the progress of the measure, and of the reasons which had induced the government to agree to the alterations which had been made in the Lords, and to accept the bill in its present state. He spoke of the clear and distinct issue presented at the last election, admitted that the government had now made concessions to the opposition, but thought there were important and sufficient reasons for their doing so. He concluded with the hope that the measure would work well, and that those who predicted benefit from it would seek to fulfil their own predictions, and that those who feared ill would seek to prevent the realization of their fears. He was followed by Mr. Vance, who deprecated the concessions made by the Lords; by Sir R. Palmer, who had opposed the government, but now thought it necessary to yield to the force of public opinion; by Sir F. Heygate, who, although deeply dissatisfied with the arrangement, thought that nothing better could now be done; by Mr. Whalley, who expressed the hope that the Roman Catholics would observe the obligations they had contracted more faithfully than heretofore, though of this he entertained considerable doubt. Sir J. Esmonde begged to offer to Mr. Gladstone, a tribute of gratitude, on the part of his country (Ireland). Mr. Disraeli expressed the opinion that the compromise was fair and just under the circumstances. Mr. Miall, speaking for the Non-conformists, congratulated Mr. Gladstone on conducting the matter to a successful issue, and trusted that the end would be the initiation in Ireland of a new era of peace, harmony and prosperity. Other speakers also addressed the House, and the bill was passed as amended. On July 26th, it received the assent of the Sovereign by Royal Commission, and thus became a law.

Our readers will expect our opinion as to the character of this measure, and as to its probable results. Having been one of the early members of the "Anti-state Church Association for the liberation of religion from all State control," we are of course glad that so much progress has been made, and it is indeed great

progress. It will give to the Episcopal Church about £800,000 more than was given by the original bill, but no part of the surplus can be used for ecclesiastical purposes. No one supposed, two years ago, that such a measure could be carried in 1869. Of course, care and vigilance will be necessary that the Roman Catholics do not, in some way or other, secure pecuniary advantages to which they have no right; but this evil avoided, good must arise from the changes which this law will produce.

We confess to deep regret that, instead of paying the present bishops and clergy during their lives, and leaving their successors to be provided for by the people to whom they minister, as was originally proposed, there will now be a large corporate fund provided, out of which at least a part of their salaries will be paid in perpetuity. We believe that the government thought that the arrangement was the best that they could make under the circumstances, and perhaps there was danger in delay; but we do not think that it will prove to be the best, either for the people of Ireland, or for the Church itself. The people will still have among them a Church in which they do not believe, with a large endowment, and they will hold to the opinion that it has more property than rightly belongs to it. And the Church will, by this endowment, have a barrier thrown in its way, which will prevent its success among the people whom it seeks to convert, and which will also prevent the full development of the pecuniary ability of the people connected with it. Our opinion, founded on experience, is, that endowments, even on a small scale, are oftener a clog and a hindrance, than a benefit to those who possess them; and we believe that a large endowment, in the hands of a powerful corporation, will hinder, rather than help, the progress of the gospel.

But the general effect of the measure must be good. The Episcopal Church is already preparing for action. The Bishops of Down, Meath, and Tuam, have all spoken encouragingly of the future, urging their people to look their true position in the face, and to meet it with earnestness, decision, and liberality. The Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin have each issued an address, stating that they have summoned a provincial synod to reform the representation of the clergy, preparatory to their summon-

ing the laity. These provincial assemblies met in joint assembly in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, on September 14th. There were present, besides the bishops, thirty-two deans, thirty-two archdeacons, seventy-four representatives of the one thousand five hundred and ten beneficed clergy, and twenty representatives of the twenty-nine Cathedral Chapters, making one hundred and fifty-seven persons in all. Our present information, however, extends only to the first day of their meeting. According to present arrangements, a conference of lay delegates is to meet in Dublin on October 12th, to unite with the clerical synod, in laying a basis for future operations.

But the influence of this law will extend beyond Ireland. Indeed, it has already extended beyond it. Mr. Watkin Williams has given notice that, in the next session of Parliament, he will move two resolutions: 1. That the religious equality which has been granted to Ireland be also extended to Wales. 2. That the surplus obtained from disendowment in that principality, be applied to "the advancement of a national and purely undenominational system of education."

Mr. Thomas Chambers has given notice of a motion to make certain changes in the English Church, which shall "bring it more into harmony with the feelings of the laity, and make it a more effective instrument for the evangelization and improvement of the whole community."

Meantime, the Duke of St. Albans, who holds the right of presentation to the living of Redbourne, which is now vacant, has thrown the responsibility of electing a minister upon the people of that parish. The *Times* contends that the Duke is right, and that the people ought to elect their minister. At the same time, prominent Episcopalian ministers are taking the position that the clergy ought to elect the bishops as they did in olden times, and that there has been no canonical election of bishops in England since the time of William the Conqueror, in the eleventh century. "The world moves," and we may look for further ecclesiastical changes in Great Britain of a very important character. And we may expect them before many years have passed. Church Rates were abolished in 1868. The Irish Episcopal Church is practically disestablished in 1869.

And the opponents of these measures were right in saying that the disestablishment of the English Episcopal Church will follow. But whatever there is that is good, and wise, and Christian, in the Episcopal Church, will survive; and we have no doubt that according to the extent of its disenthralment, will be the measure of its future usefulness and success.*

*In the preparation of this article, we have received much assistance from a file of the *English Independent*, a Religious Weekly Newspaper, published in London.

ART. IV.—LESSONS FROM THE TEMPTATIONS OF CHRIST.

The Temptations introduce us to a time of surpassing interest in the life of our Lord. The scene is briefly sketched,—the solitary wilderness facing the cloudless sky—our Lord alone, struggling with the tempter in the sharpest conflict, not for himself simply, but that we, by his victory, might overcome. The grandeur of this scene has not failed to impress itself upon the Christian soul. It has been made a theme for the painter, and the poet. The canvas has taught its lesson with the eloquence of color, tint, and blending; and earth's grandest singer, in one of his sublimest songs, has sung of

“Recovered Paradise, to all mankind,
By one man's firm obedience, fully tried
Thro' all temptations, and the tempter foiled
In all his wiles, defeated and repulsed,
And Eden raised in the waste wilderness.”

If, as Christians, we delighted, as we ought, to dwell upon these temptations of our Lord, we should find them never failing sources of comfort and hope. We go with the Saviour to

pray in solitude ; we are with him in the synagogue, in the temple, and at the wayside well ; we sympathize with him in sad Gethsemane, and go again, and often, to look upon him on Calvary ; but far too seldom, we think upon him in the wilderness, as our brother man, tempted like as we are ; far too seldom, we gather up the varied and fruitful lessons of these temptations, and link them with the lessons of the Garden and the Cross. But if we study this scene aright, there can be found scarcely another in the life of Christ, around which clusters so much of interest for Christian hearts, so many hopes and comforts for our earthly warfare. Here Christ fought the very battle through which every soul that follows him, must enter into rest. Here he won the victory, the first and greatest of that long series which ended on the resurrection morn, when the stone rolled back from the door of the sepulcher, and our Lord went up triumphant over his own last enemy and ours. The birthright of our race, which was lost in Eden by our father's fall, was recovered for us in the wilderness, when Christ, meeting and overcoming him who had wrought our ruin,

“ Earned thus salvation for the sons of men.”

There have been great hours in human warfare when the destiny of nations trembled in the balance, but there was never an hour in human history so great as this ; there have been decisive battles which have changed the course of the world's affairs. such were Marathon, and Pharsalia, and Waterloo, and Gettysburg. But the mightiest battle of time, fought with weapons of a different, heavenly temper, was that which was fought single handed by our Saviour, “ at the base of Nebo's barren cliffs,” and which, in its results, “ opened Paradise to guilty men.” As it was “ by one man's disobedience, the many were made sinners,” and death reigned over all, so by the perfect “ obedience of one shall many be made righteous.” Death shall lose its sting and the grave be robbed of victory.

Christ, in his temptations, left us a perfect example and gave us a blessed assurance. He “ suffered, being tempted,” he was

assailed by the same sharp conflict, by the same subtle devices, the same persistent endeavors, as we ;

“The tempter, wielding archangelic powers,
The tempted, in weak human flesh enshrined,
Not one day only, nor yet seven, nor seven
Twice told, or thrice, but forty days and nights,
That conflict inexpressible was waged.
No avenue of reason unassailed,
No shaft from that wide quiver’s mouth unshot.”

Yet our Lord resisted the temptation, was free from sin. His strength, in his human weakness, prevailed over Satan’s utmost wiles. Through the help of the promises, and the weapons of defense furnished him by the word of God, he was able to withstand all attacks, and break all snares. His strength, in all its fullness, is pledged for us. The promises are all “yea and amen” in him, and the word of God has received choicer fullness from his lips and life. Leaning, then, upon him as a helper, drawing our comfort and courage whence he has taught us, keeping ourselves vigilant, resolute and active, “looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith,” we, also, may “stand in every evil day” in the full confidence of triumph.

The Saviour brought himself into closer sympathy with us, by taking upon him the fellowship of suffering the same temptations. He could not have been so much our brother, could not have been touched so keenly with the feeling of our infirmities, nor have been so ready with succor in every time of our sharpest trial, if he had not met our adversary alone, and, by the same hard besetment, through the same disguised approaches, suffered like as we. It is evermore the joy of the Christian, that into all our experiences of conflict, the Saviour can enter ; that wheresoever in the pilgrimage our feet may wander, into whatsoever straits our enemy may drive us, we are cheered by the sympathizing voice of him we love, and the place is hallowed by his footsteps who “took upon himself the seed of Abraham, that he might be with us a merciful and faithful High Priest.”

There are many experiences of life in which we need Christ’s

help, when we feel that without his sweet sympathy our burdens would bear us down ; but there is no hour in which we need his help so much as when, like him, we fight against the strong temptations of appetite, or of love of fame and power ; as when, like him, we struggle against " racking doubts and fears, and all the powers of darkness. That he might know and meet our need, and give us fullest ground of trust, he took upon himself the fellowship of our own sharp trial."

The time of our Lord's temptation has also a special lesson for us. He had been just baptized of John in Jordan, and from the opening heaven had received that other baptism, when the Spirit of God descended as a dove, and abode upon him. Upon this fullness of joy, followed hard his desperate encounter with the deep-laid schemes of Satan. So is it often with the Christian. The valley of Humiliation lies only just beyond the Palace Beautiful. From the very sunshine of God's presence, the soul is often led into deepest shadows, and the tempter takes advantage of this reaction, to make his fiercest assaults. We need, therefore, be specially on our guard, as we come down from any hight of spiritual quickening, lest we " catch slips by the way." Into every shadow and darkening, we should go with loins girt about, full armed, with " the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

There was also a peculiar fitness in the time of our Lord's temptations. It was at the very beginning of his ministry. By the voice breaking forth from " the excellent glory," he had been approved as the one Messiah, and sealed to the work of the world's salvation. And now he was led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to do battle with the first enemy of the race which he came to save. Such a contest was fitting and necessary. " The Son of God was manifest to destroy the works of the devil." He came in fulfillment of far-off prophecy, to bruise the head of the serpent, to redeem us from the thralldom of sin, and make us servants of righteousness. Christ as our champion, then, must meet our enemy and break his power, thus " proclaiming liberty to the captive, and the opening of the prison doors to them that were bound." As Satan's first work in the world was to compass the fall of man, through the power of temptation, so, appropri-

ately, Christ's first work was to set at defiance the tempter's subtle skill, and show an example of successful resistance; proving to all who follow him, that the strength of him in whom we trust is ever sufficient for us. Our Lord came to bring immortality and life to light, and this he could accomplish only by destroying him who had the power of death, that is, the devil; beginning his triumph in the wilderness, and ending it at the new sepulcher in the garden.

The manner in which temptation approached our Lord, also forms a subject of interesting and profitable inquiry. It is the common belief, we think, that the tempter came in visible shape, speaking with an audible voice, and being recognized at once as Satan. But there are some considerations which tend to modify such an opinion, and lead us to believe that temptation came to Christ, as to ourselves, insidiously, invisible, unrecognized, so carefully concealing its origin, that it seemed to proceed from good, rather than from evil; that the tempter insinuated himself into the mind of our Lord, as into ours, with no outward demonstration, and no visible presence, but by some subtle power, beyond our ken, controlling the current of thought, suggesting a devious course of action, and presenting plausible reasons for entering upon it. The narrative, itself, seems to imply that the temptation was at first unrecognized. He is not addressed as Satan, until, in the third temptation, he throws off the mask, and makes a proposal so unequivocally wicked, that its author is at once, and clearly, discovered. We know the Saviour's summary treatment of this open proposition of sin. Neither it, nor its author, found a moment's harboring in his presence. And it is more than reasonable to suppose, that, knowing as he must somewhat of Satan's character, our Lord would not have held the least parley with him, if he had appeared openly and undisguised. All his endeavors would have been crushed at a single blow. The Saviour's "get thee hence" would have smitten him into most headlong flight. Good men, even now, would scarcely listen to Satan if he were beheld and known. They would scarcely give place to an evil thought, if they could see that it came straight from the bottomless pit, and was a direct suggestion of the devil. Wise and honest legislators are put on their guard at

once, against even a fair seeming measure, if it is proposed by wicked and disloyal men. Its very origin involves it in suspicion. We cannot, then, suppose that Christ, wise and holy as he was, even in his human nature would have endured the presence, or heard the sophistries of one whom he knew to be the "enemy of all righteousness."

But the moral force of Christ's temptations would not have been so great as a lesson to us, if the tempter had been visible and recognized. To our first parents, he came in disguise, entirely hiding his proper semblance, and putting forth a claim to wisdom and benevolence. Ever to watchful and prudent souls, evil must put on the garb of good, to form any strong enticement. Satan, coming to such, must clothe himself as an angel of light, if he would have any chance of success. If our Lord, then, only resisted a visible tempter, undisguised and fully known, could his example be a sufficient guide and encouragement till the day of final victory, to all his followers?

The nature of the second and third temptations seems to favor the belief that they came through suggestions to the mind, and not by open, verbal proposition. We are told that our Lord was "led up into the wilderness," and we cannot think that he allowed himself to be actually transported to the temple, or lifted to the mountain top, by Satanic power. If he had done so, his body, for the time, must have been under full control of the tempter; and that, we think, can scarcely be believed respecting Christ. It was in mind, doubtless, that he was set upon a pinnacle of the temple; there was suggested the thought of casting himself down from thence, in sight of assembled multitudes. And it was in vision, we may believe, the kingdoms of the world, and all their glory, passed before him, for no natural eminence of the wilderness could display all those things to the natural eye. To suppose the whole transaction carried on in the mind, and the temptation, a suggesting of the acts mentioned as expedient, and prudent, and, therefore, every way advisable, is to our own mind far the simplest and most probable interpretation. But above all else, in support of this view, is the Apostle's declaration; that Christ was "in all points tempted like as we are," tried, that is, in all respects as men are tempted now. Satan

never comes visibly, or undisguised, to us. There are legends of such appearings ; of actual physical encounters with demons, but they are far off, and shadowy, and scarcely credible now. We know, also, that it has been said that Satan does come visibly to us, in the person of wicked men who beguile and lead astray. But it is not Satan whom we see, it is not his voice we hear. It is the form and speech of men that are apparent, and if the temptation is from Satan, as we are ready to admit, it is certainly disguised. He uses all manner of devices, of which this is but one, to ensnare our souls. He taxes a subtle intellect for all possible wiles wherewith to overcome us, and we may be sure he did not fall short in deceit and subtlety when assailing the Son of God. Knowing as he did the mighty stake at issue, knowing as he must how strong in holiness stood the One assailed, he would call into action all his craftiest enginery to work his fall. Our Lord was tempted by the same enemy as we, beset through the same approaches, and with the same artful weapons, by one who evermore hides the deformity of sin beneath some luring disguise. We can touch upon a single question only, in closing the present article. Could our Lord have yielded to the temptations of the devil? We must approach this question with the deepest reverence, and yet we think it is allowable to consider it, and possible to have in answer to it, a wise and edifying belief.

The temptation, so far as outward influences were concerned, came to Christ as a man. In his human nature he was weary, and suffered hunger and pain, so in his human nature only was he tempted. The very fact of his temptation, to us implies so much. If he had been filled with the Spirit as God, if he had not been self-limited, by taking our likeness, we see not how temptation could ever have approached him. We read that "God is not tempted with evil." No one can suppose that when there was war in heaven, that he who fell, through "conspiring against the Highest, and drawing after him the third part of heaven's sons," dared for a moment, with the faintest breath of temptation, assail the blessed Messiah, the beloved of God. It was only when his divinity was veiled in mortal flesh, and he had stooped down from his throne to the low estate of his fallible brethren, that even Satanic audacity could dream of his defection.

As a lesson for us the temptations of Christ, require in him a natural ability to sin. We must make a distinction here, not very difficult, between natural and moral ability. We can justly say, that it would be impossible, for certain good men whom we know, to commit any infamous crime, yet it is, naturally, as easy for a good man to be a thief, or a murderer, as it is for the veriest villain. The impossibility in the case, is a moral one, and lies in the will, and conscience, and character of every upright and godly man. So, if it be "impossible for God to lie," it is not because there is some necessity outside of himself, which doth hedge him round, but because there is in himself such knowledge of good, such infinite benevolence, and such unalterable holiness of will. And that is what we mean when we say of Christ, "it is impossible for him to sin. He had all natural power and freedom like ourselves, and only lacked our wicked inclination. If it were not so, but rather some unseen impregnable defense which guarded and kept him, there could be for such defenseless souls as ours, no such lesson, and no such encouragement as we all draw from the glorious example, the glorious victory of our Lord. But if Christ resisted the temptation as a man, standing in the strength of a human will, and fighting with weapons which are furnished to us, as to him, then every tempted soul, in time of sharpest conflict, when hardest pressed, can rejoice and be strong in the thought, that One who calls himself our brother, came out unscathed from the same fiery trial. But we must remember that in Christ, temptation was not strengthened, reinforced, by indwelling sin and an evil heart. His was a holy nature, as Adam's was at first. It was a city fenced, and faithfully garrisoned, with all its towers and bastions, strong, and firm, and well defended; and hence, with all their skill, the wily besiegers found no successful approach. But our natures are corrupt, our natural defenses are weakened, and broken down by sin; we have traitors within the gates, ready to league themselves with enemies outside, and, therefore, temptation makes easy conquest. Were we like Christ, holy and full of faith, armed with the word of God, and strong in a righteous will like him, our "get thee hence" would, evermore, drive Satan discomfited from all his attacks upon us. We have thus looked at some of the lessons

from our Lord's temptations, considering the time, manner, and significance of them, as related to the work he came to do for tempted, needy souls. There is still another light in which to look upon them, viewing his temptations as types of those which assail men now. Of this we shall treat in a subsequent number.

ART V.—THE RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF FRANCE, FROM THE REVOLUTION OF 1789 TO THE PRESENT TIME.*

In no modern country has the history of Christianity been more varied than in France. It has been for ages the battleground of Catholicism and Protestantism, of unbelief and faith. With that history are associated the horrors of St. Bartholomew, and the dragonnades of Louis XIV., the revocation of the edict of Nantes and the consequent persecutions, the blasphemies of Voltaire and the Encyclopædists, and the anarchy of '89.

Hope has given way to despair as Henry IV. is followed by Louis XIII., as Napoleon I. is succeeded by Louis XVIII. The leaven of Protestantism has saved the nation more than once from the fate of Spain, and in these latter days promises a better future for the nation whose life seemed again and again ready to go out, under the fearful experiences that priest and king brought upon her.

The subtlest and the crudest forms of infidelity abounded there and found a ready soil, until, in religious thought, in the eighteenth century, whole nations became paralyzed and dead. A new life was infused when the bloody pageants of the Revolution had passed by, and Napoleon began to evoke order out of chaos.

The disposition of the hostile religious elements in France

* "Meditations on the actual state of Christianity and on the attacks which are now made upon it." By M. Guizot. 12 mo. pp. 390. Scribner & Co., New York.

seems to be quite like that shown in England and in our own country. The foes and the friends of Christianity are drawing the lines of their respective systems with greater distinctness, and defining their positions with greater precision.

Guizot remarks in his preface :

“Beliefs become firmer beliefs ; opinions hostile to them receive fuller developments. On the other side, vacillating minds are occupying themselves more and more with the struggle to which they are witnesses ; minds, earnest at once and sincere, feel the disturbing influence of the doctrines hostile to Christianity ; many, again, are uneasy at these doctrines, many demand a refuge from them, without finding it, or daring to seek it, in the essential facts and principles of the Christian faith. Between the adversaries of Christianity and its defenders the discussion grows each day in importance and gravity ; and with it also grows the perplexity in the minds of the spectators. . . . Humanity never so floated between heaven and the abyss.”

In 1797, it was proposed, amid the vagaries of the hour, to establish a new religion and a new form of worship. The authors of this innovation consulted Talleyrand. “I have but a single observation,” he replied, “to make : Jesus Christ, to found his religion, suffered himself to be crucified, and he rose again. You should try to do as much.”

Hardly four years afterward, the dream and the dreamer had disappeared and left no mark upon society to tell of their short life. Napoleon was jealous of any influence that tended to lessen the influence of Christianity and strove to replace it, in some manner, upon the pedestal from which it had been torn ; while the brilliant genius of Chateaubriand gave her new attractiveness in the minds of the people. The Concordat and the “Genie du Christianisme,” cleared away the foul miasmas which the hot-beds of the Revolution had created, and gave rise to a thorough Christian movement.

Liberty of conscience in worship and in philosophy, was proclaimed and maintained. While Chateaubriand recalled France to an admiration of the beauties of Christian literature, other writers were either protesting powerfully against the spirit of the Revolution, or striving to furnish a better religion, some substantial

standing place. It was to be expected after such a history as that from 1790 to 1800, that religious ideas would become warped, and the religious vision indistinct.

Some of the most powerful minds, far from comprehending the great heart of Christianity, thundered merely against the gross and vulgar forgetfulness of the great moral interests of humanity. But after all, progress was made. It was the awakening of Christianity, though accompanied by the promulgation of inconsistent principles, and the pressing of most contradictory issues.

In this new era succeeding the Revolution, infidelity and faith rose with new vigor, Protestantism and Catholicism, love of classical literature and a tendency to romanticism sprang up together and entered, with most ardent zeal, the lists against each other. Many who hoisted the banner of Christianity, did it in the name of politics chiefly. They attacked the French Revolution as a terrible monstrosity, without building up the bulwarks around a living faith. Their most powerful writers, in the dimness of the times, could discover no other remedy for such enormities as were produced by the Revolution, than absolutism. The pendulum vibrates to the opposite extreme. They joined in close intimacy Cæsar and God. "They thought too much of Cæsar while defending God." Give us, they cried, some infallible authority, that men may be submissive and anarchy be known no more. And they sought to find that infallible authority in men. The Abbe de la Mennais, a brilliant and powerful writer, declares, "the search for certitude is the search for a reason not liable to error at all, that is, for a reason that is infallible. Now this infallible reason must necessarily be either the reason of each individual or the reason of all men; in fact, of human reason. It is not the reason of each individual, for men contradict one another, and nothing frequently is more discordant and more contradictory than their judgments; therefore it is the reason of all."

Here spoke the remnant of that old spirit that animated the Revolution, which endeavored to strike out the word God from the memory of man. The infallible authority had been sought amid the things of earth and therefore the Revolution sprang into life. It makes little difference whether that absolute authority

be sought in the multitude or in one, the result is disastrous. We find this lack in French thinking, to this day; a vacillation between absolutism and the rule of the masses, without understanding that the authority and safety of any government are gained from the direction of Jehovah.

The Jesuits, in those years of fearful anarchy, were special objects of hatred and violence. But as soon as the storm was over, they went vigorously to work to re-establish their chapels, their preaching and teaching, without regard to the laws proscribing them. Their own laws, as they believed then and as they believe now, were higher and more binding than any human enactments. One law bound them, to the exclusion of everything else. One solemn oath, which all the blood, and threats, and suffering of a score of years could not cause the Jesuit to forget, still exerted its potent force. To support, at every and any price, the church of Rome, is the undeviating policy of that order of wily religious politicians under the garb of monkhood. The fanaticism and mysticism of Loyola still animate the joints, and penetrate the marrow of the system he founded.

The cause of Jesuitism is the cause of Absolutism without variation. Jesuitism sees no popular liberties without endeavoring to uproot them. Freedom cannot live in its stifling embrace. The Netherland struggle, the contests of Protestantism and Catholicism in France and England, the usurpations of Catholic authority over free institutions in the United States, proclaim the *animus* of that system whose net-work woven throughout all lands, puts its violent hand, and its subtle grasp upon every fresh, free thing of life and hope to throttle it. Over all, it would raise the banner of one dread Absolutism, and that Absolutism is the reign of the Church of Rome.

Napoleon awakened the hopes of the Jesuits by his tendencies toward Absolutism, at the same time that he aroused their suspicions by exalting some of the principles and ideas of the Revolution. Napoleon had no sympathy with the Jesuits in their exclusive devotion to the Romish See, for he would brook no assumption of a higher authority than his own; he dictated to both Church and State. The independency and devotion of the Jes-

uits were fatal to their claims. Napoleon ordered their establishments to be closed.

The days of Napoleon over, the Jesuits found the spring of their hopes in the Restoration. Power was on their side. The court gave them its favor. Instead of bending their energies and employing their power for the triumph of purely religious principles, they became involved, as usual, in political contests. The drift of their efforts excited alarm. France shuddered at the prospect of the triumph of Theocracy and Absolutism. Her statesmen were incensed against the Jesuits for attempting to serve the double cause "of the ancient regime of the Papacy, and of the ancient regime of the Monarchy." Ecclesiastical ambition made itself odious, as it forgot the fundamental character of French society. "French society," says M. Guizot, "is essentially and insuperably 'laic'; the separation of temporals from spirituals, and the empire of the laity in public affairs, are consummated and dominant facts, not to be attacked, or even menaced, without occasioning throughout the whole framework of society an irritation and a disquietude, perilous alike for Church and for State. Nothing in France at the present moment is more fatal to the influence of religion than the chance, or the appearance even, of ecclesiastical domination."

Accordingly the clergy by their retrograde policy toward Absolutism, brought about an explosion of popular sentiment in the revolution of 1830—1832. The acts of violence of that period were the legitimate outgrowths of the policy of the priesthood. Crosses were thrown down, the archiepiscopal palace was ruined and pillaged, priests were menaced, and many other threatening movements took place.

As a result of these revolutionary movements, the clergy ceased to count upon the favor of the government. Left to themselves, they felt the need of independent existence, yet, after all, as a whole, they "showed little taste for liberty; even while they demanded it, they were rather inclined to immobility than progress." By insensible degrees this reluctance toward progress wore off, and the spirit of liberty and growth gained ground. The Catholic world addressed itself to works of benevolence and

charity. Missionary work at home and abroad, was inaugurated. The association "for the propagation of the faith," which was begun in 1822, grew in its work so as to receive in 1864 the sum of one million dollars, for the support of missionaries in five different parts of the world. The following extract will exhibit something of the spirit and work of charity of the Catholic church from 1833 to 1853. "In May, 1833, eight young men, wishing to give one more proof of what Christianity can effect in behalf of the poor, began to ascend to those upper stories which were the hidden haunts of the misery of their quarter. Men saw youths in the flower of their age and fresh from school regularly visiting, without any feeling of repulsion, the most abject habitations, and conveying to their unknown and suffering tenants a passing vision of charity. Twenty years later, Ozanam said at Florence, when on his death-bed: 'Instead of eight only, at Paris alone we are two thousand strong, and we visit five thousand families, that is to say, twenty thousand individuals, or a quarter of the poor in that great city.' Nine years afterward, in 1862, when the government, listening to mistaken counsels, suppressed the general council of the Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul, and, by doing so, destroyed the central bond that kept the society together, the latter counted more than three thousand local conferences; it consisted of about thirty thousand members, who visited in their homes more than one hundred thousand indigent families, and had already introduced into the greater part of the principal cities a system which exercised a control over the interests of apprentices and of prisoners." Another society receives and succors in its establishments nearly twenty thousand aged men. Other societies have been plying their labors in various departments with increasing success. "During the last fifty years, ten thousand churches have been built, rebuilt, or suitably adapted for the performance of the services of the Church of Rome." All affording proofs of the quickening which has resulted from the separation of the cause of religion from politics.

It has always resulted that any form of religion, be it Catholic or Protestant, has lost power, because benumbed and dead in proportion as it claimed control of the affairs of State through

intrigue and political management. Such, we have seen again and again, has been the result in France. Such a fate awaits any party of religionists in any land who grasp eagerly after the reins of government. When the object is gained, ruin and death to every high and noble aspiration of the soul ensue. Religious zeal relapses into ecclesiastical ambition for political power. Should Romanism triumph, politically, in America, its triumph would be not only defeat to Protestant and civil freedom, but dire defeat to itself. The tendency of Romanism is inevitably toward Absolutism, and Absolutism is the breeder of political disturbance, of popular reaction; it is the subverter of public confidence, the disturber of the quiet of the nation over which it acquires control. By the history of France it is easy to foresee the result of the rule of Absolutism and political ecclesiasticism in America.

In respect to this period of ecclesiastical prosperity referred to, "never before," says Guizot, "did the church stand so aloof from politics; never was she more modest in her attitude; never less exacting, as far as the government or the public was concerned; never more absorbed with her mission of piety and morality, whatever the government of France might be, and whoever her masters." The result was that the church never so flourished in its inner life, and was never so strong in its real work.

When, therefore, the popular movement of 1848 took place, we find a far different spirit manifested by the people from that shown in '89 or in 1830—2. "Religion and its ministers were not ill-treated, insulted or persecuted; their forms of worship were not interrupted; when they showed themselves out of doors, they were received with respect."

The liberal movement in the Romish church in France, has been, since 1832, steadily growing in power. It accepts, as the great mission of the nineteenth century the work of reconciling authority with liberty, so that they may live together; not as heretofore in violent conflict, each alternately flushed with victory, or vanquished, ruined. If it shall accomplish this, it will do a much needed service for a country that has not been accustomed to recognize authority and, at the same time, to accept freedom without intoxication and excess. "These," says Guizot, "are

the imperative necessities which our age is called upon to feel and to satisfy both in State and Church. The recognition, veneration, and guarantee of the different rights which co-exist naturally and necessarily in human societies—of the rights, both of individuals and of the State—of the rights of religious society and of civil society—of the rights of little local societies as well as of the grand general society—of the rights of conscience as well as of tradition—of the rights of the future as well as those of the past—these are the dominant principles of which the nineteenth century has to ensure the triumph.”

Hopeful and liberal words like these are precious seed cast into the French mind. The spirit they breath finds response in that mind, and appeals to the love of freedom which has never wholly been lost. No despotic rule of Church or State can obtain where such principles as the Bishop of Orleans advocates, are enthusiastically received. He expresses himself as follows : “Free institutions, freedom of conscience, political liberty, civil liberty, individual liberty, liberty of families, of education, and of opinions, equality before the laws, the equal division of imposts and of public charges, these are all points upon which we make no difficulty ; we accept them frankly ; we appeal to them on solemn occasions of public discussion, we accept, we invoke the principles and the liberties proclaimed in 1789 ; even those who combat those principles and those liberties admit that liberty of religion and free education have become acknowledged, self-evident truths.”

From such sentiments as these springs the reaction against the usurpations of Napoleon III. With such breathings after liberty no form of Absolutism can flourish whether in the palace or in the Church of Rome. This spirit of freedom, this enlargement of vision in the Catholic Church itself, is a most happy omen for France. The development of such deep and healthful principles in that Church will well nigh make impossible violent acts like those of 1832. Revolutions will and must come, but there will be no conflict of swords but of ideas ; they will be carried on with a self-possession hitherto unknown to France.

Guizot, Minister of Public Instruction, uses no words of timidity before the Encyclical of Pius IX., dated Dec. 8, 1864. He

declares: "I feel no hesitation in saying what I think of this document, at once the occasion and the pretext for such a stir. In my opinion the error was a grave one. Regarded as doctrine, the Encyclical was dignified and yet embarrassed, positive and yet evasive; it compounded in the same sweeping condemnation salutary truths and pernicious errors, the principles of liberty and the maxims of licentiousness; it made an effort to maintain, in point of right, the ancient traditions and pretensions of Rome, without avowing in point of fact that the ideas and potent influences of modern civilization were the objects of its declared and unceasing hostility.

Pius IX. could not discern between liberty and excess, between a healthful development and an abnormal one. The day had long gone by when he could hope to put an end to the debate between Catholic Absolutism and Catholic Liberalism by peremptory decision. The time, let us hope, has passed forever, when a declaration of papal authority can smother freedom and check its growth even in its own Church.

The only hope of Catholicism in France is in penetrating the edifice which the Concordat of 1830 built up, with those liberal principles which can alone win the respect of the government and the confidence of the people. "Let sincere Catholics," remarks Guizot, "reflect well upon their course, for here is their main stay, here their best chance for the future." Only a frank acceptance of the present age and actual society, with its tendencies toward freedom, can constitute a safe attitude of the Catholic Church in France, but such an acceptance leads her more and more from bondage into the glorious liberty of the gospel.

The best minds in the Catholic Church have little sympathy with the attempts of Rome to divorce the Church from the spirit of the age, and to keep from it such progressive thought and action as shall put it in sympathy with the thinking, active mind of the nineteenth century. Many of the French bishops and clergy look with suspicion upon the approaching Ecumenical Council. They fear lest the interests of the Church shall be compromised by the attitude of that Council toward the questions of the rights of the state, of science, and of liberty.

The opposition to the assumptions of the Roman See which

has always, more or less, characterized the French Church, the sympathy of many in that Church with the spirit of freedom and progress, finds an expression in the language of her most eloquent preacher, Father Hyacinthe, in a recent letter to the General of his Order at Rome. What others in his Church feel, but do not express, he utters boldly, and his regal soul, in all that constitutes the freedom and blessing of the race, finds for itself a place in the noble rank with Lacordaire, Montalembert, and Guizot. He protests in this language: "The saints were never silent. I am not one of them, but nevertheless I belong to their race *filii sanctorum sumus*, and I have always been ambitious to place my steps, my tears, and, if necessary, my blood, in the tracks which they have left. I raise, therefore, before the Holy Father and the Council, my protestation as Christian and preacher against these doctrines and practices, calling themselves Roman, but which are not Christian, and which in their encroachments, always most audacious and most baneful, tend to change the constitution of the Church, the basis as well as the form of her teaching, and even the spirit of her piety. I protest against the divorce, as impious as it is insane, which it is sought to accomplish between the Church, who is our mother according to eternity, and the society of the nineteenth century, of whom we are the sons according to the times—and toward whom we have also some duties and attachments."

Such an utterance, at this hour, is full of significance. Its spirit is shared in France to such an extent that the spiritual tyranny of the Ultramontanists and the followers of Loyola can never be re-established in the Catholic Church.

The system of Terrorism at the time of the Revolution, included under one common oppression both Catholics and Protestants. Without distinction the worship of each was abolished. The proud bishops of the Romish Church and the despised pastors of Protestantism walked side by side to the scaffold. But when that terrible hour had passed, the condition of the Protestants was, in some respects, better than that of the Catholics. The Protestant had fallen from no high pinnacle of power; accustomed for two centuries to persecution, the scenes of the Revolution were to him only the intensifying of cruelty and insult, while to

the Catholic they involved the loss of power, of prestige, besides the cruelties of persecution to which he was previously a stranger. The prayer of the Protestant, that he might live without molestation and pray to God openly, was granted when the waves of anarchy had subsided. His temples were restored; his pastors received salaries from the State; his life was no longer in jeopardy because of his faith.

After that severe struggle, in the sixteenth century, in which Protestantism well nigh won the victory; after the loss of the protection of the laws, their great chiefs, their temples of worship, their great preachers, Protestants still clung to the purity of their faith, the fundamental principles of Christianity. When, therefore, in the eighteenth century, society fiercely broke with the traditions of the prevailing Church and those of the State; when sturdy blows were leveled at the corruptions of both, and men began to throw off all political and religious restraints, Protestantism looked on calmly and approvingly, without yielding up its habits and faith.

In 1802, a severe struggle began in Geneva between Rationalism, as it began to creep into and paralyze the energies of the Protestant Church and evangelical religion. For the deism of Rosseau and the skepticism of Voltaire "had deeply undermined the faith of Christ in the very city of Calvin. It was not merely some of the Calvinistic doctrines of the sixteenth century that the pastors of Geneva doubted or denied, but it was also the fundamental articles of Christianity; they abandoned not only the dogmas of predestination and salvation by faith alone, but the dogmas of original sin, and of the divinity of Jesus Christ." A powerful reaction in favor of evangelical religion soon followed, however. A number of zealous Genevan pastors went over into France, and, aided by a society in England called the "Continental Society," established many religious papers, published books, preached fervently and successfully the fundamental, living doctrines of Christ. A large corps of agents went through the Provinces, carrying to willing multitudes the Scriptures and religious tracts. Though this new, vigorous movement was opposed by priests, and not seldom by the civil magistrates, it surmounted them successfully, finding their zealous efforts constantly aided

by the general growth, in the nation at large, of the principles of justice and liberty. The Restoration "recognized the chief Protestant societies and gave them the sanction of the law. Under the government of 1830, they used their rights with more confidence and fewer hindrances."

The deep, philosophical insight of our author into the nature of Christian truth is strongly exhibited in his remarks upon this awakening of Christianity in the Protestant Church: "In times of religious incredulity and of religious indifference, and even in the transitional times which immediately ensue, it is the error of many, and even of men who respect and support religion, to consider it in the light of a great political institution—a salutary system of moral police, however necessary to society, indebted for its merits and its prerogatives rather to its practical utility than to its intrinsic truth. Grave error, misconceiving both the nature and the origin of religion, and calculated to deprive it both of its empire and its dignity! Utility, men hold as of great account, but it is only truth that commands unconditional surrender. Utility enjoins prudence and forbearance, truth alone inspires feelings of confidingness and devotion. A religion having no other guarantee for its influence and its endurance than its social utility, would be very near its ruin. Men have need of, nay, they thirst for truth in their relations with God even more than with one another; the spontaneous prayer, adoration, obedience, suppose faith. It was in the very name of the verity of the Christian religion, of that verity manifested in its history by the word and even by the presence of God, that the awakening of Christians was accomplished among us. The laborers in this great work felt the faith of Christianity, and they diffused it; had they spoken only of the social utility of Christianity, they would never have made the conquest of a single human soul.

"Incredulity and indifferentism may diffuse themselves and pretend to dominate; they leave unsolved the problems that lie in the depths of man's soul; they do not rid him of his perplexities, of instinct or of reflection, as to the world's creation and man's creation, the origin of good and evil, providence and fate, human liberty and human responsibility, man's im-

mortality, and his future state. Instead of the denials and doubts that had been thrown over these unescapable questions, those who applied themselves fully to rouse awakened Christianity, recalled the human soul to the memory of positive solutions of these questions; . . . solutions often contested, never reputed; always recurring in the lapse of ages, and century after century! It was from the intrinsic and permanent value of the doctrines which they were preaching, and not from themselves, that the laborers in the work derived their force and their credit." These words should command the most careful consideration of the Christian pastor in the present peril that menaces the truth in our own country.

The liberal spirit of our author, though a Catholic, appears in these words, remarkable for their appreciation of both the spirit and work of Protestantism, as a Christian force. Speaking still of Protestant ministers, he says: "They had another principle of force as well; a force born and developed in the bosom of the Christian religion, and in that alone; they had the passionate desire to save human souls. Men are not, they never have been, struck as they ought to have been struck with the beauty of this passion, or with its novelty in the moral history of the world, or with the part it has played among Christian nations." Before the era of Christianity, in times of Asiatic and European antiquity, pagans and philosophers busied themselves about the destiny of men after the close of their earthly life, and with curiosity, too, did they sound the obscurity; but the ardent solicitude for the eternal welfare of the human souls, the never-wearying labor to prepare human souls for eternity—to set them, even during this existence, in intimate relations with God, and to prepare them to undergo God's judgments;—we have in all this a fact essentially Christian, one of the sublimest characteristics of Christianity, and one of the most striking marks of its divine origin, God constantly in relation with mankind and with every man, God present during the actual life of every man, and God the arbiter of his future destiny; the immortality of each human soul, and the connection between his actual life and his future destiny; the immense value of each human soul in the eyes of God, and the immense import to the soul of the future that awaits it; these are

the convictions and the affirmations all implied in the one passion alluded to, the passion for the salvation of men's souls, which was the whole life of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which passed by his example and by his precepts into the life of his primitive disciples, and which, amid the diversities of age, people, manners, opinions, has remained the characteristic feature and the inspiring breath of the genius of Christianity; breath which animated the men who, in our days, labored, and with success, to revive Christian faith among the Protestants of France!"

The reaction was thoroughly Christian in its character. Two men, well known in America through their writings and sermons, Alexander Vinet and Adolphe Monod, gave special character and power to this reaction and evangelical quickening of the Protestant Church of France. Vinet, born in Switzerland, continually living and writing there, was of French extraction. He sympathized as much with France as with Switzerland, and served the cause of religious liberty in both. He yielded up no fundamental truth of Christianity to its foes, nor made the least concession in the sphere of positive belief. He expressed his convictions with a clear and forceful eloquence: "Neither are the ideas which he teaches," he says in reference to Christ, "deduced logically from the primitive axioms of reason; that which he teaches, that which forms the substance of his doctrine, embraces subjects which confound the reason, and to which the reason has neither way nor access; he preaches a God on earth, a God man, a God poor, a God crucified; . . . he preaches a new birth, without which man can never be saved; he preaches the sovereignty of God's grace and the plenitude of the liberty of man. I do not in any way qualify his teachings; I give them to you as they are, and without disguise; I seek not to justify them. . . . But the dogma of the Cross persisted in recurring. . . . This dogma is good for all, everywhere, always; it never grows old. The religion of the Cross appears nowhere in arrear of civilization; on the contrary, far as civilization may progress, it ever finds Christianity in advance. Suppose not that a complaisant Christianity will ever cancel any article or expunge any idea to accommodate itself to the age; no, it derives its strength from its inflexibility, and needs not make any surrender to be in harmony with

what is beautiful, legitimate, true ; for it is in itself the type of them all. Still, it is not a religion which flatters man ; and the worldly, by keeping aloof, show plainly enough that Christianity is a strange doctrine. Those who dare not reject it, strive to render it palatable. They strip it of what offends them—of its myths, as they are pleased to style them ; they almost make out of Christ's doctrine a rationalism. But, singular to say, once a rationalism, it has no longer any force ; in this respect, resembling one of the most marvelous creatures in the animate world, to which it is death to lose its sting. The strange dogmas disappear, but with them all zeal, fervor, sanctity, charity, disappear also ; the salt of the earth has lost its savor, and we know not by what means to restore it. . . . No natural development of events, either among the Jews or among the Greeks, can account for the existence of Christianity. Whatever the progress made by the ancients, there never was a time when there existed not an infinity between their ideas, and the ideas of Christianity ; and infinity alone can fill up the gulf between. There is an end of Christianity, if men agree in thinking the contrary—if they succeed in causing the supernatural to assume a place in one of the compartments of the Philosophy of History. As far as we are concerned, we would prefer for the Christian religion the most outrageous denial, to an admiration circumscribed within such limits. Christ's faith is nothing, if not, like Melchisedek, without earthly parent here below, and without genealogy."

But this defender of the faith, this powerful indicator of the key-stone of Christianity, lived long enough to see one hundred and sixty evangelical pastors of the Canton of Vaud, forced from their charges in order to preserve their faith. In the stormiest hour, though in sickness and near his death, he yielded to no despair but calmly prophesied : " Our progress will be slow, and amid storms ; but the circle of universal truth will be completed." Vinet opposed strenuously the union of Church and State, as destructive of truth and liberty in spiritual and temporal affairs. The zeal and devotion of Adolphe Monod finds expression in his oft-repeated prayer : " Let my life only terminate with my ministry, and my ministry only with my life." Earnestness of conviction, impassioned earnestness of lan-

guage, an expansive zeal, made him a powerful preacher and gave him great influence. "Thus did he gain over to his Divine Master the hearts disposed to receive him, strongly shake the purpose of those not confirmed in their rebellion, and leave astonished and intimidated those whom he did not bring over."

The mantles of Vinet, Monod, and the renowned Lutheran preacher, Verny, have fallen upon valiant men, who labor for the establishment of a like faith, the living power of a present Redeemer.

But awakening Christianity found itself confronted by resolute foes. Philosophy more boldly denied its claims to authority; science sneered at its account of the origin of man and the world; criticism denied its histories. Men were, from many quarters, encouraged to throw off the restraints and reject the demands of a positive religion, and to substitute, as an equivalent mere morality. Learned societies voted that morality is entirely independent of religion.

A false idea of liberty insisted that Church government was an evil, that the presence of an organized Church imperiled the liberties of the people. Among Protestants this liberalism demanded that a common bond of faith should count for nothing, and claimed that a man ought not to be disciplined nor rejected by the Church, even if he were a minister, if he held the most contradictory opinions and opposed the sentiments of the church to which he belonged. So, the question within the pale of Protestantism has been and is now agitated in respect to the important matters of faith and discipline. "Are a common faith and a uniform internal discipline essential to the Church?" is the great question involving the integrity of that church to-day.

We frequently find in France, pastors of Protestant churches professing skeptical views. Still remaining in the bosom of the Church, they reject its confession of faith by word and by publications in which they deny the divinity of Christ, his resurrection, his miracles—all, in fine, that is essentially Christian. They remain in the National Protestant Church because they eat of the loaves and fishes, and are filled by the salary granted from the national treasury. The difficulties of discipline in respect to

the clergy of an established Church are easily understood by the ecclesiastical history of France and England.

After the Revolution of 1848, a general assembly of the Reformed Churches of France was called, for the purpose of considering the actual state and prospects of their work. A protracted and warm debate ensued as to whether the Protestants of France "should proclaim their ancient Confession of Faith, that of Rochelle, or should they proclaim a confession of new articles; or, lastly, should they remain passive and do nothing?" Many pastors, among whom was the celebrated Frederick Monod, elder brother of Adolphe Monod, determined to retire from the assembly and from the Established Protestant Church, unless a confession of faith in accordance with the principles of the Reformation, were adopted. There was, by inaction, such a refusal, and they accordingly retired.

There is, therefore, now an Independent Protestant Church, without support from the State, with its own constitution and government, asking only from the State the protection due all citizens. Among the defenders of such a separation of Church and State are the celebrated Pressensè and Vinet, who declared the separation to be "a general and absolute principle, the sole reasonable and just system, the sole efficacious guarantee of truth and of liberty in spirituals or temporals." This body, although smaller and lacking the prestige of an establishment, is freer in its discipline, and maintains, accordingly, a more vigorous life. It embodies the best hopes of French Protestantism.

In respect to the Catholic Church, an old, deep-seated love of freedom, and a natural impatience of restraint, causes many French statesmen to look with an eye of suspicion upon her claims to the protection and guarantees of the State, and inclines them to refuse to allow the liberties of that Church to remain intact in the bosom of the State. The history of wrongs inflicted by her upon the human mind and conscience is bearing legitimate fruit.

The opponents of Christianity in France, as with us, believe that they are the interpreters and defenders of truth. "They are all proud of belonging to the department of pure science,

and of making scientific truth the sole object, the sole rule of their labors." Then, too, they utter as their watchword, Liberty, and proclaim that they are working out the liberties of the race on the only practicable basis. "Appreciate," says Guizot, "the force of these two sentiments, the love of science and the love of liberty; understand through what phases of degeneration and of deceptive transformation those sentiments may, in the ardor of pursuit and of combat, have to pass; reckon up, if reckon you can, all the false ideas, the chimerical hopes, which they may suggest; and then add to the amount, and as their consequences, the immoral and anarchical passions which may make those sentiments their pretext and their tools; and in doing this, you will find that you have passed in review the forces of that enemy now waging an implacable war against Christianity, although a war to which Christianity is called upon to put an end." When Christianity was dethroned in the Revolution, men shouted: "Reason shall be our Deity." Henceforth, in all that horrible tragedy, the lowest form of rationalism and infidelity prevailed. The church of Nôtre Dame at Paris became a temple of reason, bearing over its portals the inscription, "To all great men." A young woman was enthroned there as the goddess of reason, and was enthusiastically pointed out to the people: "Behold living reason; we celebrate here to-day the sole true worship, the worship of liberty and reason." Here we have the very dregs of rationalism.

We meet this impiety in other forms, less offensive in its outward expression, but more destructive as it is more insidious.

M. Scherer, an acknowledged leader and representative of French rationalists, after speaking about the "emancipation of faith" and the "progress of religion," "by means of which religious opinion and the human mind contrive to maintain themselves in a state of constant equilibrium," thus forming "a sort of Christian rationalism," after demanding, in the modern fashion, the rejection of all dogma and all positive revelation, and making the religious sentiment the all-sufficient guide, confesses the influences and results of rationalism in these significant words: "But I cannot refrain from asking, not without anxiety,

whether Christian rationalism is really a religion. What remains in the crucible after the operation just detailed? Is the residue really the essence of the positive dogmas, or is it but a *caput mortuum*? When Christianity is rendered translucent to man's mind, conformable to man's reason and man's moral appreciation of things, does it still possess any great virtue? Does it not very much resemble deism, and is it not equally lean and sterile?"

"The radical and permanent error of rationalism," says Guizot, is that "it regards all things as accessible to the researches and to the methods of human science. . . . Its pretension is that it may study and know, by its ordinary processes, as well the invisible world, its Sovereign and its laws, as the visible world in which man is now placed; and it wars upon Christianity because Christianity admits no such pretension."

Compte's "Positivism" arose in the second quarter of this century; another adversary of Christianity. It denies the possibility of knowing the existence of an invisible world; it declares all religion, all metaphysics "vain and chimerical sciences; there is no science but the science of the physical world, of its facts and of its laws."

Of an interview which the author of the "Positive Philosophy" held with Guizot in 1832, the latter makes the following record: "He explained to me drearily and confusedly his views upon man, society, civilization, religion, philosophy, history. . . . He sincerely believed that it was his calling to open a new era for the mind of man and for human society. While listening to him, I could hardly refrain from expressing my astonishment that a mind so vigorous should at the same time be so narrow as not to perceive the nature and bearing of the facts with which he was dealing, and the questions which he was authoritatively deciding; that a character so disinterested should not be warned by his own proper sentiments—which were moral in spite of his system—of its falsity and its negation of morality. I did not even make any attempt at discussion with M. Comte; his sincerity, his enthusiasm, and the delusion that blinded him, inspired me with that sad esteem that takes refuge in silence."

Notwithstanding the obvious bearing of this system upon the morals of society, its unnaturalness, its shallowness, it won many adherents, some of whom were men honored in scholarship and letters. With Comte, religion was a puerility. His positive philosophy arrayed itself against every other system, whether theological or metaphysical. It was certainly positive in its declarations, but had no claim to positiveness on any other ground. Whatever was fixed, it delighted to tear from all moorings, and take from the soul all rest and hope. It chained the soul to the rock and tree; it bound the mind to the observed forces and laws of matter. It made God an invention of the human mind, only profitable for the infancy of the race when no light of science illumined the path of man. It strikes out of existence everything outside ourselves of which we can avail ourselves in time of need. Human liberty is at an end, the will has no exercise. Mechanism and fatalism supplant growth and accountability. The author of this system prepared a catechism and a calendar. In the latter appear the names of the great benefactors of the race "in every department of humanity, who are to replace the Christian saints: three hundred and sixty-four names, men and women, with one hundred and sixty-five additional names, are inscribed upon this list, which begins with Moses and ends with Bichat, passing through Homer, Aristotle, Archimedes, Cæsar, St. Paul, Dante, Gutenberg, Shakspeare, Descartes, and Frederic the Second," we exclaim with our author: "a chaos is a sorry sight; a chaos of the soul is a still sorrier spectacle than a chaos of worlds!"

The doctrines of Spinoza revived and directed French pantheism. Man cannot comprehend God except by making himself God, is the teaching of the pantheist. Spinoza makes the highest happiness proceed from the highest knowledge; to be ignorant of science, of self, of the laws of the universe, is the deepest misery; "nothing is bad in itself; good and evil indicate nothing positive and are nothing but manners of thinking; the measure of every man's right is his power; a compact has only a value proportioned to its utility; there is folly in pretending to bind a man forever to his word; unless, at least, man so contrive that the breach of the compact shall entail for him

that violates it more danger than profit."* From these principles and the more moderate and truthful philosophy of Hegel, that "stands midway between theism and pantheism," French pantheism has largely received its character and direction. A school has thus arisen in France concerning which Guizot quotes the learned critic, Willm, as follows: "It tends to substitute for the ancient worship the worship of humanity, and to found a new worship dispensing with God, and with morality properly so called. . . There is no such thing as theology but only anthropology; for the mind of humanity is the divine mind realized. There is no longer any other piety than devotedness to the objects of humanity; no longer any other prayer than the contemplation of the human mind. . . Man's will be done: such is the principle of the new law."

In respect to materialism, Guizot admits its "progress in the learned world and in the unlearned world, in the name of scientific studies and of popular tendencies." The poison scattered by the sensual Diderot and the reckless atheist, de la Mettrie, is palatable to this century. That which was made a complete system in the eighteenth century by de Holbach, Voltaire and the Encyclopædists, retains its old character; though the form and expression may be a little varied, the heart of the system is not changed. With unsparing hand, materialism still clutches at every object promoting man's hope and peace; bitterness is in its heart while it speaks soft words of beguilement. It imperils every principle of morals and of religion.

M. de Remusat, adverting to the hesitation, timidity, and sensitiveness of materialists, thus analyzes their character and position: "I have never observed without astonishment the testy sensibility of philosophers on this point. Who is there that has not witnessed the indignation manifested by the followers of the philosophy of sensation when they hear retraced to them the positive consequences of this doctrine? It seems just as if their rightful claims were being disavowed, or as if they were being denounced; as if the Inquisition were still at hand, with its tortures and its auto-da-fé; or as if their refuters were sending them to martyrdom. A general timidity reigns throughout their school; they seem to think freedom of opinions never sufficiently assured,

*Spinoza's Works.

and society never tolerant enough, for their philosophy to declare and avow itself for such as it is. Whether from shame or from fear, materialism asks to be tenderly handled, suspects that every one who defines her has the designs of a persecutor, makes protestations of her good intentions, and is alarmed at her very faith. She defends herself from the imputation of believing only in the senses, even while making sensation the one universal fact. It might be said that she blushes at matter just as persons infirm of faith blush at the name of Jesus."

Define this philosophy, and it becomes hideous. Men shrink from its true portrayal. • It keeps its strength only when it does not touch the solid earth. When the question is fairly put to the materialist, if he believes man to be merely matter, he shrinks from an affirmative reply, for he knows that by it he would do violence to the prevailing, innate sentiment of the human race.

Men will continue to ask: "If the soul be only the result of the play of the organs, how is it that the soul is able to resist the impressions and the appetites of the body, to direct, concentrate, and govern its faculties? If the will be but instinct in a different form, how explain its empire over the instinct?"* Here is the fact, and the irresistible argument which must always be fatal to materialism.

"In our days," says Guizot, in closing his picture of the anti-religious elements at work in France, "impiety is spreading, and assuming serious development, more especially among the operative classes, and in that young generation that issues from the middle classes, and is destined to follow the liberal professions. Not that the infection is universal even there; on the contrary, those classes show also the most different tendencies; among them, too, the progress of the Christian awakening has made itself felt, and religious belief is treated with more respect. There, however, it is that the evil of impiety has its focus and its center of expansion. Sometimes it manifests itself under gross and cynical forms, sometimes with a pretension to thought and learning; now by the brutal licentiousness of its behavior, now by the arrogant yet embarrassed expression of its opinions. . . Reck-

*Vacherot.

lessness in religion is, in our days, a more widely spread evil than impiety. . . The recklessness, now so common, gives no thought at all to these subjects, does not picture to itself that there is any ground for so doing."

From this feeling of indifference arises one of the greatest obstacles to the work of the Gospel here as in France. Opposition can be hopefully met, a contest is to be welcomed by the friends of the Redeemer, but in this indifference they have a fearful, dead weight to raise. Still, taking new methods according to the exigency, methods which the Bible suggests and which the Spirit will render effective, the foe will be driven from this fortress also.

Politically, France is undergoing a revolution not less sure, though less violent, than that of '89. There is to-day a political reawakening. Important concessions have recently been made by the crown to the liberals. It would seem that before the present strong tendencies toward constitutional government, the usurpations and even the rule of the family of Napoleon must soon end.

The history of those usurpations, the whole course of the crown, is fearlessly passed in review by the debater in the Chambers. It is vividly shown how little of the past, from the hour of Napoleon's election, is forgotten by the French people. By a surer road than ever before, France is passing on to freedom and parliamentary government. Her representatives are resolved to have an active part in the work of government, to supervise the national expenses so as to prevent the reckless expenditure of monies by secret plans and for selfish ends. Inaction is the safe position, as it seems to be the policy, of Napoleon. The usual resource of his family when its prestige seemed to be waning, to create a reaction in its favor, has been foreign war. Neither opportunity, nor pretext for a foreign war exists or is likely to arise. If the family shall continue to rule, it will be with inviolable constitutional restrictions, and by laying down the greater portion of its power and becoming more a servant of the people.

Out of constitutional liberty springs religious freedom. By political overturnings the hopes of the race are brightened. The land of Henry of Navarre, of Louis XIV., of the Revolution,

and of the Napoleons, of St. Bartholomew, and of the dragonnades, of Bossuet, Voltaire, and de la Metrie, has still the bow of hope stretched over its borders. Often passing through no common ordeals, with triumphs won at fearful cost of blood and untold sufferings, it illustrates in a signal manner the enduring, living power of God-given truth; as that truth, in politics and religion, marches on to no doubtful victory.

ART. V.—THE OFFICE AND WORK OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.*

It is needful to the success of the minister of the gospel that the spirit of consecrated, persistent, indomitable labor burn within him. But though the spirit of labor be present, though the heart grasp in its sympathies the broadest fields, and the feet hasten where the sympathies lead, yet, without the discipline which directs mind and heart in the best channels, marks out the choicest methods, the laborer toils at a needless disadvantage. As the farmer will ever sow at random, and with loss, without knowledge of the nature of soil and grain, so he who sows on gospel fields without an understanding of the adaptation of truth, and of the methods of presenting truth to the heart, will find himself proportionately hindered and powerless.

No man is fitted for work without some special training. The well-taught apprentice shows the readiest skill. The disciplined student wields, all things considered, the widest influence. The training to which the world is most indebted is systematic training. The long continued contact of mind with mind, grappling with difficult questions in long continued thought, develops the

**The Office and Work of the Christian Ministry*, By James M. Hoppin, Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in Yale College. 8 vo. pp. 620. Sheldon & Co. New York.

largest number of efficient toilers. He who has best learned to obey becomes the best commander; the mind that has looked steadily and with severe scrutiny into truths, is best fitted to teach them.

Retirement is necessary for depth and strength of mind and heart. Valued ores are concealed from the grasp of the mere passer-by; they yield their richness only to him who is content to leave the crowded highway and labor in loneliness. The advent of Moses to the work of deliverance was not from the court, but from the solitudes and communings of the wilderness. The discipline of watching and waiting in Arabia intervened between the conversion and the public work of the apostles to the Gentiles. The workman who needeth not to be ashamed is he who dwells long and with earnest thought over the details of labor, who turns with greatest success the eye within to catch the many-sided developments of his own heart-life, who reads with greatest certainty the needs, and interprets best the voices, of the world about him, who finds the sacred page more fully luminous because an enlightened mind, bowing at the same altar, aids the devotion of a sincere heart.

Pulpit eloquence is impossible without vigor of mind and heart. It is not built up from mere sentiment; its foundations are granitic; and he who aspires to it must toil long and severely at tasks which common minds deem useless drudgery, but which to him are radiant with the promise of undying power. It is not the mere excitement of animal sensibilities that men need. The pleasant voice of one that singeth a pleasant song never so sweetly, soon palls upon the mind. Men will not long wait upon that ministry that is not a thoughtful ministry. It is trained power that the masses need. "It requires more culture to be terse, than to be verbose; severer discipline to be simple than to be ornate; more wisdom to present truth in Christ's way than in Paul's."

It is learning in the ministry that must save the church and the world. We do not mean that kind of learning which sacrifices Christ to literature or the muses, and which has no direct reference to the distinctive work of reconciliation; but that which girds the armor closer, quickens the heart and makes the

intellect a more valued servant in the contest with error; that gives the shield a hardness to repel the darts and a polish to reflect the hideousness of error. It was the devout, the active Luther who protested most loudly against the divorce of learning and religion, and none had greater popular power than he.

It is not more rhetoric nor more style, but more theology that our preachers need; more matter, not more words; substance, not sound. Highest consecrated culture brings highest and broadest power and wields the popular mind with surest grasp. No greater mistake can be made than that learning in the ministry is out of place. By the severest application we cannot gain too much insight into the mighty work which the wisdom of God devised and carries on.

Who moved the common mind with greater power than Wesley, than Whitefield, yet by their superior learning, knowing the range of truth, balanced by the broadest culture, quickened by the severe dialectics of the schools, they were enabled to do this. No one doubts the vast learning of Matthew Henry, but his commentaries exert a wide influence at once among scholarly and unscholarly minds. It is not merely the heart, but the clear, disciplined mind of the scholarly Newman Hall, that makes his tract, "Come to Jesus," loved alike by the Hindu and the American heart. The severe discipline of the University of Cambridge found an appreciative mind in Henry Martin, as he bore off the highest honors, yet he found occasion for all his skill among the Moolahs of Persia; his talents were not buried, but they shine out gloriously in the path of living light that he made from the Ganges to the Euphrates.

"In this land the ministry can gain an abiding influence only by commanding respect for its superior intelligence, purity and worth. The gospel, in their hands, must vindicate its own glorious origin and show its adaptation to the highest and deepest wants of man. It has no earthly force behind to back its teachings or support its claims. It stands alone, relying upon no adventitious aid."* The preacher reproduces his life in those who live long after him. Like priest like people. Narrow the life,

*Report of the Am. Ed. Soc. 1868.

stint the development of the rising ministry, and it will go out to maim and weaken the spiritual life of the church and obstruct the conversion of the world. A full, free, largely developed soul produces healthfulness and fullness of life in society; a cramped, dwarfed spirit, a hesitating mind, apologetically presenting a truth, chills and destroys.

Resting upon such principles as these, Prof. Hoppin has given the theological student and the pastor the valuable contribution mentioned at the head of this article. Notwithstanding the number of books upon this topic already in existence, this new work comes in as no superfluity. It discusses in a fresh, earnest, manly way, with ripe scholarship, a pure taste and devoted spirit, the things which are needful to give power and success to the work of "the ministry of reconciliation." It is characterized by an ardor which can not fail to inspire the minister and pastor with new feelings of the sacred nature of his high calling.

The spirit of the work is well set forth in the introduction: "The preacher can no longer successfully deal in dull learning and trite ideas, without fresh thought, original and conscientious exegesis, noble and true literary form, and above all, practical earnestness and spiritual life. Not that the want of these has characterized the past age, but that the time has come when their absence is a marked deficiency.

"Still, too much ought not to be made of the intellectual aspects of the subject, important as they are; for, of the two classes into which Pascal divided preachers,—into those who belong to the order of intellect and those who belong to the order of love,—the greatest preachers, as Pascal thought (among whom he counted Augustine), have ever been of the latter class; for to love God is the only way to know him and to teach him.—Truly, for one to be a great preacher, one must have a deep and pervading enthusiasm; he must have an inward harmony with the object which interested the heart of Christ, and in which every selfish feeling is absorbed and lost. The main impulse of the preacher must be from within,—from sanctified affections, from the real sympathy of his soul with God. Thought and expression—the profoundest thought and the most fit expression, are of little moment, if there is not the true, glowing heart behind them.

“While I believe that divine truth should be presented to men’s minds in fresh, powerful and beautiful forms,—no less so than should scientific and literary truth,—there are, nevertheless, certain principles of preaching which do not vary, and which are always true, ‘for the church must light its candle at the old lamp;’ and an endeavor has been made in the following pages to set forth some of those true and essential principles.” With such a spirit and purpose the author has successfully completed his task, and provided substantial aid for those who shall go to him for help in solving the problems which are forced upon the attention of the devoted pastor.

No man can hope for happiness or success in his ministry who is not made earnest and devout by a proper comprehension of the greatness of his work, and its essential nature. He must conceive of it as the work above all others in importance and honor. The height and depth, the vast meaning of his divine commission, must in some large degree be comprehended.

The greatness of his work appears from his position as an ambassador of God to man, and from the nature of the truths with which he deals. In this work, too, he is following the steps and the example of his Master, and the presence and blessing of Christ are promised him in winning souls. There is enough in this work to rouse and develop to the fullest extent possible, all the faculties of the minister. Let him study closely the nature, the relations, the magnitude of his tasks and they will be performed with reverence and delight.

It is of the utmost importance that the minister have a definite, well settled purpose, a fixed and adequate aim, or his mind will waver and his spirits flag as hindrances and obstacles arise in his path. If a minister is devoted to his work, and counts it all joy to be found in the way of the cross, he will not fret over lack of appreciation, nor long for the emoluments of other spheres of labor. The remedy for many of the unhappy feelings, the antidote to many sorrowful repinings, is a spiritual one. If any pastor finds himself growing in distaste for the details of his labor, if he murmurs over the slowness and the dullness of his people, let him draw nearer Christ, deepen his piety, and all will be changed.

“This one thing I do,” must be the motto of the pastor. To

study how to be the most successful pastor is the only worthy object of one set apart to the work of the ministry.

“No wonder,” says Dr. Alexander, “that we preach so coldly on the Sabbath, when we are so little moved on week-days, about what we preach. You have perhaps met two or three clergymen lately; what did their conversation turn upon? The coming glory of the Church? the power of the Word? the best means of arousing sinners? even the most desirable method of preparation? or some light point of doctrine? Or were they upon the last election, the last land speculation, the last poem, or the price of cotton and tobacco? According to your answer, will be the conclusion as to the temperature of their preaching. There is, indeed, a sort of pulpit fire which is rhetorical—proceeds from no warmth within, and diffuses no warmth without; the less of it the better. But genuine ardor must arise from the habitual thought and temper of the life. He with whom the ministry is a secondary thing, may be a correct, a learned, an elegant, even an oratorical, but will never be a powerful preacher.” In respect to all other things the minister of Christ should be able to say with Leighton, “one devout thought outweighs them all.”

Would that every young man entering the ministry might feel the earnest words of Philip Henry, on the day of his ordination: “I did this day receive so much honor and work as ever I shall know what to do with. Lord Jesus, proportion supplies accordingly.” Did such a sense of the greatness and dignity, of the importance of the work, possess every young toiler as he enters upon it, we should seldom hear, as we now hear, of an unsuccessful, unhappy pastorate. We fear the latter is the rule, and a truly happy, fervent, devoted pastorate is the exception. Every pastor’s life may be, ought to be, a happy and successful one. It may not be famed for learning, it may not be known in the world outside his parish, but he may be an eminently successful pastor. This success will be measured by the degree and glow of his personal piety. The success is the conversion and strengthening of souls; a success gained only by the mighty indwelling of the converting and enlightening spirit of God.

The object and design of preaching, says our author, is “to teach men truth. Its first idea is instruction—instruction in the

things of God. It is intended primarily for the purpose of publishing the gospel, of making it known to man. The didactic element, if not the chief element in preaching, thus comes first in the order of time; for men must know the truth before they can obey it. Divine truth in preaching should not be chiefly regarded for the interesting subjects of thought which it opens, but as the will and word of God, which preaching is to so set forth, exemplify and explain, that it may be '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.' The preacher himself is not so much the instructor, as God through him.

"Another object of preaching is, to commend divine truth to the heart, so that it shall be received to the salvation and edification of the soul. It does not end in setting forth truth, but it is to impel men, by God's help, to choose and obey it; it is the practical application of divine truth to meet the great wants of the soul." Its great aim is to win souls to Christ, and make them Christ-like. It has been said that Christ need not be in every sermon; but as Christ is the life of all divine truth, and thus must be the end of all preaching, how can he really be absent from any true sermon? To exhibit the truth of Christ requires the spirit of Christ in the preacher, his own spirit of love to men; otherwise the converting energy of the sermon is lacking. All preaching should be 'a word of the Lord,' and should have this characteristic of apostolic preaching; that it leads to Him who is the life.

"The design of Christian preaching, then, in the largest and fullest view of it, is, by God's blessing, so to set forth divine truth, with such clearness, simplicity, love, and dependence upon the spirit of Christ, as to build up men in the whole faith and life of Christ—to convert, educate, and sanctify their souls."

There are difficulties to be met in preaching. Not every writer of essays can compose a sermon, nor can every orator on other subjects preach a sermon. A man may protrude a literary composition and call it a sermon, while at the same time the essential elements of a sermon are wholly wanting. If, in the first place, the design and aim which is to characterize every sermon is

wanting, there is no real sermon. He who aims to produce a sermon must have a knowledge of men, and especially of the Scriptures; he must be imbued with the Spirit, and filled with the knowledge of the Word of God. "Preaching cannot be rushed upon with heedless haste, as if one who had some little knack at writing or speaking, could at once preach a pungent, edifying sermon."

It is a great thing to preach the gospel; it is no by-play, no pastime. It requires the utmost energies of the man. Too many make no account of the gifts God has bestowed upon them to improve them for this great work. We find in the following description a record of many who, year after year, give no proof of strenuous labor for God's glory and the strengthening of the Church; indolent ministers, presumptuous ministers, who mock God by misusing or neglecting the talents God gave them, saying, by their life and habits, that God gave them faculties in vain, threw away his bestowments; that only something less than a complete man is necessary to the work of the ministry.

"Although it may be an ungracious thing to say it, there are ministers who are not, and who do not seek to be, inspired.—They will not labor to preach well; they will not learn even the outward collateral means and accomplishments of their profession; they will not learn how to write; they will not trouble themselves about the simplest rhetorical culture; they will not mend awkward habits of delivery; they will not correct a false tone or a harsh pronunciation; they will not take pains to acquire the art of public speaking, so that they can address an assembly upon any subject with effect; but above all, they will not grapple with the real difficulties of the setting forth of divine truth in preaching, which requires thought, clear arrangement of ideas, spiritual meditation and earnest prayer. They are doing, perhaps, all other things except giving their undivided energies to preaching. They say there is no need to take so much trouble about these things, for they will be helped at the time of speaking; but they who say that are those who, above all others, need this thorough training; for in God's work, as well as in man's, those who do not work are not helped; and do such preachers deserve to be successful?"

Our author enumerates some of the faults of preaching with clearness and force, as follows :

“ 1. Preaching without a strong, impelling purpose.

“ 2. Preaching too long, and too learnedly expressed, sermons. A sermon should be intensive, rather than extensive or pretensive ; there should be more pith and point than elaborate argumentation in a sermon. It is a religious address to men, and not a religious treatise.

“ 3. Preaching sermons addressed to the fancy and the nervous sensibilities. This is what Shakspeare would call ‘ taffeta-writing.’ It is striving to rival brilliant and popular lecturers, who, by continually working upon their lectures, have made them like polished gems, and have taken everything out of them which is not brilliant and immediately effective. It is also what is commonly called ‘ sensational preaching ;’ since it is determining to produce a sensation on the nerves by words, rather than on the conscience and heart by thought and feeling. In the words of another writer, ‘ This whole business of preaching and learning for entertainment may be told in these two words, “ deceiving and being deceived.”’ ● We do not say a preacher should not attract his audience, nor, if he has anything original in thought, or powerful in imagination, or moving in truth, that he should repress it ; on the contrary, let him be himself ; let him use every power that he possesses ; let his thought be fresh, and let him make a sensation if he can ; but let him not preach for the special purpose of making a sensation, of captivating, entertaining, exciting, drawing. How wasteful the efforts of such a preacher !

How terrible the responsibility he incurs ! If the objection be urged that the sermon of an opposite character fails to interest an audience, it probably springs from other reasons ; the preacher has, perhaps, failed to inspire a true and manly taste in his congregation ; he does not put genuine thought, feeling, or spiritual earnestness into his preaching ; there is nothing to attract in it ; there is no unction ; he copies his ideas, and feigns his emotions, and how can he create a legitimate interest in this way ? The preacher should therefore resist the temptation (which is one of the first to assail him) to make a fine, attractive sermon, but let him rather strive to make a plain one ; and if there is aught of lite-

rary or awakening power in him, it will shine out in due time."

In the preparation of a written sermon, as well as in its delivery, the great danger is formalism. Mechanical composition brings mechanical, unnatural delivery. Except by great care and labor, the preacher of written sermons finds himself hampered and his usefulness in the pulpit greatly hindered. The formal reading of sermons cannot be too strongly condemned. He who sees only his manuscript during the delivery of his sermon, and not the people, will miss the needed inspiration from his audience, and the latter will find comparatively little inspiration in the preacher.

Whatever hinders unction in the preacher, is a clog to be thrown off at the earliest possible moment. There must be that unction in the study, if it shall appear in the pulpit. "What is written with weariness," says Dr. Alexander, "is heard with weariness. The true way is to have an object, and to be full of it. I never could understand what is meant by making a sermon on a prescribed text. The right text is one which comes of itself during reading and meditation; which accompanies you in walks, goes to bed with you, and rises with you. On such a text thoughts swarm and cluster like bees upon a branch. The sermon ferments for hours and days, and at length, after patient waiting and almost spontaneous working, the subject clarifies itself, and the true method of treatment presents itself in a shape which cannot be rejected."

To escape the embarrassment consequent upon attention to manuscript, and to silence the objections to its use, many preachers have attempted to commit their sermons to memory and recite them. This is really much worse than reading from manuscript. The deception is apparent. "This real want of freedom will surely make itself manifest, if in no other way, by the abstracted expression of the eyes, gazing at vacancy, by which it will soon be discovered that the preacher is 'reading from memory.'—There is more honesty and power in openly delivering the sermon from the manuscript; for the secret being out that one is speaking from memory, the virtue has departed from the discourse." p. 70.

Let every man in this matter of written sermons "be fully

persuaded in his own mind." No one method can be prescribed to the exclusion of every other. It is folly for men to declaim vehemently, as some do, against the use of manuscript. Some men are, and must ever be, more effective in this way than in any other. The history of the pulpit proves the moving power and usefulness of the written discourse as well as of the extemporaneous. "Dr. Chalmers," remarks our author, "did not seem to lose much by written sermons; and now, though dead, he speaks through them. His unsuccessful efforts at extemporaneous preaching are described in Hanna's 'Life,' vol. 1, p. 342. The editor says he found that "the ampler the matter he had prepared, the more difficult was the utterance. It was not easy for him to light at once on words and phrases which could give anything like adequate conveyance to convictions so intense as his were; and he could not be satisfied, and with no comfort could he proceed, while an interval so wide remained between the truth as it was felt and the truth as his words had represented it. After a succession of efforts, the attempt at extempore preaching was relinquished; but he carried into his study a secure and effective lodgment of the truth in the minds of others, which had so much to do with the origin of all that amplification and iteration with which his writings abound. In preparing for the pulpit he scarcely ever sat down to write without the idea of other minds, whom it was his object to impress, being either more distinctly or more latently present to his thoughts; and he seldom rose from writing without the feeling that still other modes of influential representation remained untried."

"Here was Dr. Chalmers's security as a preacher of written sermons—his earnestness to impress truth on the souls of his hearers. In Scotland there is a strong aversion to what is called 'paper'; but Dr. Chalmers had—so it was said by a peasant woman of another Scotch preacher—"a pith wi' his paper." p. 74.

Any man will preach well and successfully if he feels that he cannot help preaching, who is so full of his work and the subject immediately in hand, that he is forced to give utterance to the living emotions of his soul. "But the usual awkward and confused manner of reading written discourses is unendurable.

He who has good sight and good memory should deliver his sermon standing erect, as if he had no shred of manuscript before him. To see a preacher of the free gospel with his head continually bent over his sermon, and tied down to his manuscript, as if there were no living audience before him, is certainly a pitiable spectacle." p. 75.

The sermon is to be preached, not read; it should be a living thing not an essay. Give men the spirit and substance of the gospel, for the mere "letter killeth." When men object to the use of manuscript, it is an objection chiefly to the formal, cheap, ineffective use of it. There is a demand, we care not how strong it may be, for more practical effectiveness, simplicity, power, in sermons. "No thought or logic can make up for the lack of that which excites a real interest in the audience."

"This want has of late been sought to be met by a 'sensational' style of preaching; but this is not its remedy, for charlatanism in the pulpit cannot long maintain its influence." p. 77.

The cultivation of extemporaneous preaching is recommended, as a partial remedy of this want. We believe the rising ministry must pay special heed to this style of preaching. It is certainly the most natural, and usually the most effective mode of presenting truth. The preacher then becomes alive and quick in thought; living power is generated. He becomes freer and more at home, he is more in sympathy with his audience. His speech becomes more electric when he stands forth free and strong, filled with the earnestness of a vital message. Besides, it is often the case that the most efficient, the burning words, are the product of the place and the hour. A more natural style of speaking ensues. 'This, perhaps, is the greatest advantage of the extemporaneous method, that it serves to abolish a strained style, which supposes certain circumstances, characters, antagonisms, and certain wants, that do not exist in an audience,—in which style one may write, but cannot talk,—and tends to make preaching more like ordinary conversation, without at the same time losing its dignity. Let a man talk to his audience, and if he does sensibly and earnestly, every one will listen. The moment a preacher ceases declaiming, and begins talking, every one wakes up. That is the power of many of our greatest living or-

ators, both clerical and secular. These men do not talk spasmodic nonsense, but their 'forte' lies in uttering fresh and substantial thought in the natural language of ordinary and earnest conversation among men." This style, when kept free from familiarity or lowness, is the perfection of close, affectionate, reasonable, interesting and effective preaching.

"But extemporaneous preaching should be of the right kind—not the semblance and the sham. . . Free extempore preaching is trusting to the moment of speaking for the form of words in which the thought is expressed. That is all. The carrying of the idea beyond that leads to fanaticism and absurdity. . . Extempore preaching is not unpremeditated preaching." pp. 80—82.

We commend to careful attention the following practical hints for extemporaneous speaking ;

"Train yourself to think without writing.

"Think through the subject beforehand.

"Prepare beforehand, either mentally or on paper, the actual wording of your main proposition and the principal divisions, and perhaps of some of the most important passages.

"Cultivate the faculty of expression.

"Do not choose too easy or familiar subjects.

"Look beyond and above the opinions of men upon your preaching.

"Mingle the written and extemporaneous methods.

"Cultivate oratorical delivery." pp. 83—88.

We shall not be able here to follow our author's remarks under these several directions, but they will be found to be pertinent and valuable.

The pastoral office forms no distinct ecclesiastical order, or class, in the Christian church. All precedence given the ministry is warranted only by, and in accordance with, the precept of Paul, that they "be esteemed highly for their works' sake."

It is no priesthood, performing acts of mediation between God and man, nor is it a merely temporary relation of "guide, philosopher and friend." The office is a higher, spiritual one, divinely instituted, dealing with eternal truths, responsible for the way in which it deals with the souls of men, by its teaching of

the most sacred, important truths. Its relationships are the eternal connections subsisting between regenerated and sanctified hearts. In these few words we have presented the true idea of the Christian ministry. "It is a divinely appointed and divinely guided office in the Church, to sow the word of God, which is the gospel of Jesus Christ, in the hearts of men, that they may learn to love and serve the living God, and to lead lives of active benevolence and goodness, in imitation of Christ. That is its fundamental idea and design. The ministry is a 'ministry of the word.' The minister is 'the man who speaks the word of God; he does not recite it. The priest was a slave, but the minister has free intercourse with God.'" p. 384.

In regard to church building the author remarks: "The building of exceedingly costly and elaborately architectural churches, of imitation-cathedrals, is, we think, uncalled for. It is contrary to our spirit. . . and it reveals no settled principle, nor true conception of religious art, whose whole beauty consists in adaptation to the idea, the design and the place; for beauty here has a vital relation to religious wants." The "sanctuary should not be for the rich alone, for 'a fashionable church,' as it is called, is an 'abomination to the Lord,' but it should be a place for rich and poor to sit together, and for the poor to feel a right to be there, because they, too, bear some small part of the expense, or have an opportunity to pay a low rent within their means. . . Christians should let it be understood that their church, be it in town or country, is the religious home of the whole community, of all who wish to come—that there are no places in it to be unoccupied." p. 502.

The pastor and preacher is to suit his services to no elect class of families or hearers, to the exclusion of others. His ministrations are to be adapted, as far as possible, to all classes and conditions of men. He should make himself edifying to all; finding out the real wants of all his hearers, he should be a debtor "both to the wise and the unwise," being careful how he preaches exclusively to the great majority of his hearers, the unlearned, and the young.

Let us give up our scholarly ideals, and cast them to the winds, if they stand in the way of our coming to the people's

true wants and hearts, of exciting a real interest on their part. p. 507.

We close this article with the forceful, timely words of Professor Phelps, recently addressed to the members of the Senior class, at Andover Theological Seminary: "At the same time I have found alongside of this conviction another, which is also deepening with years. I have tried in various parts of these Lectures to give you a hint of it in the way of warning. It is, that our Protestant denominations are not in all respects using this theory of high culture in the ministry in a Christian way. Somehow or other, it is not working altogether right in practice. I acknowledge some alarm at the prospect before us, if the present drift of things, in one respect, is not arrested. A scholarly ministry, taken as a whole, we must confess is working away from the unscholarly masses of the people. Perhaps it would seem more strictly accurate to say that the unscholarly masses are working away from it. But practically this makes no difference. The ministry is in its conception aggressive, not receptive. The commission is, 'Go:' not 'Wait.' . . . Our tastes in architecture; our craving for artistic music; in some cases a hankering for liturgies; worldly views of what constitutes ministerial success; and more than all else, the principle of elective affinity in the gathering of churches, by which identity of social rank is made to mark practically the outline of church-membership, and still more sharply, that of Christian fellowship—are all tending the same way. It is not difficult to see whither. More than one minister and theological student and layman, who have abandoned churches of Puritan origin, have confessed to me that they were led to the change, not by convictions of conscience, but by cravings of taste. They wished to release themselves from association with the 'low-born and low-bred.' . . . Make your pulpit reach the masses of the people. I tell you frankly, that no theory of preaching is worth a farthing which cannot be worked practically to that result. No theory of ministerial culture is either scriptural or philosophical or sensible which cannot bridge the gulf between the clergy and the masses. The pulpit never can accomplish its mission on any such theory—never. . . . A preacher had better work in the dark, with nothing but mother-

wit, a quickened conscience, and a Saxon Bible to teach him what to do and how to do it, than to vault into an aerial ministry, in which only the upper classes shall know or care anything about him. You had better go and talk the gospel, in the Cornish dialect, to those miners who told the witnesses summoned by the committee of the English Parliament, that 'they had never heard of Mister Jesus Christ in these mines,' than to do the work of the Bishop of London. Make your ministry reach the people; in the forms of purest culture, if, you can, but reach the people; with elaborate doctrine, if possible, but reach the people; with classic speech, if it may be, but reach the people. The great problem of life to an educated ministry is, to make their culture a power instead of a luxury. Our temptations are all one way. Our mission is all the other way."

"It is not, then, less education that our clergy need. It is inconceivable to me how any educated man can see relief from our present dangers, or from any dangers, in that direction. Ignorance is a remedy for nothing. So, imperfection of culture is always a misfortune. . . . We do not want inferior culture if we can get anything else. The world will not bear it from us when it can command anything else. But we do need consecration of culture. This is the thing which the world is blindly craving. We need subjection of the personal tastes which culture creates. We need contentment under the limitations of culture which the necessities of labor in our profession demand.

"Above all, we need faith in the Christian ideal of culture which measures its value by its use; its dignity by its lowliness; its height in character by its depth of reach after souls below it. This was Christ's own ideal of culture. He possessed no other; he respected no other; he denounced every other most fearfully. Not an act of his life, not a word from his lips, gives any evidence that he would have tolerated the awful anomaly of clerical life, in which a man ministers placidly in a palatial church, to none but elect and gilded hearers, with all the paraphernalia of elegance around him, and with culture expressed in the very fragrance of the atmosphere, while 'Five Points' and 'Boweries' and 'Ann Streets' are growing up uncared for by any labors of his, within hearing of his organ and his quartette.

“ Our guard against the peril here indicated, then, is spiritual, as distinct from intellectual, in its nature. The cry should be, not ‘ Less intellect! Less study! Less culture!’ But simply ‘ More heart! More prayer! More godliness! More subjection of culture to the salvation of those who have little or none of it!’

“ Esteem no institutions sacred which set you above and aloof from the commonality. Revere no clerical usages, no laws of etiquette, no guards of your reputation, no proprietary claims, which require you to hold back from personal labor with the humblest or the most guilty. Yield to no churchly sentiments, or whispered arrangements, or tacit understandings, or unuttered disgusts, through which churches shall be gathered by the law of social affinity instead of the law of benevolence; so that pastors cannot get at the poor and degraded, because there are none such within hearing.”



ART. VII.—THE RENAISSANCE AND THE REFORMATION.

Translated from Taine's History of English Literature, Vol. 2, Ch. V.*

Adolph Hypolytus Taine, author of more than a dozen works in history and criticism, and a regular contributor to the “ Review of Two Worlds,” is one of the most candid, energetic and successful among French contemporary writers. His art criticisms have received higher commendations than those of Ruskin ever deserved. Of his “ Travels in Italy,” the only volumes which have been translated into English, it has been said they “ almost make one feel that other observers have journeyed without eyes,” so much does he surpass other tourists in the catching of the spirit and interpreting the beauties of Italian art. His History of English Literature is not only the most perfect that has been produced in any foreign language but it is believed to surpass in

*L'Histoire de la Langue et de la Literature Anglaise; Par A. H. Taine. Tomes IV. Paris, 1860.

vivacity and interest any that has been produced in English, for our brief histories are but dry compendiums of personal facts, and biographies, while in larger works the reader too often finds unless his tastes are exclusively philological, the dry philosophies of the facts still more uninteresting than the facts themselves. Taine, like D'Israeli, looks at a literary work not as the simple play of one imagination, not as the individual caprice of an ardent brain, but as a copy of the surrounding manners, and the sign of a spiritual condition. Hence he studies the literary remains of a period to discover the manner in which its men felt and thought. The "huge, stiff pages" of an old folio, "the yellowed leaves of a manuscript, a poem, a collection of laws, or a confession of faith," are to him only a mold like a fossil shell, like an impression left in stone by an animal that lived and perished while the stone was forming. "Under the shell there was an animal, and under the document there was a man." The shell is studied that we may reproduce the animal, learn his habits, and the system of things to which those habits were adapted. In the same manner he would have us study the document, only that we may recognize the man. Entered upon according to this method, the study of literature vitalizes history, transforms its arid and dreary wastes into landscapes made attractive with passing life, beauty and fruitfulness.

Languages, creeds, charters, volumes are abstractions; look at the people who made them. It is the performing man whom you need to know. To state the authorship of opinions, the classification of poems, the transformation of dialects or the progress of constitutions, is but laying the foundation. "The real history, arises only when the historian begins to distinguish beyond the distance of time, the living, acting man endowed with passions and encompassed with habits;" when, taking us across the intervening centuries, he introduces us to the man whom he discovers, individualized by voice and features, attitudes and dress, distinct and entire as the one whom just now we left in the street. The writer who aims only to interest or instruct us by images will mingle the fancied with the actual, or substitute the imagined for the real, like Scott and the host of his imitators who are ransacking every field of modern history for scenes to illustrate, or texts on

which to hang, the lessons they wish to teach. But such is not the object of Taine. He seeks to reproduce the veritable men in their writings, their works of art, their schemes of business or of politics; to notice the manifestations of their ingenuity and self-possession, the kind, the habitual power and range of their ideas, because all these are avenues uniting in a common center. By these he would reach that center where is the real man, the group of faculties and sensibilities which we call the soul.

He endeavors to see the men of the past with all their surroundings, in their workshops, their offices, their fields, with their sky and their soil; at their homes and their books, their sports and their wars, and he does this, in a manner all the more careful and trustworthy, because he believes that in these externals he will find the exponents of the inner man, the forces that mold the soul and determine the nature of its conceptions and emotions, and therefore the key to customs, government, literature and religion.

One may gratefully accept his aid in studying the visible facts while not forgetting other supernatural facts that ought to modify his conclusions. We may admire his clearness, vivacity, and the nicety of his æsthetic judgments, while regretting that he does not unite spiritual illumination with intellectual insight, and that his understanding has not been clarified by a Christian faith. We may be excused for preferring a historian who has had no bias from Parisian frivolity or French philosophy; to whom the contempt for home life and domestic virtues, the sensuality and irreligion, or the substitution of priestly mummeries and artistic display in place of religion, which characterize his countrymen and the Italians, is something more than the inevitable and blameless result of a climate where the skies are bright and the winters bland. Yet there is a profound truth in this materialistic philosophy. That a rigorous climate and rugged country are favorable to the development of intellect and conscience rather than to the reign of the passions; that a mild climate fosters the love of art and of pleasures; that in the one we may expect literature to be marked by more vigorous thought and a stronger loyalty to conscience, and in the other by greater violence of passion, more of sentiment and of the exaltation of sen-

sual delights, are fair deductions from the facts of history. The nature of the religion which satisfies a soul or a nation, will surely be modified by the wants of the soul that are felt, and souls are often brought to a consciousness of need by the pressure of outward necessities. As the same experience is not possible in all conditions, so all men cannot be satisfied with the same forms of doctrine or modes of worship. But this truth has the effect of a fatal error, when it is exalted out of its true place as if it were the sum of all truth. That must be a lame philosophy, by whatever names endorsed, which can only answer the question, "Why was this man or this nation profligate? by saying, "The southern skies made it necessary;" or the question, "Why were these men, this people, heroic in religion and virtue?" by declaring "their chilly home and hard work made it impossible they should be otherwise." That is only "a philosophy falsely so called" which does not acknowledge that a religion which lulls conscience to sleep and throws the reins on the neck of passion, is congenial to the heart of man in any clime, and that a religion which curbs passion, enlightens conscience and seats it on the throne of the soul, must fight its way against man's inclinations at Wirtemberg as well as at Rome. However, a religion of artistic show and priestly tricks, or a rollicking atheism, may be most acceptable to the pleasure-loving Italians or Parisians, and the soul-constraining rigors of Lutheranism may seem to them impossible, yet the truth remains, and a wise philosophy will find it, that a pure Christianity is the most vital want and the grandest of possibilities everywhere. May not that philosopher be justly charged with blindness who sees no cause for the difference between Melancthon and Tetzal and the systems of morals and of belief which they severally represent, except the climate of two localities, perhaps a day's ride asunder! Luther in penitence and rapture, pores over his new Testament at Erfurt. He confronts Tetzal and his venal indulgences, with the watchword, "The just shall live by faith." He goes from his closet, where he has prayed with strong crying and tears, to tell the council and the Pope that he obeys the behests of conscience, not theirs. Leo X. despises the Bible, denounces conscience as a wicked foe to happiness, and measures the value of opportunity, wealth and pow-

er solely by their capacity to minister to the pleasures of ambition and lust. It is sad that a historian, whether Taine, or Draper, or Buckle, should see no explanation of facts like these, but the simple observation that these men were reared on opposite sides of the Alps. And this in substance is all the explanation which Taine gives us. How much more natural and adequate is that explanation to which the convictions of the race bear witness as is shown in the language, mythology and theology of all nations ; the explanation which the Scriptures give, and which the consciousness of Luther, and of every man, with like experience, endorses, viz: that there are supernatural forces, as well from above, and from beneath, as from within man, co-operating with, or else counter-working, these forces from material nature ; and the arbitration of each individual's will, choosing which class of forces shall control him, is also an element without which no responsibility would attach to man's character, and but little significance to his actions.

It was not the purpose of this paper to review in detail the History of Literature produced by Mr. Taine. We have given an imperfect view of its aims and method, using in part, for this purpose, his own thought. We have called attention to its radical defect: a defect which yet does not lead him astray in his investigations, nor vitiate his criticisms, nor falsify his conclusions, half as often as might be expected. We now propose to lay before the reader a brief extract from the work ; one which shows its defective philosophy as distinctly as any. We do not select it, however, for this reason, neither as affording a fair specimen of the literary worth of the volumes,—his analysis of one of the group of writers in English literature would better do that—but we select it because of the strong incidental testimony which it bears to the truth and value of Protestantism from one who so far from having any bias in its favor, occupies a position where all the influences of society, literature and religion tend to form a bias against it. His words seem equivalent to the avowal of a conviction that it was Luther and the men of the reformation and not the popes or the papal church that were nearest not only to the doctrines of the New Testament, but to the instinct and wants of the human soul, to the true conception both of man and of God.

Commencing with chapter fifth of volume second, Taine proceeds to examine the writers of the Reformation, from Tyndal to Bunyan and Milton. In order to do this, he endeavors first to apprehend the spirit not only of the reformation, but of that general awakening of mind which prevailed in Europe, after the invention of printing began to dispel the darkness of ages. The period when Corregio and Titian and Michael Angelo Raphael, at the bidding of popes, were decorating tombs and frescoing chapels and cathedrals, which were also the whited sepulchres of a dead religion, and full to bursting with all uncleanness. A period hardly less distinguished in Southern Europe for the revival of art, than in the North for the insurrection of thought and the renovation of the church, and which was called in France and Italy the Renaissance, as it was called in England the Reformation.

Taine calls the one the pagan, the other the Christian, Renaissance. In the chapter here begun, he shows us

I. The moral condition of Southern Europe during the Renaissance, and the effect of its fundamental idea that man may pursue his own pleasure as the highest good.

"Be it known to the reader," says Luther in his preface, * "that I have been a monk and an ultra papist, so besotted with the papal doctrines, or rather so swallowed up in them, that I should have been entirely ready to kill or to condemn to death those who should refuse obedience to the Pope even with respect to the smallest matter. I was not utterly unfeeling or entirely heartless in defending the Pope like Eck and his associates, who seemed to me to make themselves defenders of the Pope rather in order to serve their own bellies, than because they took the matter seriously. Besides, even now, it seems to me that they are making themselves merry at the Pope's expense, like Epicureans. But I supported him in sincerity of heart, as a man who fears awfully the day of judgment, and who nevertheless with a trembling in all his bones, was longing to be saved."

So when for the first time Luther beheld Rome, he prostrated himself, saying: "I salute thee, holy Rome, bathed in the blood of so many martyrs." Imagine, if you can, the effect made upon

*Edition of his Complete Works, Vol. 1.

such a spirit, so loyal, so Christian, by the shameless heathenism of the Italian Renaissance.

The beauty of art, the delights of a sensual and effeminate life, had no charm for him. It is the manners which he criticises, and he does it only with his conscience. With the eyes of a man of the North, he scrutinizes that Southern civilization, and comprehends only its vices. Like Ascham, who used to say that "he had seen at Venice more crimes and infamies in eight days than in all his life in England;" like Arnold and Channing of our day; like all the men of Teutonic race and education, he had a horror of that voluptuous life, sometime reckless and sometimes unrestrainably licentious; but always unchecked by any moral scruple; swayed by passion, enlivened by irony, limited to the present, destitute of the sentiment of the Infinite, with no worship but the admiration of sensible beauty, and no aim but the search for pleasure; with no religion save the terrors of imagination, and the worship of that which appeals to the eyes.

"I would not," said he on his return, "for a hundred thousand florins, have failed to see Rome; I should always have been uneasy, yet I should have done no injustice to the Pope.* The crimes at Rome are incredible, nobody could believe so great wickedness, if he had not the testimony of his eyes, of his ears, of his experience. There every form of vice and infamy prevails; all atrocious crimes are fashionable,—principally blind avarice, contempt of God, perjury, sodomy. Among us Germans, men gorge themselves with drink nearly to bursting, while the Italians are abstemious, but they are the most impious of men. They mock at true religion, they laugh at us Christians because we all believe the scriptures. They have a phrase in Italy which they use when they go to church, 'Let us go to comply with the popular error.' 'If we were obliged,' they say again, 'to believe all the word of God, we should be the most miserable of men, and could never enjoy a moment's pleasure. It is necessary to put on a suitable appearance, but not to believe every thing.' Thus did Leo X. who, hearing a dispute whether the soul were immortal, gave his opinion in the negative. 'For,' said he, 'it would be

*Table-talk, passim.

terrible to believe in a future life. Conscience is a vile creature that arms man against himself. * * * The Italians are either Epicureans or superstitious. The people fear St. Anthony or St. Sebastian, because of the plagues which they send. For this reason when any one desires to prevent Italians from frequenting any place, he paints there St. Anthony with his lance of fire. Thus they live in the utmost superstition, ignorant of the word of God, neither believing in the resurrection of the body nor in eternal life, and fearing only temporal evils. So their blasphemies are horrible. The cruelty of their revenges is atrocious. When they cannot rid themselves of their enemies in any other way, they prepare ambuscades for them in the churches, so that a man has been known to cleave the head of his enemy even before the altar. Often at funerals, murders are committed in quarrels about the heirship. They celebrate the carnival during several weeks with the greatest folly and indecency, and they have originated many kinds of sins and extravagance, for they are men without conscience living in public scandals and despising marriage. We Germans, and other simple nations, are like a blank canvas, but the Italians are painted and mottled with all sorts of false opinions and still readier to receive worse ones. Their fasts are more splendid than our most sumptuous feasts. Where we spend a florin for dress, they spend ten, arraying themselves extravagantly in robes of silk. Their chastity is sodomy. Society among them is an impossibility. They do not trust each other, nor mingle freely with one another as is the custom among us Germans. No stranger is allowed to speak in public with their women. They are entirely a people of the cloister."

These words, severe as they may be, convey but a faint image of the reality.

Treachery, assassinations, tortures, ostentations, debauchery, the trade of poisoning, the basest and most shameless crimes brazenly enjoying the public toleration and all the light of day.

In 1490, the Viceroy of the Pope, having forbidden the clergy and laity to keep concubines, the Pope revoked the prohibition, saying "that is not forbidden; for the life of priests and ecclesiastics is such that scarcely one is found who does not keep a concubine or at least have a courtesan. Cæsar Borgia, son of the

Pope, at the taking of Capera, selected forty of the most beautiful women whom he reserved for himself, and plenty of captives are sold cheap at Rome." In the time of Pope Alexander VI. (1492 to 1503,) we are told all the ecclesiastics from the greatest to the least have concubines as though they were wives, and even publicly. "Unless God interposes," adds the historian, "this corruption will extend to the monks and religious orders, although, to confess the truth, almost all the monasteries of the city have become houses of prostitution, and no man denies it." Alexander was the paramour of Lucretia his own daughter. The reader can find depicted in Buchard the scenes of extraordinary lewdness in which he is engaged with Lucretia, and Cæsar his son.

Likewise, if the reader will go to the trouble, he may read for himself in the original, the bestiality of Peter Luigi Farnese, another son of the Pope, how the young and virtuous Bishop of Fano died by his hand, and how the Pope, dealing with this crime "of youthful levity" gave him by a secret bull, "the most complete absolution from all pains, which in any manner or for any cause whatever, he can have incurred through the indulgence of human passions." As to security in civil life, Bentivoglio causes all the Marescotti to be murdered, Hyppoletus orders the eyes of his brother to be dug out in his own presence, Cæsar Borgia kills his brother. Murder belongs to the customs, and no longer excites astonishment. A fisherman who saw a body thrown into the water was asked why he had not informed the governor of the city, he replied that in the course of his life he had seen a hundred bodies thrown in at the same place, and that nobody had ever troubled himself about it.

"In our city," says an old historian, "murders and robberies were taking place day and night, and scarcely a day passed that some one was not killed." Cæsar one day killed Peroso, a favorite of the Pope, while in the latter's arms and under his cloak, so that the blood spirted in the Pope's face. He caused his sister's husband to be stabbed and then strangled, upon the steps of the palace in open day. Count if you can, his assassinations! Unquestionably he and his father in subtlety of intellect, in moral character, in perfected, open and systematized wickedness, have presented to Europe the two most successful images of the

devil. To express all in a word, it is on the model of this society, and for this society that Machiavelli wrote his "Prince." The two distinguishing features of that pretentious and perverted civilization are, the complete development of all intellectual faculties and of all human lusts, and the complete destruction of all restraints both of morality and of modesty. Its object is to make man a being abundantly fortified with genius, audacity, presence of mind, political cunning, dissimulation, patience, and to devote all this power to the search for pleasures; pleasures of the body, of luxury, of arts, of letters, of power,—in a word, to produce and let loose a marvelous and formidable beast, well armed and very hungry. At the end of a hundred years, the result is visible. They tear one another like noble lions and sleek panthers.

In the midst of this society—rather of this circus, this arena of ravenous beasts, and just as exhaustion is beginning, the foreigner* appears. They all crouch under his rod, they are driven to their dens, where they languish in secret pleasures, they grovel in loathsome vices.

Despotism, the Inquisition, and profound ignorance and open rascality; the shameless, and yet fashionable artifices of buffoons; and *scapins*; † wretchedness and lice—such is the consummation of the Italian renaissance.

Like the ancient civilizations of Greece and Rome, ‡ like the modern civilizations of Provence and Spain, like all the civilizations of the South, it bears within itself a fatal defect, a false and mischievous conception of man. The Germans of the sixteenth century have judged correctly concerning it, as did the Teutons of the fourth.

With their plain common sense, with their practical honesty, they have put their finger on the secret plague spot. Society cannot be founded on the worship of pleasure and of force; it can

*Luther.

†Let us rejoice that the English language contains no synonym for some of these Italian words. *Cheats* is a term approaching as nearly in signification to it as any other.

‡From Homer to Constantine the ancient city has been an association of freemen, which has for its end the subjugation and use of other freemen.

be established only on a regard for Liberty and Justice. In order that the grand renovation of humanity, which, in the sixteenth century, rouses all Europe, may possibly become complete and lasting, it was necessary that, encountering another race, it should develop a different religion; and that, out of a more wholesome conception of life, it should bring a better form of civilization.

THE GERMAN MANNERS ADAPTED TO THE REFORMATION.

So the Reformation was born by the side of the Renaissance. In fact, it is itself a *renaissance*, adapted to the genius of the Germanic peoples. That which distinguishes this genius from others, is its moral prepossessions. More rude and heavy; more addicted to gluttony and drunkenness,* they are at the same time more influenced by conscience, firmer in defending their belief, more disposed to self-denial and sacrifice.

Such their climate has fashioned them, and such they have remained from Tacitus to Luther, from Knox to Gustavus Adolphus and Kant. In a long time and under the constant impression of centuries, their phlegmatic bodies, led by gross nourishment and strong potations, have become torpid, the nerves less excitable, the muscles less alert, action less promptly follows desire,

*In proof of this remark, the author refers to the manners of German students, and quotes a passage from Misson—a traveler who wrote in A. D. 1700. We subjoin this passage because it affords a corrective to the impression which our author's words convey, that their climate fashioned the Germans for reformation, since it shows that climate was quite as truly fostering drinking habits, that foe, which, next to papal corruption, is most hostile to all serious morality and religion. The same foe, which, to-day in America, is clasping hands with popery in alliance against the principles and institutions which were vindicated in the Reformation:

"The Germans," says Misson, "are, as you know, strange drinkers. No people in the world is more affectionate, more civil, more attentive to friends, but on the other hand they have terrible customs in the matter of drink. They drink while doing everything. Before one has had time to say three words at a visit, he is all taken aback at seeing a collation brought, or, at least, several bottles of wine and a plate of bread crusts cut fine, with pepper and salt,—fatal preparation for hard drinkers.

You must never refuse the glass that is offered, and of course must drain it to the very last drop. Then you must immediately propose the health of some one. So it is a perpetual round. To drink, in Germany, means to drink unceasingly.

life is more sluggish and spiritless, the soul less delicate and less sensitive to corporeal influences. The mud, the rain, the snow, the abundance of unpleasant and gloomy sights, the absence of lively and delicate incitements to sensible enjoyments, compel man to maintain a militant attitude. Heroes in barbarous times, workers to-day, they endure annoyances as they used to provoke wounds. Now, as then, it is nobleness of soul that moves them. Shut up to inward enjoyments, they find there a world,—that of moral beauty. Their beau-ideal occupies another place. It is no longer situated among forms, composed of power and pleasure, but transferred to the region of sentiments, composed of truth, of right, of devotion to duty, of fidelity to law. What though it snow and blow; what though the tempest rage in the black forest of firs or over the dismal surges, among screaming sea-birds; what though the man, stiffened and reddened with cold, while immuring himself in his hut, in the light of a smoky lamp and by a fire of turf, may find for his repast only a plate of sour-kroust or a piece of salted beef; no matter, another realm opens to compensate him—that of inward content. His wife is faithful and loving. His children around his hearth are spelling out the old family Bible. He is master, protector, benefactor at home, honored by others, respected by himself; and if, perchance, he should have need of aid, he knows that he will see his neighbors array themselves bravely and faithfully at his side.

THE REFORMATION AND THE RENAISSANCE IN ART.

The reader has only to look at the portraits of the time, those of Italy and of Germany, to distinguish at a glance, the two races and the two civilizations, the revival of art and the Reformation: On the one side, some half-naked official in Roman costume; some cardinal in his gown sumptuously adorned, reclining on a richly carved easy chair ornamented with heads of lions, wreaths of foliage and dancing fauns, himself dissimulating and voluptuous, with the subtle and sinister look of a man of the world, cunningly inclined and watching: on the other side some bold Doctor, a theologian, a plain man, badly painted, stiff as a stake in his single robe of black baize, among huge doctrinal tomes with strong clasps, evidently a hard student, but also an ex-

emplary husband and father. Consider now the great artist of that age, a laborious and conscientious worker, a friend of Luther and a genuine Northerner, Albert Durer. *

He, too, like Raphael and Titian, has his ideal, from which spring by hundreds, living figures and delineations of manners, but how natural and original! There is no effort after blooming and jocund beauty. His * * figures are only * * * like those of his neighbor the carpenter, and of his garrulous acquaintance the sausage-woman. The heads of uncultivated or common persons, embossed with tireless pains, stand out upon the copper, often furrowed by the fatigue of constant toil, generally sad, careworn and patient, sorely and pitifully distorted by the necessities of actual life.

From this minute copy of unsightly reality, what is the way of escape? To what region in the world of fancy will the grand, melancholy imagination betake itself? To visions replete with profound ideas; to the mournful contemplation, the dim conception of the grand enigma of human destiny; to the groping reflection which in the blackness of bristling words among obscure ~~embellishments~~ and fantastic figures endeavors to grasp truth and justice. Nor does he endeavor in vain. Already has he found them. If chastity is anywhere in the world, it is in the Madonnas that incessantly recur under his burin. * * * They are not only innocent, they are virtuous. The child in their arms fills all their thoughts. The discreet German housewife, shut up forever by her choice and her nature to domestic duties and enjoyments, lives entirely in the profound sincerity, the serious, impregnable loyalty of her attitudes and glances.

*Durer, born 13 years before Luther, was a kind of Father of German Art, a favorite with royalty, as well as with the common people, and with all the artists and learned men of his time. As a portrait painter, he was eminent for "catching the exact expression of the features and delineating all the passions." As a writer he aided to "elevate and purify the German language." The fame of his paintings, which procured for him the appointment of court painter and the painter's coat of arms, was hardly greater than that of his engravings on copper and wood. Among the best of these are figures of Fortune, Melancholy, and of Adam and Eve in Paradise, together with more than sixty delineations of scenes in the crucifixion and fifteen plates illustrating the Apocalypse. His letters, as well as the subjects of his engravings, attest his sympathy for Luther and the Reformation.

But this is not all ; by the side of peaceful virtue, he has figured the militant virtue. It is the real Christ, the pale, crucified One, weakened and torn by agony, whose blood drops more and more slowly each minute in proportion as the feebler palpitations announce the last pang of a life departing.

Not here, as among the Italian masters, is it a spectacle to refresh the eyes, a mere overwhelming of drapery, an arranging of groups ; the heart in its most profound depths is smitten by the sight ; it is the persecuted Just One, dying because the world hates justice ; the powerful, the men of the world are there, indifferent and mocking ; a plumed knight, a portly burgomaster with hands crossed behind his back is keeping guard, but all the rest are weeping. In the background, some women have swooned ; angels, full of grief are coming to receive in cups the sacred blood as it trickles down, and the stars are veiling their faces in the sky that they may not behold so enormous a crime.

There are other groups conceived in the same spirit. Tortures upon tortures. The real martyrs by the side of the true Christ, resigned, speechless, with the gentle look of the first believers. They are bound to an old tree and the executioner tears them with a whip armed with iron nails. A bishop, stretched at full length, is praying with clasped hands, while one is boring into his eye with a gimlet. In the background, among scraggy trees and tangled branches, a group of men and women are driven with cruel blows, to climb the steep side of a hill, and from the top, are forced at the point of the lance, to leap from the brink of a precipice. Here and there roll heads and lifeless trunks, and besides those which have been decapitated, distorted bodies impaled on poles hang waiting for the croaking ravens.

All these evils must be endured to testify to the faith and establish justice. But there is a Guardian, an Avenger on high, a Judge all powerful, who has his appointed time. That time will surely come. Already the rays of the final dawning are flashing across the darkness of the age. High in the heaven appears, in his shining robe, the angel guiding the charging hosts, the flaming swords, the inevitable arrows of the avengers that come to trample down and punish the earth. People are beaten down

beneath their hoofs; and already the jaws of the monster of the pit are grinding the heads of impious prelates.*

This is the popular poem of conscience; and since the days of the apostles, men have never formed a conception of it more sublime and more complete. For conscience like other things has its poem. By a natural perversion the omnipotent idea of justice overwhelms the soul, covers the heavens and enthrones there a new Deity; a God to be revered; neither the impassible intelligence which serves the philosophers for an explanation of the visible system of things; nor that tolerant Divinity—a kind of constitutional Sovereign whom Voltaire reached at the end of a process of reasoning; whose praises Beranger sings, as complimenting an equal, and whom he salutes “without asking him for anything.”

THE RELIGIOUS CONCEPTION MARKING THE REFORMATION.

It is the just Judge, impeccable and stern, who requires of man an exact account of his visible conduct, and of all his invisible sentiments, who tolerates no forgetting, no neglect, no failure, before whom every beginning of weakness or of fault is a crime and a treason. What is our righteousness before this perfect righteousness? Men lived without fear, in the times of ignorance. At most, when they felt themselves guilty, they would seek absolution from the priest; to make it sure, they would buy a costly indulgence. There was the scale of prices; there it is still. Tetzels, the Dominican, declares that all sins are washed away, “as soon as the money sounds in the chest.” Be the crime what it may the man is quit of it; “even though he had violated the holy virgin,” he would return to his home pure and certain of paradise.

Unfortunately the pardon-mongers do not know that all is changed, and that the soul has become conscious that it is defiled. It no longer recites the words mechanically like a catechism; it pronounces them anxiously as a truth. In the universal renaissance, in the mighty awakening of all human thought, the Ger-

*Such are the ideas mirrored in the collection of the engravings on wood of Albert Durer. Every reader of Luther's “Table Talk” will remember that his imagination was no less busy than Durer's with the scenes of the Apocalypse.

manic idea of duty grows with others. When one speaks of righteousness now, it is no longer a dead phrase which he repeats: it is a living conception which he produces. He perceives the object which that conception represents, and feels the apprehension by which it is awakened. He does not merely receive it, he makes it. It is his work, and his master. It springs from him, and he obeys it. "These words, righteous and the righteousness of God," said Luther, "were a thunder in my conscience. I trembled to hear them, I said to myself if God is righteous, He will punish me." As soon as the conscience has discovered the perfect ideal, the least failures seem to it crimes, and man, condemned by his own convictions, falls overwhelmed with terror, "and, as it were, swallowed up."* "I, who was leading the life of an irreproachable monk," says Luther again, "still, for all that, felt in myself the unquiet conscience of a sinner, without any hope of making amends for my lack of obedience toward God. * * * Then said I, 'am I indeed the only one who ought to be in sadness of soul?' * * Ah! what specters and horrible figures did I see! In this alarm conscience believes that the horrible day is coming. 'The end of the world is at hand'"—* * * * Under these agonies the body sinks. During fourteen days Luther was in such a condition that he could neither eat, nor drink, nor sleep. "Day and night," with his eyes fixed on the writings of St. Paul, he was contemplating his Judge. That is the tragedy which is acted in all Protestant souls—the eternal tragedy of conscience—and the result of it is a new religion.

For nature does not of itself, and without assistance, come out of this abyss. In itself, "it is so corrupted that it feels no desire

*Calvin, the logician of the Reformation, well explains the sequence of Protestant doctrines. 1. The conception of the perfect God—the inflexible Judge. 2. The alarm of conscience. 3. The helplessness and corruption of nature. 4. The advent of free grace. 5. The rejection of all rites and ceremonies.

"As long as pride is rooted in us, it seems to us that we are just and whole, wise and holy, unless we shall be convinced, by clear evidence, of our injustice, defilement, folly and impurity. For we are not convinced of it while we regard only ourselves, and do not fix our eyes also upon God, who is the only rule according to which we ought to conduct, and by which we are to weigh ourselves." (And then) "he who has vaunted his virtue will discover himself to be only frailty."

for heavenly things. * * * There is nothing in it, before God, save selfish desire." Good intentions do not come from it. "For, frightened at the sight of his sin, man would not know how to set himself about doing well, however alarmed and anxious he might be. On the other hand, overcome and crushed by the power of sin, he falls into despair and into hatred of God, as happened to Cain, to Saul and Judas;" so that, left to himself, he can find in himself only the passion and despair of a hopeless soul, or a demon. In vain would he try to ransom himself by good works. Our good deeds, are not pure; even if they were, they would not take away the defilement of former sins, nor would they remove the original corruption of the heart; they are only the branches and flowers and the hereditary taint is in the tree itself.

Man must descend into his own heart—beneath the obedience of the letter, and legal uprightness. He must pass from the kingdom of law into that of grace; from compulsory rectitude into the obedience of spontaneous affection. It is necessary that beneath the primary nature which was bearing him only towards selfishness and the things of earth, a second nature should be developed, bearing him towards self-renunciation and heavenly things. Neither my works, nor my righteousness, nor the works and righteousness of any other creature, or of all creatures, can work in me this extraordinary change. Only One can do it,—the Holy God, the sacrificed Just One, the Redeemer, the Restorer, Jesus, my Saviour, imputing to me his righteousness, turning upon me his merits, overwhelming my sin under his sacrifice. "Mankind are a mass of ruin,* doomed to hell. Lord Jesus, save me; choose me in this mass. I have no right to it, there is nothing in me that is not abominable. This prayer even, it is Thou who dost inspire and make it in me. But I weep, my bosom heaves and my heart is broken. Oh, Lord, let me feel that I am redeemed, pardoned, thine elect, thy servant; give me thy grace, thy faithfulness!" "Then," says Luther, "I felt myself clean and it seemed to me that I was entering the open portals of Paradise."

What remains to be done after this renovation of the heart?

*The words of Augustine.

Nothing, all religion is in that ; other things must be diminished or suppressed. It is a personal transaction, an intimate dialogue between man and God, where only two things are in question,—the real word of God, that which is given in the Scriptures, and the emotions of the human heart, as the word of God awakens them and keeps them alive. We discard the outward observances, by which it has been attempted to supply the place of that intercourse of the invisible soul with its invisible Judge. I mean the penances, the fasts, the bodily inflictions, the lents, the vows of celibacy and of poverty, the beads, the indulgences. Rites are good only to stifle living piety under mechanical works.

We discard those intermediate agents which have been employed to hinder direct intercourse between the soul and God, that is, the saints, the virgin, the pope, the priests. Whoever worships them or obeys them is an idolater. Neither the saints nor the virgin can convert us and save us. It is God alone who through Christ regenerates us and saves us. Neither the Pope nor the priests can fix for us our creed, or forgive us our sins.

THE REFORMED IDEA OF THE CHURCH.

God alone teaches us by the Scriptures and absolves us by his grace. No more pilgrimages no more relics ; away with traditions, away with auricular confessions.

A new church appears and with it, a new worship ; the ministers of religion perform a different service, and the worship of God takes a different form ; the authority of the clergy is restricted, and the pomp of the service is diminished ; they are restricted and diminished more and more in proportion as the primary idea of the new theology is more controlling ; so that there are sects in which they disappear altogether. The priest descends from that high place in which the right of forgiving sins and regulating belief, had elevated him above the heads of the laity. He re-enters society, he marries like them and tends to become their equal ; he is only a man wiser and more pious than the rest and their chosen counsellor. His church is a temple void of images, of ornaments and ceremonies ; sometimes entirely bare, simply a place of assembly where, between white walls elevated in a single pulpit, a man in a black dress, speaks without

action, reads a passage from the Bible, leads in singing a hymn in which the congregation join.*

There is one other place of prayer as little decorated, and not less venerated,—the domestic hearth, where, each evening, the father, in the presence of his servants and his children, reads the scripture and pronounces aloud the prayer. Austere, yet free religion, purged from all sensuality, and ceremonial obedience, wholly inward and personal, which is instituted by the awakening of conscience and can be established only among those races, where each one finds naturally in himself the conviction that he alone is responsible for his works and always bound by his duties. But, (the translator ventures to add,) it will yet be established “in every nation.” Of this we are assured not alone by the promises of Scripture but by the fact, known and admitted by the wisest and the best of every race and of every age, that the Creator has planted in the soul of each man the faculty that originates this conviction. Every man finds it within himself, unless his eye is blinded by the glare of a false philosophy or his judgment perverted by the deceitfulness of sin.

*A practice which still prevails among Lutheran ministers, making the singing—though not an art-recreation—a real and inspiring part of the worship. (Tr.)

ART. VIII.—CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS. By J. P. Lange, D. D., and the Rev. F. R. Fay. Translated from the German, by J. F. Hurst, D. D., with additions by P. Schaff, D. D., and the Rev. M. B. Kiddle. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869. Octavo, pp. 453.

It is quite too late now to praise Lange's Commentary, and it is hardly needful to speak in detail of its peculiar characteristics and its rare and striking excellences. Scholars, both in Europe and in this country, have given the work a strong approval in plan and execution, and clergymen and Sabbath school teachers are finding the value and interest of the successive volumes such as to set this Commentary, in their estimation, far above every other. We have heretofore pointed out its peculiar qualities and expressed our high sense of its worth and adaptation.

This volume, devoted to the leading epistle of the New Testament, exhibits all the excellences which the plan holds. The epistle itself is full of significance, since it brings out so fully the Pauline theology, and has been the occasion of so much earnest controversy. The very best results of critical, exegetical and patristic study appear fully exhibited in this volume. Whatever can be made to throw light upon the confessedly hard passages in this epistle, is sought and applied. Learning and labor are amply represented in the exegetical and critical portions of the work, and the doctrinal and homiletical suggestions deserve no little respect. But one of the most prominent features of the present volume appears in the extended Introduction, covering more than fifty of the large, closely-printed pages. Half of it is devoted to the consideration of Paul's epistles in general, and the other half to the discussion of whatever specially pertains to this epistle to the Romans. In this part of the work, the great Apostle's life is taken up in detail, his training, his associations, his contact with other men, his missionary tours, the characteristics of the nations, laws, literature and religious systems with which he was forced to deal, his own personal qualities and the traits of his religious character,—all these pass under review. Then follows an analysis of the contents of the several epistles, a discussion of the fundamental ideas out from which they grow, and the specific objects which were sought in their composition. In the special consideration of the epistle to the Romans, we

have a view of Rome and its significance as it was in Paul's day; then, of the Christian congregation there, to which the epistle was addressed; next, a discussion of its authenticity, and finally of its occasion, purpose and contents. A large amount of valuable information is thus brought together, and the student is prepared to use the Commentary which follows, with increased intelligence, receptiveness and profit.

It is a great work which the Messrs. Scribner & Co. are thus reproducing for the use of American students of the Bible. It is somewhat extensive and costly, to be sure, but it will prove, when completed, no mean exegetical and theological library. The American edition is rendered more valuable than the German, by the important additions of Prof. Schaff, a man who happily blends the minute and extensive learning of Germany with a rare Christian simplicity and an eminently devout and chastened spirit. Every minister, who knows the meaning of study, the value of fresh ideas, and the inspiration springing from a clearer apprehension of a sentence in Scripture, will be not a little richer, in the highest sense, for having such a work as this on the shelf of his book-case or at his right hand on the study table.

SERMONS, preached in St. James's Chapel, York Street, London. By the Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, M. A., Honorary Chaplain in ordinary to the Queen. Boston: Fieldes, Osgood & Co. 1869. 12 mo. pp. 323.

Mr. Brooke is the Biographer of F. W. Robertson, and, like him the occupant of a pulpit in the Established Church of England, and a fearless, vigorous, independent thinker. He recites the creed, assents to the thirty-nine articles, and uses the liturgy; but when he begins to preach, there is certainly very little to suggest the stereotyped methods of speech that one looks for in the pulpits of the Establishment. These sermons are quite out of the ordinary line. Lacking the depth, the fire, the throbbing force and the marvelous suggestiveness of Robertson, Mr. Brooke is still a man of marked originality, a stimulant to thinkers, a keen inspector of life, and a rare painter and interpreter of the subtler and deeper experiences that lie too far down for superficial and commonplace men to find. His style, unlike Robertson's, is finished and exact,—a piece of literary art that yields a rare pleasure. He has evidently studied the human soul more than he has the commentators, and he would be sure to attract earnest and deep-hearted men to him, who know what it is to go through great conflicts of opinion, and to find themselves every now and then baf-

fled with the problems and mysteries of life. His habits of thought are philosophical and scientific; he rarely ties himself in the pulpit to the letter of Scripture; his interpretations and applications of passages would perpetually annoy the textual expositors; and his sermons would not satisfy the hearer who insists upon the frequent and emphatic statement of the points that occupy the central place in the evangelical system. Indeed, he does not seem to regard that as the thing to do in preaching, and there are now and then sentiments expressed that raise a serious question over his full orthodoxy. He appears to be a restorationist in belief, he says some things about miracles that would not pass unchallenged, and while he asserts the divinity of Christ in strong terms, his method of discussing the development of the Messiah may well raise the question whether he holds that opinion in such a sense as would satisfy any pronounced Trinitarian. So much must be said in justice to the truth; but it must also be as frankly added, that the larger portion of these sermons are among the most marked and quickening utterances of the pulpit which have got into print since the fifth volume of Robertson came out from the same Publishing House. Some of them are wonderful for their insight and elevation; most of them are fresh and full of marrow; not one of them could be carefully and receptively read without making a deep impression. They are unique and powerful. They are formed on no model, and they scarcely admit of being copied in style and method. They need to be read with discrimination, as does everything of the kind; and it may be added that only discriminating minds will be likely to read many pages. Lovers of commonplace, seekers after something startling, and admirers of a style that is florid and sensational, will here find little or nothing to their taste. But thoughtful readers, who love strong meat, and prize what reaches the quiet depths and flashes new meaning over familiar things, will welcome this book with some misgiving, perhaps, but surely with high satisfaction.

SAINT PAUL. By Ernest Renan. Membre de l'Institut. Author of "The Life of Jesus," etc. Translated from the Original French by Ingersoll Lockwood. New York: G. W. Carleton. 1869. 12mo. pp. 422.

One does not need the testimony of this book in order to know that the author would write of the great apostle in a critical, bold, learned, artistic, interesting and self-contradictory way. He is a skeptic, a scholar, a poet, a rhetorician and a genius, all in one, and his books thoroughly photograph the whole of his many-sided nature. He is frank and unhesitating, always expressing his thought, and

while the reader is under his spell, even his wildest fancies wear the semblance of truth, and his most audacious denials appear half brave and almost beautiful.

This volume is a continuation of his work of criticism upon the New Testament records and their chief personages, on the precise line of the first work, *Vie de Jesus*; and it possesses the same merits and the same faults as its predecessors. There is some genuine and valuable criticism; some real light shed upon the ancient life of the lands and cities which the apostle traversed; some photographing of the scenes out of which the chief significance of passages in the epistles springs, that at once expounds and vitalizes what before was dark and dull.

But as a whole, the volume will neither win converts to the author's views nor add to his reputation. As before, so now, he alternately lauds and denounces, mixes up criticism and declamation, endorses the New Testament record and then kicks it contemptuously aside, and seems to swing back and forth from the position of a devout worshiper to that of a desperate iconoclast. He says many just and noble things of Paul, but seems especially to enjoy finding fault with him. He speaks of his "ever-increasing pretensions, his pride, his need of being absolute chief;" then of "his austerity and even his ugliness; says of him at Athens,—“the prejudices of the iconoclastic Jew, insensible to plastic beauties, blinded him,” and, apostrophizing the statues of the gods and goddesses, he cries out, “Ah! the error of this ugly little Jew will prove your death-warrant;” says that “the anger of Paul knew no bounds;” and allows himself to add, that “he even feigned, in accordance with a pretense which was customary with him, to be obeying an order from heaven and to have had a revelation.” Of his epistles, he writes as follows:

At times animated, harsh, polished, malicious, sarcastic; then suddenly tender, delicate, almost roguish and cajoling, with the expression happy and fine to the highest degree; skillful in varying his style with reticences, reservations, infinite precautions, malicious allusions, dissembled ironies, he was destined to excel in a style which, above all, exacts impulse. The epistolary style of Paul is the most personal that ever existed. Do not think that this ascendant was won by flattery, by gentleness. No. Paul was churlish, ugly at times, passionate. He in no wise resembled Jesus.

This is a specimen of the tone and style, though there are better and truer things in the book than these which we have quoted. Judged on its literary side, the volume is certainly a noticeable result, and if it had not been preceded by the “Life of Jesus,” it would naturally make a sensation. As it is, it will be read in much the same spirit as one would look at Dore's pictures; it will not change the thinking

of many minds, nor secure any permanent place among the books that are regarded as really important in their bearing upon the question of the Evidences, nor materially aid in any way to answer the question of Dilke, "What is truth?" Luke's unambitious sketch of Paul will be read with a devout faith long after Renan's elaborate biography and critique is left unopened in the skeptic's library.

THE CHARACTER, CLAIMS AND PRACTICAL WORKINGS OF FREEMASONRY.
By Rev. C. G. Finney. Cincinnati: Western Tract & Book Society. 16mo.
pp. 272.

This discussion of Masonry is a book such as might have been expected from a man of such thoroughly positive qualities and pronounced opinions as the former President of Oberlin College is known to be. He has been a member of the order, he has studied the subject in the light of Christian obligation, he has become thoroughly satisfied of the evil tendencies and results of the organization, he believes that it is succeeding in its effort for standing and power by false pretenses and through the misconceptions, credulity and apathy of the Christian public; and, hence, he takes up his pen and enters the lists against it with a real knightly valor, an intense religious conviction, and a resolute straightforwardness every way worthy of the man. Of the thorough sincerity with which he addresses himself to this task there is no room for doubt; that he speaks with a careful regard to the evidence adduced it is impossible to question, and that he makes a strong plea, not one of his intelligent opponents can afford to deny. It will be far easier to push the book aside and attempt to divert attention from it, by calling it a piece of well-meant extravagance, than to meet it with a frank and manly reply. Until this last thing is attempted and done, members of the Masonic Fraternity need not wonder nor complain if the judgment and conscience of a large part of the Christian public unite in a quiet or even a vehement protest against it. A man like Prof. Finney is above all suspicion of misstatement and unfairness for the sake of making out a case. He certainly appears to write from an ample knowledge, and his points are made with so much force and sincerity that they deserve the fairest examination and a manly reply. The volume contains very little information beyond what has been afforded by other writers, but it is here arrayed and used in the venerable author's own peculiar and pungent style. The book will be read. Will it be properly answered?

THE SECRET OF SWEDENBORG: Being an elucidation of his doctrine of the Divine Natural Humanity. By Henry James. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 1869. Octavo. pp. 243.

Mr. James has undertaken a task which greatly needs performing. It is a long time since Swedenborg lived, dreamed, rhapsodized, wrote and died. Everywhere he is recognized as a man of eminent talent, varied learning and irreproachable character. His philosophic and scientific works were creditable. But his views of religion were vague, misty and difficult of comprehension. He has had more or less disciples, and he has them still, who agree in representing him as a rare and divinely inspired seer, whose visions opened to him the mysteries of the spiritual world, and whose words hold the quintessence of religious truth. But when they attempt to interpret his utterances to the masses of mankind, they often contradict both their master, each other and themselves. At the end of the exposition the spiritual sense often remains hidden, and the comments of the exponents need a commentary not less than does the text with which they have been dealing.

Mr. James is one of the ablest of Swedenborg's disciples to be found in this country, if indeed the discipleship can be allowed. He is a thinker, something of a scholar, knows how to write in a vigorous, nervous way, and is manifestly a man of strong convictions which he plainly and unhesitatingly avows. He glorifies the great seer whose secret he proposes to unfold,—i. e., he glorifies him in words full of eulogy, and in frequent incidental references to him, as though his opinions, once discovered, were the climax of human wisdom and should mark the end of religious controversy. But we have serious doubts respecting the accuracy of many of his interpretations. The disciple seems to us more daring as well as more dogmatic than the master. He appears to be developing his own opinions of religion from the starting-point which the "Celestial Arcana" afforded him. He is often drawing inferences while professing to be recording dogmas. Swedenborg supplies the text, but it is Mr. James who preaches the sermon; and to us the discourse not unfrequently appears at war with the passage which it promises to elucidate and apply. And while Mr. James can write with terseness and point, he actually does write in the free use of bewildering verbiage and provoking obscurity. The language of metaphysics abounds; the language of common life is greatly lacking. The German transcendentalists are freely illustrated; the directness and simplicity of the evangelists are practically set at naught all through these twenty-six chapters. And yet we are ready to admit that Mr. James has really given us the nearest ap-

proach to a clear and connected statement of the main points in the theology of the new Jerusalem church that we have yet seen. That statement is far enough from being simple and readily comprehensible, and the theology is a long way removed from that of Paul. Its obscurity will prevent its intelligent acceptance by the cultivated intellect, and its lack of reasonableness and scripturalness will hinder its endorsement by the popular heart. We had marked many passages with a view of presenting an outline of the thought here followed, but we can not spare the space at present. To the critical religious student the book will have both an interest and value; to the ordinary reader, very little.

DIARY REMINISCENCES, AND CORRESPONDENCE OF HENRY CRABB ROBINSON, Barrister-at-Law, F. S. A. Selected and edited by Thomas Sadler, Ph. D. In two volumes. Boston, Fields, Osgood & Co. 1869. 12mo. pp. 496, 555.

Few works of the class to which these books belong, have appeared during the last quarter of a century, that had more of agreeable entertainment to offer than will be found within the covers of these goodly volumes. Mr. Robinson represents a school of literary men which has never been large, and which has now only an occasional representative. Born in 1775, and dying in 1867, his life covers the period within which most of the distinguished men and women lived that have given body and form to our modern literature. He knew these men and women as few other persons have known them, and he speaks of them on these pages with a frank simplicity of style, a rare discrimination, a genial courtesy, a hearty friendship and a dignified freedom that are peculiarly charming. He seems to have been drawn at once into intimate and grateful fellowship with all classes of eminent men, who received him with the most thorough unreserve, and were glad to put him on the list of special friends. He kept so full a diary, noted his thoughts and impressions so carefully, maintained so extensive a correspondence, and preserved what he had written with so much care, that his papers tell the story of his life, and exhibit his estimates of the marked men whom he met and of the subjects that occupied his thought, in the most unmistakable ways. The editor seems to have exercised admirable judgment in making selections from the immense mass of matter put into his hands, and he has filled these thousand pages with just such material as exhibits the subject in his various moods, and gives us most agreeable glimpses of many men in their common life whom we have been wont to see chiefly in the full dress of public display and in all the majesty of authorship.—He tells us something of such persons as Coleridge, Flaxman, Southey,

Hazlitt, Talfourd, De Stael, Lafayette, Schlegel, Lamb, Clarkson, De Quincey, Wordsworth, Moore, Rogers, Hare, O'Connell, Macaulay, Goethe, Tieck, Arnold, Sidney Smith, Bunsen, Robertson, Lady Byron, &c. His diary is wonderfully simple and pleasant, his reports of interviews and conversations are often piquant and racy, though never overstepping delicacy and propriety, his recorded incidents are pleasant and illustrative of character, his criticisms are often free and keen, though seldom profound and exhaustive, and the agreeable information of a literary sort that he has here supplied us, renders us grateful for his service, and the manner in which it is done puts us at once into real sympathy with what is both beautiful and noble in his character. The volumes are sure to circulate widely in every literary sphere.

BIBLE ILLUSTRATIONS : or, Original Readings on Sacred History, Biography, Geography, Antiquities and Theology. By John Kitto, D. D., F. S. A. Eight volumes in four. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870. 12mo.

This work of the eminent biblical scholar and clergyman has too many and too great merits, and has been too thoroughly approved by many of the best people in two hemispheres, to need at this late day either labored defense or high-wrought compliment. It has had a wide circulation, and while it does not aim at the critical exegesis of texts, or attempt to supply the place of a formal commentary, yet it has really done more in many instances, and especially where it has been read regularly in the family according to the author's design, to bring out the real meaning of the sacred text and impress its religious lessons, than many other works in which the vast learning and inharmonious opinions of the commentators have been arrayed. Two years would be occupied in going through these volumes, and so through the Bible, by one who should follow Dr. Kitto's arrangement for daily readings, and every day would add something to the reader's biblical knowledge, and at the end of the year it would be a matter of surprise if the interest in the Scriptures were not materially deepened, and if the knowledge of them had not become far more definite and practical than before. Critical scholarship and devoutness of spirit are most happily combined in these volumes, and the reader will not fail to find food for both mind and heart. It is a convenience and a means of economy to the purchaser that the publishers have issued this new edition, in which the eight volumes are bound up in four, without producing anything cumbrous or interfering in the least with good taste. There is nothing else in the same department which we can more heartily

commend for general use, and there is certainly nothing else that can be had for anything like the same amount of money.

THE POLAR WORLD : A popular description of Man and Nature in the Arctic and Antarctic regions of the globe. By Dr. G. Hartwig, author of "The Sea and its living Wonders," etc. With additional chapters and one hundred and sixty-three illustrations. New York: Harper and Bros. 1869. Royal octavo. pp. 486.

What has long been desired is at length supplied in this elegant and profoundly interesting volume,—that is, a reasonably full account of whatever discovery has brought to light in the polar world, from the earliest to the latest explorations, and a classified statement of the facts that have been collected and the laws that have been found prevailing in the territory around the northern and southern poles, and all brought within a reasonable compass and price. Dr. Hartwig has done all this for us, in a manner that leaves almost nothing to be supplied. So far from being a mere compilation, or a book of dry details, we have here a narrative scarcely less fresh and magnetic than that of Dr. Kane himself, and yet everything is subordinated to the single purpose to state, without any unnecessary prolixity, all that is essential to our understanding of the features and life of that part of our globe which so many modern heroes have struggled to explore.—The whole story is admirably told, the many expeditions sent out are followed to the end, the aims and hopes and experiences and failures and triumphs of brave men are exhibited with great clearness and appreciation, the natives of the various portions of the arctic territory are shown in both their better and their worse aspects; and when the book is finished, the reader has in his possession nearly everything that he would be able to learn if he were to wade through the considerable library of material that has been accumulating during the last twenty-five years. The mechanical features of the volume are of a high order, and the numerous and spirited engravings illuminate the text, photograph the various phases of the country, and make polar life appear full of vividness and reality. No other single volume, devoted to the subject, approaches this in fullness, interest and value.

MENTAL PHILOSOPHY: embracing the three departments of the Intellect, Sensibilities and Will. By Thomas C. Upham, D. D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Bowdoin College, etc., etc. In two volumes. Vol. I.: *The Intellect, with an Appendix on Language.* Vol. II.: *The Sensibilities and Will.* New York: Harper and Brothers. 1869. 12mo. pp. 561, 705.

Prof. Upham has been long known through his *Mental Philosophy*, as well as by means of his large contributions to our higher religious

literature. His eminence in the sphere of scholarship has only added to his efficiency in the domain of Christian faith and experience. The critical student and the comprehensive philosopher have blended, both in his life and his service, with the devout believer who bows daily before the Christ crucified and risen, as the supreme embodiment of truth, the sublimest phenomenon of the universe, and the central fact of human history. But his *Mental Philosophy* is the product of study, scholarship, reflection and experience. The fact that it has been, and still is, so extensively used as a text-book in our institutions of learning, of various grades, proves its value and adaptation. Latterly, it has been somewhat criticised as failing to give proper prominence to the views of the Continental metaphysicians respecting the internal source of human ideas. He is complained of for being too largely a disciple of Locke and an ally of the sensational school. But his chapter on the Intuitive or Suggestional Power, shows that he has not overlooked the claims of what has been called transcendentalism, and that he finds an important element of truth in it. His work, though not exhaustive or remarkably profound, is clear, discriminating and instructive. Its classifications and definitions are worthy of praise.—He never bewilders the student by a perplexing style, by learned speculations, or by long, critical digression. He explores the domain of the mind in the search after facts and principles and laws, thoroughly content when he has found and exhibited them. And, hence, the work is especially adapted to those who are beginning the study of this science.

The new edition is greatly improved in its details. It has received just such modifications and touches as the constant study, reflection and experience of the class-room, during many years, suggested to the author. And the gains are real and many. The publishers have issued it in a style that ought to be satisfactory to all reasonable purchasers.

SONGS FOR CHRISTIAN WORSHIP. in the Chapel and Family: Selected from the "Songs of the Church." By Rev. C. S. Robinson. New York & Chicago: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1869. Octavo. pp. 301.

THE MOUNT ZION COLLECTION OF SACRED AND SECULAR MUSIC: Consisting of tunes, anthems, Singing-school exercises, and songs for the Sabbath school and social circle. By Theodore E. Perkins. Same Publishers. pp. 384.

SABBATH CAROLS: A new collection of music and hymns. Prepared for the use of Sabbath schools by Theodore E. Perkins. Same Publishers. 12mo. pp. 144.

Judging simply from the number of new collections of tunes and

hymns for use in every sphere where Christian worship is maintained and where worship may hope for a recognition, one might be pardoned for believing that we are fast becoming a nation of singers, and that the Psalmist's exhortation is stirring the whole land as he cries, "Let the people praise thee, O God; yea, let all the people praise thee." And the growing interest in vocal music is a cheering feature in our life. There is promise in the increasing dissatisfaction with the monopoly of choirs and quartettes. The orchestra of the sanctuary is felt to be no proper place for the artistic display that constitutes the chief attraction on the stage of the opera. Praise by proxy is more and more regarded as something else than the praise which God waits for when a congregation would vocalize its gratitude and adoration. Singing is found possible, and not extremely difficult, for most people whose vocal mechanism is complete and whose tympanum has a fair share of healthy nerves. It is, moreover, a wholesome thing for both the body and the spirit. It gives the lungs normal exercise, it socializes retiring and exclusive natures, it puts down rising passions, it lightens the load of care, it soothes a worried and feverish soul, it adds sensibility to the esthetic nature, and it gives a keener appreciation of the infinite and perfect harmonies that flow from the life of faith and the experiences of heaven. True, music may be perverted, like every other gift of God, but the interest taken in supplying the people with hymns and tunes of a substantial sort, and especially in inducing the old and the young alike to join in the songs of the sanctuary, the Sabbath school and the family, is an encouraging fact, and every year is witnessing an improvement in the collections that are supplied. The mere religious doggerel that gained a temporary and local popularity, is being weeded out of our hymn-books, and the mere jolly, characterless ditties that threatened mischief in our social meetings and Sabbath schools, are being sent away, with perhaps an occasional sigh of regret, but certainly with an immense and general satisfaction. Whatever aids in this work of making good hymns and music popular, and of dismissing worthless rhymes and bar-room melodies to exile and forgetfulness, is to be prized and commended. We shall some day be a nation of singers; the character of our music will largely determine the question whether our songs render us a more solid or a more frivolous people.

NOV 19 1973



