THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1866.

C. Hodge

No. II.

ART. I.—*The Vicarious Sacrifice, grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 124 Grand street. 1866. 8vo. pp. 552.

JUDGING from its impression upon ourselves, we should say that this book of Dr. Bushnell is far inferior in power to his former one. That was an outburst, instinct with feeling and poetic fire. This is cold. It is addressed to the understanding. It is an attempt to justify to the reason, and in the presence of the Bible, a theory as to the work of Christ, which is the product of his imagination. It deals in analysis, in subtle distinctions, in arguments, which from the necessity of the case are sophistical, and which must be known to be false, even by those who may not see where their fallacy lies. A man undertakes a desperate task who attempts to argue against the intuitive judgments of the mind or conscience; or who strives to prove that all mankind for thousands of years, who have read and studied the Scriptures, are mistaken as to one of its most prominent and most important doctrines. The case of the Reformers affords no parallel to such an attempt in our own day. The Romanists did not admit the Scriptures to be perspicuous or designed for the people. They did not profess to believe the doctrines against which the Reformers protested,

on the authority of the Bible. They relied on the authority of the church; and the church with them was the hierarchy. The protest of the Reformers, therefore, was not against the interpretation which the people of God, with the Bible in their hands, had, on a great practical and experimental doctrine, been led with unanimity and under the inward teaching of the Spirit, to give to the sacred records. Any such attempt, we say is desperate. Every right-minded Christian would be authorized to put aside the volume in which such an experiment was made without further examination. No man is called upon, for his own sake, to refute arguments against what he knows is true. He is not bound to prove his own existence, or the existence of other men. Life is too short, and too much crowded with higher interests, to justify the waste of time in proving that white is white. Unfortunately, however, many men are not right-minded; and many more have no settled convictions on the plainest points of revealed doctrine. Hence the necessity of answering what the mass of experienced Christians feel that, so far as they are concerned, needs no answer.

A second introductory remark suggested by the perusal of Dr. Bushnell's book, is, that it contains nothing new. By which we mean, first, that it contains nothing essential to his theory, which was not contained in his former volume. This is true both as to what it denies, and as to what it affirms. Besides this, the theory concerning Christ's work propounded in this volume is not new in the history of theology. It did not originate with Dr. Bushnell. There is nothing new about it but its terminology. The reed-bird of the North is the rice-bird of the South; so the theory of the Socinians is the theory of Dr. Bushnell. Apart from the obsolete doctrine of some of the Fathers, human ingenuity has been unable to devise more than three general theories concerning the work of Christ.

The first is, that the eternal Son of God assumed our nature, fulfilled all righteousness as the substitute and representative of men, bore the curse of the law in their stead, and thus made expiation for their sins. Because his work is a full satisfaction to the justice of God designed for the recovery of

men to the image and enjoyment of God, it is represented as the most wonderful display of the wisdom, love, and especially of the grace of God, ever made to the universe; and, therefore, the most fruitful in beneficent results, being the great means which God has devised to promote the glory and blessedness of all orders of intelligences.

The second doctrine is that commonly known among us as the governmental theory. This is founded on the assumption that happiness is the highest good; that "the love of being," or the disposition to promote happiness, is not only the highest, but all virtue; and therefore that justice is only a form of benevolence. The primary end of punishment is consequently the good of God's moral government, or the prevention of the evil consequences of gratuitous forgiveness. Christ's work therefore is a satisfaction to rectoral justice; and rectoral justice is only a benevolent regard to the good of rational creatures. This doctrine flows necessarily from the view of divine justice presented by Leibnitz; and was adopted by the jurist Grotius, and assented to by his Socinian antagonists as removing their objections to the church doctrine of satisfaction. In this country it has been widely adopted as one of the modern, and American improvements in theology.

The third general theory is that which resolves the saving efficacy of Christ's work into its subjective influence. This theory comprehends many different views of the nature and design of the Redeemer's work. The three most comprehensive are the following: 1. That the work of Christ owes its power to the confirmation which it gives to important truths,—such as the immortality of the soul, the willingness of God to forgive sin, &c., &c. 2. That its power is due to the exhibition which it makes of self-sacrificing love. And 3d. The mystical doctrine of the renovation of humanity through a participation of the theanthropic life of Christ. It is to the second of these views the doctrine of Dr. Bushnell belongs. This will be rendered plain by a statement, first, of what he denies, and secondly, of what he affirms.

In the first place, he denies that any such attribute as justice belongs to the Divine character. That is, he denies that the moral excellence of God demands and renders necessary the

punishment of sin. There is an obvious distinction between righteousness and justice. The former is general rectitude or rightness; the latter is concerned in the distribution of rewards and punishment, according to the general understanding of the term; but according to Dr. Bushnell it is concerned exclusively in connecting suffering with sin as a means of the recovery of the sinner. That is, it is only benevolence in one of the modes of its exercise. He distinguishes between law before government, and law after government. He assumes that God himself is subject to the eternal law of right; so also are all rational creatures. It is supposable that a universe of such beings should exist, subject not to God, but subject with God to one and the same rule of right. Should any of these intelligent creatures sin, God would "feel himself elected" to be a ruler, to institute government. P. 244. Here comes in statute law; and, justice to enforce them, penalties, &c., all designed for redemption, or recovery of the apostates. "The problem cannot, therefore, be to satisfy, or pacify justice, but simply to recompose in the violated law the shattered, broken souls, who have thrown down both themselves and it, by their disobedience." P. 246. What he denies is, that there is any such attribute in God, which requires "an exact doing upon wrong what it deserves." P. 267. He admits that there is what he calls "a wrath-principle," in the Supreme Being, which "enables him to inflict pain without shrinking;" just as a benevolent surgeon does. But that is not justice. Hence justice and mercy are one and the same, only different in terms or modes of expression. When a regard to the welfare of the victims suffering evil leads to the exercise of kindness, we call it mercy; when it leads to the infliction of pain, we call it justice. This is the doctrine of the volume before us, on this point, covered in a wonderful amplitude of words and figures. Its thoughts are smothered in rose-leaves. The whole system of Dr. Bushnell is founded in this denial of the justice of God. There might have been, he tells us, just such a scheme of redemption as that effected by Christ, "which has nothing to do with justice proper; being related only to that *quasi* justice which is the blind effect, in moral natures, of a violation of their necessary law." The righteousness of God "never

requires him to execute justice under political analogies, save as it requires him to institute an administrative government in the same." "Law and justice might be instituted as co-factors of redemption, having it for their object simply to work with redemption, and serve the same ends with spiritual renovation." P. 248. The language which Dr. Bushnell at times allows himself to use in reference to the justice of God, must be very painful to his readers. It is language which is seldom heard except from the lips of irreligious men. We are told in representing God as just, in the ordinary sense of the term, we adopt the heathen idea of the Godhead, representing him as thirsting for vengeance, and only to be appeased by suffering.

2. In denying any such perfection as is commonly understood by justice to God, Dr. Bushnell explicitly denies that there has been any expiation of sin made by the Redeemer. Expiation he pronounces to be a purely pagan idea. He denies that it has any support from the sacrifices of the Old Testament or the didactic statements of the New. "What is expiation?" he asks. "It does not simply signify the fact that God is propitiated, but it brings in the pagan, or Latin idea (for the word is Latin), that the sacrifice offered softens God, or assuages the anger of God, as being an evil, or pain, contributed to his offended feeling." "The distinctive idea of expiation is that God is to have an evil given to him by consent, for an evil due by retribution." P. 486. "The classic and all pagan sentiments of worship, being thus corrupted by the false idea of expiation, the later Jewish commentators and Christian theologians finally took up the conception, laying claim to it as a worthy and genuine element in all sacrifices, whether those of the law, or even the great sacrifice of the gospel itself. And now there is nothing more devoutly asserted, or more reverently believed, than our essential need of an expiatory sacrifice, and the fact that such a sacrifice is made for our salvation, in the cross of Jesus Christ." P. 488. "We never speak," he says, "of good deeds, or sentiments, or sacrifices of love, as expiations. Nothing is expiatory that does not turn upon the fact of damage or pain, or just punishment. Neither is there any difficulty of discovering from the manner in which theologians speak of expiation, that they think of God

as having some evil, or pain, or naked suffering offered him for sin, and that, on account of such offering, he may release the evil, or pain, or suffering, his unsatisfied wrath would otherwise have exacted. Thus, taking the mildest form of superstition, it will be maintained that God's wrath is to be averted by sacrifices, that is, by something given to wrath, that is wrath's proper food; which can of course be only some kind of pain or evil." P. 489. "If it is a mere feeling in God which is to be placated by an expiatory sacrifice, then we have to ask, is God such a being, that having a good mortgage title to pain or suffering, as against an offender, he will never let go the title till he gets the pain—if not from him, then from some other? Such a conception of God is simply shocking." P. 491. It is indeed shocking to hear a Divine attribute thus caricatured; to hear justice, which is to the moral world what gravitation is to the material universe, degraded into blood-thirstiness. How this can be done by a man of moral culture is a mystery. Washington was not a monster when he signed the death warrant of Andre; nor is a judge blood-thirsty when he passes sentence upon an assassin. We have no knowledge of God at all unless what is virtue in us be virtue in him. This is a principle which, when it suits his purpose, Dr. Bushnell pushes to an extreme. And yet he violates it recklessly when it works against his theory. Dr. Bushnell admits that God punishes sin. But punishment is pain or evil voluntarily inflicted in satisfaction of justice. Dr. Bushnell indeed makes no difference between the pain which follows a wound, and the suffering which follows sin. He seems to consider both as "the blind effect" of the nature of things. But who constituted the nature of things? Who so ordered our physical and moral constitution that fire applied to living flesh should cause pain, and that crime should burn the conscience? Evil does not cease to be penal because it is a natural consequence. It may be that the sufferings of a future state are to a great degree the natural and necessary consequences of the order which God has established in his universe. But they do not, on that account, cease to be judicial inflictions. The most awful judgment denounced in the Bible is reprobation; which is simply giving the sinner up to himself and his sins.

It matters not, therefore, whether the pain or evil be a natural consequence, or whether it be inflicted *ab extra*, it is in either case punishment; and in either case determined by the will and judgment of God. This being admitted, it follows that the infliction of pain on account of sin, is no proof of blood-thirstiness. The wanton infliction of pain is cruel. But its infliction for a high end, by one having authority, may be wise, just, and good. The only question is, therefore, what are the ends which justify and demand the infliction of evil for the punishment of sin? The thing is done by an infinitely holy God, as Dr. Bushnell admits, and as even Deists admit. Why? Dr. Bushnell and others say, for the reformation or redemption of the offender. Others say, for the prevention of crime. Others say, that these are subordinate, though important ends for the infliction of evil on account of sin, whether in the form of penalty or chastisement, but that the primary and immediate ground of such infliction is the ill-desert of sin; and that its efficacy as a moral preventive of crime arises out of the fact that it is inflicted on the ground of intrinsic ill-desert. That the reformation of the offender is the primary or sole end of punishment is contrary to the Scriptures, and to the universal judgment of men. Among men it is impossible that such should be the object of punishment, when the penalty is death; and no less impossible in the Divine government, when the penalty is eternal death, the utter and final reprobation of the offender. Every man finds in his own consciousness the sentiment which demands the punishment of sin for its own sake, irrespective of the effects of punishment upon himself or upon others. A sinful soul, if alone in the universe, in the presence of a holy God, would feel the sense of guilt in all its force. No man who has ever experienced conviction of sin is ignorant that sin is guilt as well as pollution; that it stands in a relation to justice as distinct and as necessary as it sustains to holiness; and that expiation is as necessary for pardon, as regeneration is to purity and peace. This sentiment is natural. It does not belong to any one class of men; it is not peculiar to those who have been subjected to any one mode of moral culture. It belongs to all men. It is impressed on all human languages. It is revealed in the social,

political, and religious usages of all races of men. It just as undeniably belongs to the constitution of our nature, and is just as obviously a revelation of the nature of God, in whose image man was created, as reason or conscience. Punishment, therefore, that is, evil inflicted in satisfaction of justice, is morally right. It is not an expression of malice, or revenge, or blood-thirstiness, but of a necessary constituent element of moral perfection. But punishment is the expiation of guilt. That is its nature and effect. If punishment is morally right, so is expiation. If the one be demanded by the nature of God, so is the other. If the one be consistent with love, so is the other. Whether that expiation be made by the offender himself, or by a substitute, does not alter the thing. It is expiation still; and it is expiation which Dr. Bushnell pronounces to be a pagan idea, shocking in its nature, and unknown to the Scriptures, even in the sacrifices of the old dispensation. That it is shocking to him, we must admit on his own testimony; and this doubtless is the reason why he rejects and labours so hard to disprove it. But it is not shocking to the minds of the vast majority of men of all ages and nations, as is proved by its universal adoption; nor to the great body of God's people, as is proved by its incorporation in the doctrines and inmost religious life of every Christian church on earth; nor yet is it shocking to the infinitely holy God, as is proved not only in its being the corner-stone of the Divine plan of redemption, but also by every punitive declaration of his word and every infliction of his providence. If God punishes sin, he demands an expiation for sin. And therefore expiation is something holy, just, and good. The rising of the human heart against it, is no objection to its righteous character. This is the pith and substance of all Dr. Bushnell's book, so far as the denials are concerned. He rejects expiation, because the idea shocks him; and hence there is nothing in God which demands it; there is nothing in the Old Testament sacrifices which imply it; and nothing in the work of Christ which involves any such idea. Then, unless the whole Christian world be mistaken, there can be no salvation for sinners.

Dr. Bushnell's objections to the doctrine of expiation are refuted not only by the fact that the idea of expiation is in-

cluded in that of punishment; by the universal recognition of the justice and integrity of such punishment; by the still more authoritative sanction derived from the work of the Spirit in the hearts of the people of God; by its lying at the foundation of the whole sacrificial system of the Scriptures, both in regard to the offerings under the Old Testament economy, and in reference to the great expiatory sacrifice of Christ. It is little less than an insult to the common sense of men, to attempt to show that the sacrifices of the Mosaic economy were not expiatory, but reformatory; not intended to expiate the guilt of the offender, but to cleanse him from moral pollution. Dr. Bushnell's arguments on this point are so unsubstantial they hardly admit of being handled. He says the word used signifies *to cover*, and to cover is to hide, or remove from sight; and therefore properly expresses the idea of cleansing. The offender has his sins covered because the service tends to lead him to repentance and a new life, and thus he is cleansed from inward pollution. Sin is guilt, however, as well as pollution, and needs to be hidden from the eye of justice. It is thus covered, and can only be covered by expiation. And thus the soul, according to Scripture, is cleansed from guilt by blood; as it is cleansed from pollution by the renewing of the Holy Ghost. To deny that the sacrifices of the Old Testament were expiatory can only be done by denying the express assertions of the Bible, and by ignoring the import of all the rites connected with the sacrificial services, and by overlooking the specific effects attributed to offerings for sin. The direct and specific design of the sin-offering is declared to be, not reformation, that was the remote, or ultimate design, as in the great sacrifice of Christ, but forgiveness. If a man sinned he was required to bring a proper offering, "and the priest shall make atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him." This is the constantly recurring formula. The words in the Hebrew are just as perspicuous as they are in the English version. In neither case do they admit of any interpretation which excludes the idea of expiation. Sin incurs a penalty, that penalty was remitted on the condition of the death of a victim in the place of the sinner. It is everywhere, constantly and distinctly asserted, that pardon, deliverance from a justly incurred pen-

alty, was the design of every sin-offering. They were therefore not merely "lustral," in Dr. Bushnell's sense of the word. They were not designed to cleanse from pollution, but from guilt; and this cleansing from guilt, is everywhere represented in Scripture as the indispensable condition precedent to reconciliation with God, and reconciliation with God the indispensable antecedent to inward holiness or sanctification. These are the elementary principles of the plan of salvation as revealed in the Bible. And the rejection of these truths is the rejection of the gospel. That the design of the Hebrew sacrifices was to make expiation for sin is, however, clear, not only from the obvious meaning of the formulas above referred to, but also from the express assertions of the Bible as to the mode in which that expiation was effected. It was by substitution. It was by one suffering in the place of another. Life was given for life; soul for soul. I have given, saith God, the blood, in which is the Life of the victim, upon the altar, for your life. This is the declaration contained in Lev. xvii. 11. And hence כֹּפֶר from כָּפַר means "a ransom." Something given for a person or thing as the condition of deliverance. The one was substituted for the other. Thus in Exodus xxi. 30, "If there be laid upon him a sum of money (an atonement, something to cover his offence) then he shall give for the ransom of his soul, whatsoever is laid upon him." Isa. xliii. 3, "I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee." A sin-offering, therefore, according to the Scriptures, was an expiation, a substitute, a ransom. The victim was put in the place of the offender; its blood was taken for his blood; its life for his life. A sacrifice was demanded in cases where it is impossible that the moral purification of the offerers should be the object. If a man was found slain, and the murderer could not be discovered, the elders of the city were to bring a heifer and offer it as an atonement, that its blood might be taken for the innocent blood which had been shed. Deut. xxi.

All the ceremonies attending the offering of sacrifice for sin lose their significance if the ideas of substitution and expiation be excluded. The offender brought a faultless animal to the altar; he laid his hands upon its head, confessing his sin; the

victim was slain and its blood sprinkled on the altar or towards the tabernacle, and the offender was freed from the penalty which he had incurred. These acts are as significant as words. They teach that the victim was substituted for the offender; its blood taken for his blood; or, as the Bible itself expresses, its life for his life. This interpretation of the service is given, or this view of the nature of the Old Testament is adopted by all classes of commentators and theologians, even by those who care nothing about what the Bible teaches; by Gesenius, De Wette, Bauer, as well as Hengenstenberg and Tholuck. And such has been the accepted meaning of sacrifices among all people and in every age of the world. They were always offered in expiation of guilt and in hope of propitiating an offended God. This is admitted in regard to the pagan world. But in admitting this, it is admitted that the sense of guilt is universal; that the common consciousness of men teaches that God is a just being whose nature leads to the punishment of sin; and that expiation is necessary to forgiveness. In denying these truths, therefore, we deny the intuitive convictions of our sinful race, and set ourselves in opposition to the voice of nature, as well as to the word of God. Besides all this, the Bible expresses by "bearing sin," what it teaches by saying a victim was made a sacrifice for sin. But "to bear sin" never means to sanctify, it always means to bear the penalty of sin. And therefore if a sacrifice bore the sins of the offender, the Scriptures declare that he bore the punishment of his offences, bore it in his place and in order to his forgiveness. This was the symbolical meaning of the Old Testament sacrifices, and it was this which gave them all their value. But if this be so, then Christ's sufferings were truly expiatory. He bore our sins. He died the just for the unjust, in the same sense as the lamb died for the offender under the Mosaic economy. Although Dr. Bushnell in the face of the clearest teachings of Scripture, and especially of the whole design of the Epistle to the Hebrews, denies that the Old Testament sacrifices were typical of the sacrifice of Christ, yet he admits that the one saves just as the other did. And therefore if those were expiatory, so also was the sacrifice of Christ. On this subject there seems to be no room for argument, provided men are

agreed on two points; first, that the Bible is the word of God and our only infallible rule of faith; and secondly, that the Scriptures are to be historically interpreted, that is, that we are bound to take them in the sense in which they were intended to be understood by the persons to whom they were addressed. If the words sin, law, justice, priest, atonement, sacrifice, forgiveness, and so on, are not to be taken by us in the sense in which it can be historically proved they were understood by the sacred writers and their contemporaries, then we are without any rule of faith, or any reliable source of knowledge, and the Bible may be made to mean just what any theory-builder, whether rationalistic or transcendental, may choose. Dr. Bushnell is one of those theory-builders, and his doctrine has no other foundation than his own imagination. He can bring it in to agreement with the Bible only by making the Bible conform to his theory in despite of the plainest and most authoritative rules of interpretation.

As he denies the justice of God and repudiates with horror the idea of expiation, of course there can be no such thing as justification. There may be free pardon, and the restoration of the favour of God, which he admits; but justification he denies. Justification is a declaration that the demands of justice are satisfied. But if there be no justice and no satisfaction, there can be no such declaration. The word, as is usual in such cases, he retains, while the idea is discarded. With him justification is a making morally good. The sinner is recovered from his sins; is made inwardly pure, restored to the love of God, *i. e.*, is made to love him, and on that account is loved by him. This is justification. He endeavours to show that he differs from the Romanists who confound (or unite) justification with sanctification. Because with him justification is in the consciousness and sanctification below it. This amounts to nothing. With Romanists sanctification is not confined to the states or exercises of the consciousness. They hold that justification includes the infusion of new habits of grace, which lie below all conscious holy exercises, and are their proximate cause. So far from Dr. Bushnell's doctrine being in advance of that of Rome on this subject, it is a thousand degrees below it. Romanists admit the doctrine of

expiation; they admit that the work of Christ was a true and proper satisfaction to the justice of God for the sins of men; they admit that his satisfaction is the sole ground for the remission of original sin, as well as of all sins committed before baptism; and they hold that it is the ground on which God visits postbaptismal sins with temporal penalties (which may be satisfied or remitted) instead of eternal death. All this Dr. Bushnell denies. He would push the guilty and trembling soul clean off of the immoveable rock of Christ's righteousness, into what? Why, into the hell which is within him and about him. He would bid him rest all his hopes on what he himself is. If sin be unsubdued in his own heart, if he has not a subjective heavenly state, he is not an heir of heaven. Every thing depends, not upon what Christ has done for him, but upon what the sinner himself inwardly is. All his hopes rest on his own holiness. We have not the least apprehension that there is strength enough in Dr. Bushnell's arm to push into the abyss the weakest soul who has, even in darkness, touched the everlasting Rock; but he may be able to prevent those who are seeking a sure resting-place from seeking it where alone it can be found.

Will our readers pardon us here for a short digression. They are aware that in this country and elsewhere a system of theology has prevailed, founded upon two principles, which are regarded as moral axioms. The first is, that no man can be justly required to do more than he has the plenary power to perform. If he is required to love God with all his soul and with all his strength, to hate and avoid all sin, he must be able to do so. From this, one of two things follows: either, assuming the obligation to remain to be thus perfect in heart and life, every man has the ability to conform himself to this high standard of duty; or, the standard of duty must be brought down to the level of his ability. If we cannot love or hate at pleasure, then the command to love is an absurdity; and love must be reduced to a mere purpose. The second fundamental principle of the system referred to is, that all sin consists in sinning; or, that moral character can be predicated of voluntary acts alone. Hence there can be no original sin, or corruption of nature; no inherent sin or holiness; no principles or habits

morally good or evil. It is a satisfaction to see that Dr. Bushnell repudiates both these principles. He admits the entire inability of sinners to restore themselves to the image of God. In answer to the question, Whether God could forgive sin on the ground of our mere repentance? he answers, "If he could, meaning only what is commonly meant by remission, the remission would make no change and confer no benefit whatever. Besides the question only asks, what could God bestow, if we should do the impossible? For no man is able, by his own act, to really cast off sin, and renew himself in good." P. 424. Repentance, therefore, for a sinner left to himself is "impossible." As to the second principle, Dr. Bushnell is equally explicit. To the objection against his doctrine of subjective justification, that it confounds justification with sanctification, he says, justification is in the consciousness, sanctification below it. "The consciousness of the subject, in justification, is raised in its order, filled with the confidence of right, set free from the bondage of fears and scruples of legality; but there is a vast realm back of consciousness, or below it, which remains to be changed or sanctified, and never will be, except a new habit be generated by time, and the better consciousness descending into the secret roots below, gets a healing into them more and more perfect." P. 440. All voluntary exercises, of course, are in the consciousness; if therefore there be a "vast realm below the consciousness," which needs sanctification, then there is something in the soul besides voluntary exercises of which moral character may be predicated. "And when they arose early on the morrow morning, behold, Dagon was fallen upon his face before the ark of the Lord: and the head of Dagon, and both the palms of his hands were cut off upon the threshold; only the fishy part of Dagon was left to him." This was pleasant news for the Israelites. So it is pleasant for us to see the Dagon of a false theology lying headless and handless before the ark of God's truth.

To return to our subject. Justification, as taught by all the churches of the Reformation, and virtually by the whole Christian world, is "an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received

by faith alone." According to this view, justification is: 1. As to its nature, a declarative and judicial act. 2. It consists in the forgiveness of sins, and accepting the sinner as righteous. 3. Its ground is the righteousness of Christ. 4. Its condition, or instrumental cause, is faith. Those who receive and rest on the righteousness of Christ are justified, and if justified, are glorified. Those who do not then rest on that righteousness are not justified, and are not saved. Every one of these points Dr. Bushnell denies. He denies that justification is declarative or judicial. It consists, according to him, in making its object or subject inwardly good, restoring him to the image of God. He says on p. 415, that the three words, *righteousness*, *just*, and *justifier of*, are moral, and not judicial. "There is no reference of thought, whatever, to God's retributive justice, or to the acquittal passed on guilty men, because the score of their account with God's justice has been made even by the sufferings of Christ." On page 427, we are told "that justification has no reference to justice." "To be justified by faith means to be justified by yielding our members instruments of righteousness unto God." P. 428. The difference between justification and sanctification is, that the former is in the consciousness, and the latter below it. There is, however, he says, "no objection to saying that, in a certain general way, they are one —just as faith is one with love, and love with regeneration, and this with genuine repentance, and all good states with all others. The same divine life as quickened of God is supposed in every sort of holy exercise, and the different names we give them represent real and important differences of meaning, according as we consider the new life quickened in relation to our own agency, or to God's, or to means accepted, trust reposed, or effects wrought. In the same way justification is sanctification, and both are faith; and yet their difference is by no means annihilated." P. 441. Justification therefore is not an act of God, but an inward state of the mind; a form of the divine life in the soul.

In order to establish the doctrine which subverts the faith of the whole Protestant world, and casts the sinner into utter despair, he attempts to prove against all lexicographers and interpreters, against indeed the convictions of every reader of

the Bible, and every speaker of the English language, that to justify means *to make good*, to make subjectively righteous, or conformed to the law of God. If this be so, what business has the word in the language. We have the words to purify, to cleanse, to sanctify, to reform, to regenerate, and a multitude of others, to express the idea of inward purification. What is the use of this other word *to justify?* What is a word, but an expression of thought. But this word expresses no thought of its own; no thought which is not more appropriately and definitely expressed by other words. It is attempting to argue against a palpable fact, to strive to prove that to justify means to make good. When we justify a man for what he has done, we do not reform him. We simply declare that he was right, that the law of the land or the law of God does not condemn his conduct. When we justify God, we declare that God is right in all he does, as the Psalmist, and every convinced sinner, justifies God in his own condemnation. Justification is antithetical to condemnation. If the latter does not mean to make wicked, the former cannot mean to make good. "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned." "Wisdom is justified of her children." The Pharisee justifies himself. We are said to be justified without works; but we cannot be good without goodness. A judge is forbidden to justify the wicked for a reward. He that justifieth the wicked, says Solomon, is an abomination. There is no use however of citing examples. There is not a single instance in the New Testament in which δικαιόω means to make holy, or morally good; and there is not a single case in the Old Testament in which the Hiphil form of צָדַק is so used. The only doubtful case in the New Testament is Rev. xxii. 11; but there the word is used in a middle sense, and moreover the text is very doubtful. That Dr. Bushnell should say, as he does on p. 420, that he has established his point that δικαιόω is not used in a declarative or judicial sense, but means to make morally good, "in a manner that leaves no room for dispute," is an exhibition of the very insanity of self-conceit. So far from the word in Scripture always having that sense, it never has it. He need only ask the first Sunday-school child he meets what "justify" means, to be satisfied that it has been attempting not

only to pervert the meaning of a word, but to upset the intuitive judgment of the common conseiousness of men. It is very true that the adjeetive *δίκαιος* and the noun *δικαιοσύνη* are often used in a moral sense; as when the Scriptures speak of a righteous man, or of the righteous God. But this has nothing to do with the usage of the verb. Indeed Dr. Bushnell feels that he is arguing against a self-evident truth, by proposing to substitute the word "righteouser" for "justifier." The former he makes to mean one who renders subjectively righteous, or good. What is this but an admission that justifier does not mean one who makes good, and eannot be made to convey that idea to an English ear. Of course he urges the eommon objection against justifieation being a declarative aet, that it is a eontradietion to deelare a man righteous who is not righteous. This, he tells us, is making "the gospel end off in a fiction that falsifies even the eternal distinetions of eharacter." P. 422. It is indeed impossible that God should declare a man to be good who is not good, or wise who is not wise. And therefore if the word righteous has only a moral sense, it is impossible that God should declare the unrighteous to be righteous. But every one knows, and every one, except Dr. Bushnell, admits, that the Greek word *δίκαιος* (and the English word righteous) besides its moral, has also a judieial, or forensic sense. In other words, it expresses sometimes the relation of a man to holiness, and sometimes his relation to justice; in other words, sometimes his relation to the precept, and sometimes to the penalty of the law. In the latter ease it is antithetieal to *ὑπόδικος*. There is none *δίκαιος* (righteous), says Paul, but the whole world is *ὑπόδικος* (*under condemnation*) before God. When therefore God pronounces the sinner just, he does not declare that he is morally what he ought to be, but that the demands of justice, so far as he is eoncerned, have been satisfied. Therefore he is said "to justify the ungodly." The ground of the judgment is not what the sinner is or has done, but what has been done for him. Justification under the gospel, Paul declares to be the "imputation of righteousness without works," that is, to those who have no moral excellence of their own on which a declaration of righteousness can be founded.

In teaching that God in justifying the soul imparts to it, or

"impresses upon it his own character," Dr. Bushnell of course denies that it includes "the pardon of sin." According to him there is properly no such thing as pardon. You can no more forgive sin, than you can forgive a disease. The only way to remove the suffering connected with disease, is to heal the patient, and the only way to free the soul from the suffering connected with sin, is to reform the sinner. In neither case is there a remission of a penalty in the ordinary sense of the word. As this idea of remission and penalty pervades the volume before us, it is not easy to quote particular proof passages. We have already seen that on p. 424, Dr. B. says, that remission in the common sense of the term "would confer no benefit whatever." On page 449, he says of Christ, "His work terminates, not in the release of penalties by due compensation, but in the transformation of character, and the rescue, in that manner, of guilty men from the retributive causations provoked by their sins. He does not prepare remission of sins in the sense of mere letting go, but he executes the remission, by taking away the sins, and dispensing the justification of life, (by which he means the infusion of spiritual life). This one word Life is the condensed import of all that he is, or undertakes to be." All pardon, therefore, consists in deliverance from the inward power of sin. Remission which does not include the removal of sin, is declared to be "only a kind of formality, or verbal discharge, that carries practically no discharge with it." P. 424. In forgiveness, he says, God, in the declaration of his righteousness, gets "such a hold of the souls that are sweltering in disorder, under the natural effects of transgression, as to bring them out of their disorder into righteousness. By his moral power, which is the power of his righteousness supernaturally revealed in Christ, he masters the retributive causations of their nature, and they receive more than a ground of remission; viz., the executed fact of remission, or spiritual release. Otherwise, under a mere letting go, the bad causes hold fast like fire in brimstone, and refuse to be cheated of their prey." P. 426. Remission is, therefore, "spiritual release." Most errors, even the gravest, are half truths. It is true that there are evils inseparable from the existence of sin in the soul; that these evils constitute a large part of its

penalty; and that deliverance from those evils can only be effected by sanctification. But it is not true that the natural consequences of sin are its only punishment; nor that remission and sanctification are ever confounded; nor are they related as cause and effect. The two things are distinct in their nature, and are always distinguished in the Bible and by the common sense of men. And moreover, it is no less true, there neither is nor can be any sanctification or destruction of the power of sin in the soul, until there has been antecedent remission of its penalty. On Dr. Bushnell's scheme, no sinful soul can ever be saved, if Paul's doctrine of sanctification be true. He teaches clearly in the sixth and seventh chapters of his Epistle to the Romans, that so long as the sinner is under condemnation, he brings forth fruit unto death; that it is not until he is delivered from condemnation, by the body or sacrifice of Christ, that he brings forth fruit unto God. He must first be justified, before he can be sanctified. This is the theology of the apostle; and it is a great blessing that the religious experience of God's people always accords with the doctrinal teachings of the Scriptures, while it utterly refuses to harmonize with the speculative theories of imaginative and presumptuous men.

The idea that the punishment of sin is only in its natural consequences, and that remission is merely deliverance from the natural operations of moral evil in the soul, as freedom from the pain of a burn can be effected only by allaying the inflammation, is so repugnant to Scripture and to common sense as to need no refutation. The expulsion of our first parents from paradise; the deluge; raining fire and brimstone upon Sodom and Gomorrah; the death of the first-born of the Egyptians; all the plagues brought on Pharaoh; drought, famine, pestilence, threatened as the punishment of the Hebrews; were not the natural consequences of sin, but positive punitive inflictions. Indeed, almost all the judgments threatened in the Bible are of that character. And every human being knows that when he prays for pardon, he prays for something different from holiness. When our Lord said to the man sick of the palsy, "Thy sins be forgiven thee," no man ever supposed he meant, "Be thou holy." It is true that

the gospel in making provision for the pardon of sin, provides also for the sanctification of the sinner; that salvation in sin is a contradiction and absurdity. But it is utter infatuation to deny the one in order to maintain the other. We need both pardon and sanctification, and cannot have the one without the other. Nevertheless they are distinct and separate gifts of grace through the mediation of Christ.

It need not be added that in denying justice, expiation, judicial justification and remission of the penalty of sin, as any thing different from the destruction of its power, he also denies that Christ or his righteousness is the ground of our justification. One of his distinct propositions, p. 423, is, "Christ not a ground, but a power of justification."

Such are the denials involved in Dr. Bushnell's theory. He denies what has, at least for ages as he admits, been the faith of the church, as to the method of salvation. What then is his own doctrine? How is it that Christ secures the salvation of sinners? It is by the power of expression; it is by the manifestation which he makes of Divine love. There are two kinds of power, "The fiat power, and moral power." The former he seems to exclude entirely from the work of salvation. Every thing is attributed to the moral power of Christ. This power he gradually acquired by a long course of self-denying, self-sacrificing labour for the restoration of fallen men. His sufferings had nothing to do with the saving efficacy of his work, except as the necessary incidents of the task which he had assumed. If a missionary goes to labour in an unhealthy climate, he may suffer, and perhaps perish under its influence. But he did not go in order thus to suffer. That was no part of his missionary work. That he willingly endures such suffering in the prosecution of his mission, may enhance his moral power over those among whom he labours, but sufferings have no specific virtue, they are merely incidental. This is Dr. Bushnell's own illustration, which makes his meaning plainer than any of his formal didactic statements. He supposes (see p. 396,) a case of a prison in a miasmatic district, where the fell poison of the atmosphere decimates the inmates almost every week. It comes to the knowledge of a good monk that a prisoner, formerly his bitter enemy, is infected with the poison.

Whereupon the godly man goes to his relief, nurses and attends upon him until he is recovered and goes free, while the benefactor takes the infection and dies. The rescued man expresses his gratitude by saying his friend "bore my punishment"—"became the criminal for me"—"gave his life for mine"—"died that I might live," &c., &c. After a time "the dull, blind-hearted literalizer takes up all these fervours of expression in the letters and reported words of the reputed felon, showing most conclusively that the good monk actually got the other's crime imputed to him, took the guilt of it, suffered the punishment of it, died in his place, and satisfied the justice of the law that he might be released! Why the malefactor himself would even have shuddered at the thought of a construction so revolting, hereafter to be put upon his words."

Christ therefore saves us as the suppositious monk saved the felon. Our Lord's sufferings arose only from the moral and physical malaria of the world into which he came. He "simply came into the corporate state of evil, and bore it with us—faithful unto death for our recovery." P. 514. The state of corporate evil which follows sin as its natural effect, the Scriptures call it the curse; "and it is directly into this that Christ is entered by his incarnation. In his taking of the flesh, he becomes a true member of the race, subject to all the corporate liabilities of his bad relationship." P. 386. Such being the nature of Christ's vicarious sacrifice, there is nothing in it peculiar to him. It arises necessarily out of the nature of love; and therefore every rational being governed by love, is impelled in the presence of evil to make such sacrifices. This is true of God himself. From the entrance of sin and misery into the universe, he has suffered just what Christ suffered. There is a Gethsemane in the Divine nature. God cannot but suffer whenever he sees evil, and he must strive to correct it and deliver its victims. "Love is an universally vicarious principle." "See how it is in the case of a mother. She loves her child, and it comes out in that fact, and from it, that she watches for the child, bears all its pains and sicknesses on her own feeling, and when it is wronged, is stung herself by the wrong put upon it, more bitterly far than the child." P. 46. "Given the universality of love, the universality of vicarious

sacrifice is given also." P. 48. This being the case the Eternal Father suffered for us as truly and as much as Christ did. Christ did not do the same things in his first year as in his last, so the sufferings of the Father were not the same in kind as those of the Son after the incarnation. But they were as real and as truly vicarious. "In the ante-Christian era may have been one of the heaviest points of sacrifice, that there must be so long a detention, and that so great love must be unexpressed, until the fulness of time had come." P. 60. What is true of the Father must be true of the Holy Spirit. "Whatever we may say, or hold, or believe, concerning the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, we are to affirm in the same manner of God. The whole deity is in it, in it from eternity and will to eternity be." P. 73. This he calls a "full and carefully tested discovery." "There is a cross in God before the wood is seen upon Calvary; hid in God's own virtue itself, struggling on heavily in burdened feeling through all the previous ages, and struggling as heavily now even in the throne of the worlds." P. 73. The Holy Spirit bears our sins "precisely as Christ himself did in his sacrifice. He is, in fact, a Christ continued, in all that distinguishes the offering and priesthood of Christ, and is fitly represented in the same way." P. 74. "It requires quite as much suffering patience, and affliction of feeling, or even of what is called passion, to carry on the work of the Spirit, as it did to fulfil the ministry and bear the cross of Jesus." P. 76. He is well aware, Dr. Bushnell says, "how very distant such conceptions are from the commonly received impressions of the Holy Spirit." P. 74. But more than all this, "all good intelligences are in vicarious sacrifice." This is true of the holy angels and glorified saints. They perform a priestly work; they bear a priestly character as being intercessors for men. P. 103. They are concerned for sin as God is, and suffer for our sins as Christ did. All this is true also of men here on earth. "Vicarious suffering was in no way peculiar to Christ, save in degree." P. 107. "The true and simple account of his (Christ's) suffering is, that he had such a heart as would not suffer him to be turned away from us, and that he suffered for us even as love must willingly suffer for its enemy." P. 108. All therefore who have his love must suffer,

in their measure, in the same way. Their suffering are vicarious sacrifice in the same sense that his were. See the whole of Ch. V. Part I. Christ therefore did nothing extraordinary. He had no "superlative goodness." He did nothing but what he was "bound to do." See pp. 91, 105, &c. He did nothing more or less than what the common standard of holiness and right requires. P. 108.

Such being the nature of vicarious sacrifice, Christ is in no sense a special Saviour; he does no more than the Father and the Spirit ever did and are still doing; he did only what saints and angels in heaven, and saints on earth are ever doing, except that he brings the power of self-sacrificing love more home to us. He "came simply to be the manifested love of God." P. 141.

The salvation of men, as above stated, is effected, according to Dr. Bushnell, not by the fiat power, but by the moral power of God. Christ is the power of God unto salvation, not as an example, nor merely by the revelation of the love of God, as softness, or instinctive sympathy, (p. 171,) but by the manifestation of all the moral perfections, or greatness of God. It is the power of character. The power of Alexander was that of force, that of Socrates, of character; so in the case of Napoleon and Washington. P. 172. For Christ to take away our sins, "by the force that is manifested in him, is the same thing as to be the moral power which masters the soul's inward disorder, and renews it to holiness of life." P. 180. But this moral power is not inherent; it is not an attribute. It is something acquired, as by Howard, George Fox, and Whitefield. Men think away God's perfections in thinking of them as attributes. They become dry words. "We feel him a platitude more than as a person." "As a kind of milky-way over our heads; vast enough in the matter of extension, but evanescently dim to our feelings." P. 187. He became incarnate in order to obtain moral power. "The undertaking is to obtain, through him (Christ) and the facts and processes of his life, a new kind of power, viz. moral power; the same that is obtained by human conduct under human methods. It will be Divine power still, only it will not be attribute power. That is the power of his idea. This new power is to be power cumula-

tive gained by him among men, as truly as they gain it wit each other." P. 188. "His (Christ's) reality is what he expresses; under the law of expression; the power, the great name, he thus obtains under forms of human conduct that make their address to reason, conviction, feeling, passion, sympathy, imagination, faith, and the receptivities generally of the moral nature. What rational person ever imagined that he could state, in a defined formula, the import of any great character; Moses, for example, Plato, Scipio, Washington." P. 214. Thus it is Christ saves us. He acquires, as others do, a moral power, by his life, his deeds of love, by the works of self-denial, labour, and suffering he performed, differing in nothing from the power of character, which attaches to great and good men, except in degree. And this moral power, or character, so operates on the minds of men as to make them good, and by making them good frees them from the corporate evil, or the natural causes of pain inseparable from a state of sin. Such is the nature, and such the method of Christian salvation, according to Dr. Bushnell.

No intelligent reader can rise from the perusal of this book without being convinced that its author has no correct idea of the nature of Christian theology or of the duty of a Christian theologian. Christian theology is nothing but the facts and truths of the Bible arranged in their natural order and exhibited in their mutual relations. The order in which these truths are to be arranged, and the relations in which they stand, are not to be arbitrarily determined. Both are determined by the nature of the truths themselves, and by the explicit teachings of the Scriptures. Such being the nature of theology, the duty of the theologian is first to ascertain and authenticate the facts of Scripture, that is, make it clear that they are indeed contained in the word of God. This induction of facts must, as far as possible, be exhaustive. All must be collected, and each must be allowed its due value. No one is to be ignored or modified. Then secondly, the theologian, having obtained his facts, is to present them in their natural order; that is, the order determined by their nature.

The philosophy of the facts is in the facts; underlies, and arranges them, and determines their mutual relation. The

theologian has no more right to explain the facts by his own philosophy, than he has to manufacture the facts for his philosophy. His business is simply to exhibit the contents of the Bible in a scientific form. His relation to the Scriptures is analogous to that of the man of science to nature. The business of the naturalist is to collect the facts belonging to his particular department. He is bound to collect them all, and to allow each its proper value. His success depends on his fidelity as to those two points. Then he has to observe the relation in which these facts naturally stand to each other; and thence deduce the laws which determine that relation. He is simply an interpreter. He cannot invent facts; he cannot ignore them; he cannot undervalue them; he cannot imagine laws or causes which control the facts which he observes. He must gather the laws from the facts, or they have no more scientific value than the fancies of a poet. This is the inductive method which has given science its firm foundation, and secured its wonderful triumph. Before this method was adopted, all was confusion and failure. Men presumed to determine à priori what matter was, what were its laws, how those laws must operate, and what must be the results. Their whole effort was to make the phenomena agree with their à priori theories. Facts therefore had to be overlooked, or distorted; and combined by a purely *ab extra* process of the mind. Tons of volumes, worm-eaten, and covered with cobwebs, are stored away, filled with these idle and now contemned speculations. Theology has had a similar fate. Thousands of books have been written showing what the truths of revelation ought to be, and must be made to be, in order to conform to the à priori principles of their writers. And these thousands of books are either already keeping company with the worm-eaten tons of speculative science, or are soon to be buried in similar receptacles of useless lumber. Dr. Bushnell has added another to these à priori disquisitions. He has formed a theory which pleases his imagination, and gratifies his feelings, and to this *per fas et nefas* the facts of the Bible must be made to conform. That this is a hopeless and a useless task is self-evident. "No man knows the things of God but the Spirit of God."

We must humbly receive what he has revealed, or remain in darkness.

Dr. Bushnell, for example, has his own idea of God, very different from the scriptural doctrine, and from this arbitrary conception of the Divine nature, he undertakes to determine what the acts and purposes of God must be. According to the Bible God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. Dr. Bushnell denies that he is a just being. That is, he denies that justice, in the established meaning of the word, is a virtue, and therefore denies that it is an attribute of God. But this is one of the facts of Divine revelation; just as clearly revealed and just as well authenticated, as that God is infinite or eternal. As this sentiment of justice is instinctive and indestructible in the constitution of our nature, Dr. Bushnell must persuade men to deny themselves, to deny a self-evident truth, before he can get them to adopt his idea of God, or to accept the conclusions which he draws from it.

He ignores the element of guilt in sin. Guilt is the relation of sin to justice. If there is no justice, there can be no guilt, as where there is no law there can be no transgression. Every sinner knows that he is subject to wrath; not merely to the natural consequences of his sin, as when he burns his hand, but to the righteous judgment of God; to the positive and intentional infliction of evil as the punishment of transgression. He knows that he deserves such infliction. He knows that it ought to be inflicted, and therefore he dreads it from the hands of a righteous God. This is an universal fact of consciousness, as well as one of the clearest facts of revelation. How dreadful it is for a man to devise a plan of salvation for himself and others, which ignores the fact of guilt; which denies the justice of God, who after all is, and will be found to be, a consuming fire.

Again, according to the Bible, God is infinite in power, governing all his creatures and all their actions; working all things after the counsel of his own will. Subject to no law out of himself; but is the law to all rational creatures. An absolute sovereign, not only as ruling according to his own will, but as being free from all limitation either actual or conceiv-

able. As he foresees and directs all things for the attainment of the highest ends, nothing can occur inconsistent with his purposes, and therefore nothing can be the cause to him of surprise, perturbation, or distress. Nothing can disturb his infinite tranquillity and blessedness; a blessedness which arises from the absolute perfection and harmony of his own nature, and the impossibility of anything occurring contrary to his infinitely wise and benevolent designs. Such is the scriptural doctrine concerning God, as understood and received by the Christian church. This is one of the great facts of the Bible which lie at the foundation of all sound theology. Dr. Bushnell's idea of God is very different from this. It must be different or he could not hold his peculiar theory. With him God is as much subject to law as any of his creatures. He speaks of him as bound to do this and to avoid that. He even conceives possible, although not actual, a state in which creatures owe no allegiance to God, but are subject, with their Maker, to a rule of right above both. According to the scriptural doctrine, the absolute reason cannot be irrational, or the absolute good be otherwise than good. That in the highest sense God is a law unto himself, and above all law other than his own nature; and therefore a law to all intelligent creatures. The will of God as the ground and rule of obligation to man, is not mere *arbitrium.* It is the expression of absolute reason, truth, and goodness, which constitute the nature of God as a personal being. And it is to that personal being, to reason, truth and goodness as personal in God, that the allegiance of all creatures is due. Dr. Bushnell concedes to Pantheists the principle on which their arguments against the personality of God and the possibility of his possessing moral character, depends. They say that moral character supposes conformity to law, and the possibility of want of conformity; but such subjection, and the possibility of being other than it is, is inconsistent with the nature of the absolute. Therefore God as absolute can neither be a person nor possess moral excellence.

Again, Dr. Bushnell limits God in another way. The scriptural doctrine is that God can do his pleasure among the armies of heaven and the inhabitants of earth; that all created minds are under his absolute control; that he turns them as

the rivers of water are turned; that without doing violence to their nature, or interfering with their free agency, he can govern all their thoughts and all their actions. This is the foundation of all natural, and of all revealed religion. It is the only rational ground of hope, or encouragement in prayer. All this Dr. Bushnell's theory denies. It assumes that free agents can be controlled only by moral power, by expression and impression; and that such control is necessarily limited. God strives to prevent sin; exerts all his power to recover sinners from their apostacy; is filled with anguish on their account and because they refuse to be restored to holiness. Now this not only degrades God as impotent in his government, taking the reins out of his hands, and placing them in the hands of creatures, who can at pleasure, one and all, run wild, and make sin and misery perpetual and universal, but it is contrary to the plainest facts of the Bible. God allowed the fallen angels to perish without redemption. If love, from its very nature, unmodified by justice, binds all good beings, created and uncreated, to vicarious sacrifice, to untiring and ceaseless effort to recover the lost, why are not fallen angels redeemed? or, why are the finally impenitent abandoned, as Dr. Bushnell admits they are, to hopeless and endless perdition? It is perfectly plain that the clearest facts of the Bible must be rejected, and its most precious truths denied to make way for this other gospel, which is not another, but the product of a vain imagination.

Again, every believer knows, and delights to acknowledge, that salvation is of grace; that God was not bound to provide redemption for fallen man; that Christ was under no obligation to assume our nature, suffer and die in our behalf; that not only the gift of Christ, but the knowledge of salvation, the means of grace, the mission and work of the Spirit, are all perfectly gratuitous; that God would have been as holy, as righteous, as good, had he allowed men to perish in their sins. This is perhaps the most luminous of all the truths of the Bible. It strikes every eye, even the weakest. It is acknowledged by every Christian heart. Its denial is pronounced by Paul to be a rejection of the gospel. Yet Dr. Bushnell's theory does deny it. Christ did nothing out of the way; he had no superla-

tive merit. He did no more than he was bound to do. This is asserted over and over. He did no more than God the Father has been doing from eternity (how so we do not understand); nothing more than the Holy Spirit is now doing; nothing more than every patriot, philanthropist, missionary or martyr, each in his measure, does, and is doing from day to day.

This remedial scheme, moreover, ignores the scriptural account of the natural state of man. It assumes that we are in a condition to be redeemed by moral power, by "expression," by the manifestation of goodness and greatness; a power which must be earned, analogous to the influence which great and good men exercise in moulding the character of their fellow-men. It is of course admitted that the moral power of the gospel is as great as such power can be made, or can be conceived of; that the plan of salvation contains such an exhibition of love, of self-sacrificing devotion, of moral grandeur and greatness, as fills the intelligent universe with astonishment, and which is to be throughout eternity the great means of revealing to all created minds the perfections of God, and consequently the great means of promoting the holiness and blessedness of all intelligent creatures. Nay more, it may safely be asserted that the love of God as exhibited in the gospel, is unspeakably greater, higher, grander, more wonderful, and powerful for good, than in the fancy-scheme as sketched by Dr. Bushnell. With him that love is nothing superlative, does nothing more than it was bound to do; it surmounted no obstacles; it is just what love in creatures is. It has nothing gratuitous, nothing mysterious in its nature; nothing to excite the amazement of angelic minds. To them, however, it was wonderful that God should love the unholy and spare the guilty. That is what they could not do, and what was to them, as to us the mystery of redeeming love. Compared to this, the love of which Dr. Bushnell speaks sinks to the level of an every-day affair—manifested by every philanthropist and patriot. It is like changing a bridegroom's love for his bride into philanthropy; or a mother's love for her child into benevolence. But let that pass. What we have now to remark is, that his theory overlooks the nature of the

end to be accomplished; an end for which moral power, by itself, and in itself, has no adaptation. What could all the love or tenderness in the world accomplish for the redemption of a man under a righteous sentence of death? It could not reverse the sentence. It could not open the prison doors. It could not make it right that the criminal should be pardoned. Here again the great fact of Scripture and of human consciousness, that we are guilty, under a just sentence of condemnation, is in this scheme utterly ignored. A theory which makes no provision for anything but sanctification, which overlooks the necessity of pardon, or more properly of justification, is utterly unsuited to the known condition of sinners. It is also just as impotent for sanctification. What good can all the warmth and light in the world do a corpse? What effect has the love of God on devils? What influence had the love and holiness of Christ on his murderers? or, upon those now who are dead in trespasses and sins? Dr. Bushnell is like a skilful physician who should provide a rich abundance of food, and overlook the little circumstance that his patient was dead.

It need hardly be remarked in addition, that the theory of this book contradicts all those facts of Scripture and experience which prove that God is a sovereign in the distribution of his favours; that "he has mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardens." The love of God as revealed in the Bible and in history is not a principle which operates by a necessity of its nature, and with equal energy towards all the subjects of sin and misery. "I thank thee," says the tender and blessed Jesus himself, "that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." In point of fact God did not save the fallen angels. In point of fact he does not treat the Chinese as he does the inhabitants of Europe and America; nor the people of Italy and Spain as he does those of Protestant England and of the United States. The exercise of his love is determined by own will and wisdom; by his justice and righteousness. The believer is willing to leave all things in his hands, assured that he will do all things well, that in the end it will appear that the Judge of all the earth does right, however incompetent we may be to understand his ways.

It is intolerable that such an intellectual animalcule as man should sit in judgment on the infinite God, and lay down the law for Him, and decide he must do this and abstain from doing that. Our only business is to ascertain, from his word and providence, what he does do, and on the facts thus furnished construct our scheme of doctrine.

Dr. Bushnell's theory, as it ignores or denies some of the plainest facts of the Bible and the most articulate declarations of the common consciousness of men, so it is destructive of practical religion. If his doctrine be true there can be no conviction of sin. There may be a sense of pollution and degradation, but there can be no sense of guilt, no remorse of conscience, no apprehension of the wrath and curse of God; none of those feelings which arise from the apprehension of the glory of God's justice. Yet the Bible is filled with the record of those feelings; and all Christian experience, and, indeed, all religious experience include them as one of their most essential elements. Without the conviction of sin, as involving a sense of guilt, there can be no genuine repentance. Repentance is not only sorrow for sin and a purpose to forsake it, but an acknowledgment of our desert of punishment, and conviction that we lie at the mercy of God; that it would be just and right, consistent with all his perfections, to leave us to bear the penalty of our transgression. This is not a dictum. The Scriptures abound with evidence that repentance includes the conviction and acknowledgment that the penitent deserves, notwithstanding all his service and all his reformation, to be punished for his sins; that his acceptance by God is a matter purely of grace. The Psalmist says, "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and clear when thou judgest." Our Lord puts the language of true repentance in the mouth of the prodigal son, who said, "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son, make me as one of thy hired servants." This sense of unworthiness, this conviction of ill-desert, after reformation and in despite of it, is expressed in all the supplications of repenting sinners for pardon. With Dr. Bushnell there is no pardon; any more than for a broken leg. With

him repentance is restoration to holiness, followed by deliverance from the natural evils of a sinful state of mind. It is mere restoration to health. God has nothing to forgive, and forgives nothing, any more than a mother forgives a sick child when she rejoices over its recovery.

Saving faith, or those acts of faith, which secure salvation, includes a receiving and resting upon Christ alone, as he is offered in the gospel. It is the recognition of him as God manifest in the flesh, obeying and dying for the sins of men. It is faith in his blood as an expiation for our offences; a resting upon his merits as the ground of our acceptance with God. It is receiving him not only as a prophet and king, but as a priest to make an atonement for our sins. This is not a transient act merely. It is an abiding state of the mind. It is a habitual relying upon Christ as the ground of pardon, as well as the source of sanctification and of all good, temporal and spiritual. This is the received doctrine of the Bible, inwrought into all the confessions, formulas of prayer and of praise, as well as into the hearts of God's people. It is their life. Sin, as they know, must be expiated, before they can be made holy. All this, Dr. Bushnell denies. Not indeed so much in words, as in reality. The Rationalists of Germany, while holding only the doctrines of natural religion, deliberately retained the use of all scriptural language and representation. They too talked of justification by faith, (meaning by it substantially what Dr. Bushnell does); they did not hesitate to say that Christ saves us; that he is the Lamb of God; that he bore our sins; that he is our high priest; that he makes intercession for us, &c. But the ideas attached by Christians to these words they utterly rejected. So Dr. Bushnell defends the use of the same or similar formulas in an esoteric sense. He is honest enough to admit that his views are very different from those commonly expressed by the same terms. He says he is well aware how insufficient his exposition of the great doctrine of justification by faith will appear to many. P. 439. With him, as we have seen, justification is inward renovation, and of which faith is the necessary condition; it is the receptivity, or susceptibility for the moral power of the gospel.

Of Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, which is the

Protestant and Pauline doctrine, he confesses that calling it, "*articula stantis, vel cadentis ecclesiæ*, I could more easily see the church fall than believe it." P. 439. "We only speak," he says, "of justification by faith, as a new footing of salvation, because there is such a power obtained for God, by the human life and death of Christ, and the new enforcements of his doctrine, as begets a new sense of sin, provokes the sense of spiritual want, and, when trust is engaged, creates a new element of advantage and help, to bring the soul up into victory over itself and seal it as the heir of God. And thus it is, or in the sense thus qualified, that we speak of justification by faith, as the grand result of Christ's work, and the all-inclusive grace of his salvation." P. 405. The simple meaning of all this, in plain English, is, that Christ has made such an exhibition of the goodness and greatness of God, that those who recognize it are thereby strengthened to overcome sin, love God, and are thus delivered from all the evils naturally connected with a sinful state of mind. How sad a prospect the dying thief, or any other perishing sinner, must have had, if that is the way in which Christ saves us; if that be the meaning of justification by faith.

It follows, moreover, from the theory of this book that prayer has no objective power. If God is striving to the utmost, under the necessary operation of love, to convert and save all sinners; if this work is effected not by "fiat-power" but by expression, or moral influence, what is the use of praying that God would send his Spirit to regenerate or sanctify, or to do us any good? Dr. Bushnell is bold enough to ridicule the scriptural doctrine on this subject. "We have a way of saying," he tells us, "as regards successful prayer, that it *prevails with God.* Is it then our meaning that it turns God's mind, makes him better, more favorable, more inclined to bestow the things we seek? . . . . But the true conception is this—that God has instituted an economy of prayer to work on Christian souls and brotherhoods, and encouraging them to come and make suit to him, for the blessings they need;" and so on through a paragraph all tending to prove that the effect of prayer is purely subjective. P. 521. Was this the design of the prayers of Christ? Were they intended to get him "into

a state more configured to God," so that the Father could "be able to grant, or dispense, things which before he could not?" Was such the intent of the prayer of Elias when he prayed that it might not rain, and it rained not for three years? Is this the prayer of faith which heals the sick? or the effectual fervent prayer for others of a righteous man which availeth much? Is such the mother's prayer for her child, or the constant prayers of the people of God for the conversion of the impenitent?

It is not worth while to continue this review further. It is evident that Dr. Bushnell's theory is at variance with the plainest facts and truths of the Bible; with the facts of Christian experience, or the inward teachings of the Spirit as avouched by the inspired records and the whole history of the church; with the most obvious facts of providence as well as of revelation. It subverts the very foundations of evangelical religion as well as of Christian theology. And all for what? Simply because Dr. Bushnell does not like the idea of expiation. He says, it revolts him. As there is no expiation, there can be nothing in God which demands it—(no justice); nothing in sin, which requires it, (no guilt); nothing in Scripture which teaches it; no atoning sacrifice, only lustrations; no efficacy in Christ's blood beyond what belongs to the blood of martyrs; no judicial, or even rectoral justification; no intervention in our behalf possible even for God himself, but to operate on our guilty, depraved, dead souls, in the "way of expression." This surely is a costly sacrifice to make to propitiate an aversion.

Art. II.—*The Samaritans, Ancient and Modern.*

Nabulus, the Neapolis of ancient history, the Sychar of the New Testament, and the Shechem or Sichem of the Old, has from time immemorial been the residence of the Samaritans. They are, according to their own tradition, a remnant of the Ten Tribes of Israel, the only true Israelites, "to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." Hovering about the sacred mount of their fathers, they are guarding with zealous care the rites of the ancient people of God, as taught by their interpretation of the sacred books of the great lawgiver and leader of the children of Israel.

Let us accept these traditions of their fathers, and their own settled convictions respecting their origin, their religious rites, and their faith, and at once this strange religious sect are invested with wonderful interest. Of all religious sects they are the most extraordinary, the most ancient, the most venerable, and yet the most inconsiderable, the fewest, feeblest, in the world. They consist of some thirty families, and one hundred and thirty or forty souls. Among the countless millions of the human race, they are the only true worshippers of God, the sole depositaries of his revealed will. The fire that was kindled from heaven on the sacred altar of the Jews has long been extinguished. The light that, age after age, shone out upon the surrounding darkness from the holy mount at Jerusalem, has been quenched in endless night, but its latest illuminations linger still on the cliffs of Gerizim in the mountains of Samaria, a gleam of inextinguishable light. Clinging to these cliffs and steadfastly watching that heavenly light, these ancient Samaritans, as the chosen seed of Israel, are awaiting, in sure and certain expectation, the coming of the cheerful morn that shall yet arise on the dark and dreadful night that is still gathering around them. "We know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ; when he is come, he will tell us all things."

Nabulus consists essentially of one long narrow street run-

ning east and west through a wonderful cleft in the mountain, beneath the frowning heights of Ebal on the north and Gerizim on the south. The Samaritans are clustered together in the south-west quarter of the town, under the bectling crags of Gerizim which rise several hundred feet above them. The approach to them is through a rude, dark, and narrow arched way. Here, nestling in a recess of the mountain, they dwell in comparative security, fast by their little synagogue, where they assemble for their customary devotions.

Several conflicting theories have been advanced respecting the origin and significance of the name of the Samaritans. They affirm that it is not a patrial from Samaria, but a derivative from שֹׁמְרִים, the Hebrew verb meaning *to watch, to guard, to keep.* Their name derived from this root accordingly designates them as the watchmen, the guardians, the conservators and keepers of the oracles of God. Epiphanius also ascribes to this term the same significance.* They assert that their appropriate appellation is, not that of Samaritans, but *Israelites*, the true Israel of God, in distinction from *the Jews*, descendants from Judah who have forsaken the religion of their fathers. All this vaunting of their own rectitude and hatred of the Jews is in perfect accordance with their own undoubted origin from the original revolt of the ten tribes under Rehoboam. Jeroboam, that arch-traitor and rebel, who made Israel to sin, took advantage of a dissatisfaction with the burdensome exactions of Solomon, which was prevalent among the tribes remote from Jerusalem, to foment the discontent, and place himself at the head of the malcontents. The policy of the leader of the revolting tribes was at once and for ever to "break the brotherhood between Judah and Israel;" by every means to sunder violently every tie of interest and religion that had united the tribes in a peaceful, prosperous union; and to call into action every hateful malignant passion and prejudice between the dissevered sections of the country. The enmity between the rival kingdoms of Judah and Israel at this time, was of a civil, not a religious character. The religion of both was the same. Religious feuds were at a later period intermingled.

* Απο τοῦ φύλακας αὐτους εἶναι τῆς κατὰ τον νόμον Μωϋσέως διαταξεως. Adv. Hær. Lib. I.

Samaritan and Jew, became the antagonistic parties, the embodiment and expression of every hateful attribute of a common enemy. "Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil," said the Jews to our Saviour, as an expression of their implacable disgust. The rending of the government, the worship of the golden calves at Bethel, and at Dan, with the introduction of other idolatrous rites, and the consecration of Gerizim as the holy mount, the place of their solemn assemblies instead of Moriah, the mountain of the Lord's house at Jerusalem, was enough to establish for ever the hostility between Jew and Samaritan. As of old "the Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans," so now the latter neither eat nor drink, nor marry, nor associate with the Jews. This enmity, on the other hand, is fully reciprocated by the Jews towards the Samaritans.

It would be foreign from our purpose to sketch the history of the Samaritans, or glance at the strange vicissitudes by which they have been reduced to a feeble remnant of an ancient and powerful people, still abiding on their native soil after the lapse of thousands of years, in the faithful observance of the rites of their forefathers. Our inquiries are limited to their present condition, their domestic institutions, their religious belief and rites, with the conflicting theories of the learned respecting their origin.

When Dr. Robinson was at Nabulus in 1838, only *thirty* Samaritans paid taxes to the government; and their entire population was one hundred and fifty. To Dr. Wilson, a few years later, they gave the same estimate of their number. One of their most intelligent men informed us in 1857, that they then consisted of thirty families, comprising one hundred and thirty souls. Dr. Stanley, still later, reports one hundred and fifty-two as their entire number, nor has their population essentially varied from this data within the memory of man. Diminished and brought low through oppression, affliction and sorrow, this solitary remnant has sustained themselves with singular tenacity and uniformity.

The domestic institutions of the Samaritans are strictly Jewish. Their names, of either sex, are derived from the

ancient Scriptures, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Ishmael; Sarah, Rachel, Leah, Milcah, Hannah, &c. The family of their priesthood have descended from the tribe of Levi. All else are descendants from the sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh.

The prevailing costume of the sect is white, especially when they appear in public, in their religious assemblies, and on all festive occasions. Mohammedan bigotry, however, compels the men to wear red turbans. The habiliments of the women are conformed to the costume of the country, but some are permitted to wear ear-rings, because of such the golden calf was made.

Both sexes enter into the marriage relation at a very early age. The proposal of the bridegroom, or more frequently of his father, is made, not to the bride, but to her father; and a dowry from the bridegroom is an indispensable condition of the acceptance of the proposals. The marriage covenant of the bride and bridegroom is written out at great length, and witnessed with much solemnity as the covenant of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, according to the law of Moses. This is accompanied with the reading of prescribed portions of the law. The festivities of the occasion continue several days, and are concluded with an interchange of presents between the bridal parties and their friends.

Public thanksgivings are rendered on the Sabbath for the birth of a man-child, and the day is consecrated to this joyful occasion. The birth of a daughter is passed in silence, but the ceremonial purifications prescribed in the laws of Moses are carefully observed by the mother. The rite of circumcision is administered on the eighth day, according to the Mosaic ritual. Relatives and friends are in attendance, and the day is devoted to feasting and mutual congratulations. Everything commemorative of one's birth-day is scrupulously repudiated as a heathenish rite of the Pharaohs of Egypt. Gen. xl. 20.

The priest is on no occasion to come in contact with the dead; the people may themselves perform the last offices of affection to their friends; but by so doing subject themselves to the penance of ceremonial uncleanness according to the Levitical law on that subject. For this reason others, not of their sect,

are employed to perform the burial services for their dead. Various ablutions of the deceased are requisite preparatory to interment. The religious services of their funerals are protracted and diversified with the reading of several lessons from the Pentateuch, prayers, and the Song of the Angels, sung, according to their tradition, at the death of Aaron. No funeral is admissible on the Sabbath day. This is a joyful occasion, not in harmony with the burial of the dead. For some time the female friends and relatives of the deceased daily frequent his grave, and linger near throughout the day, reading from the Books of Moses passages relating to the dead, and singing their sacred elegies. For the accommodation of these mourning women suitable apartments have been erected in their cemetery. On the Sabbath following the funeral the whole congregation, after morning prayers, gather about the grave and partake of a simple meal, after the manner of a love feast of the ancient church.

In their religion the Samaritans are monotheists of the straitest sect. No pictorial representation, in the likeness of any thing "that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath," is admissible by them; not even the portrait of a friend.

They admit the existence of good and evil angels; of heaven and of hell, the abode, after death, of the righteous and of the wicked. They look for a future judgment when soul and body will be reunited, and each will be happy or miserable according to his character in this life. But their views of a future state seem not to be clearly defined.

Like the Jews, the Samaritans are still waiting for the coming of Messias, for which they have in their Scriptures one only prophecy—"The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." Deut. xviii. 15. Shiloh (Gen. xlix. 10) is not Messias but Solomon, according to their interpretation.

The coming of Messias will be six thousand years from the creation of the world. Their redemption is drawing nigh. He will quickly come and gather all nations to himself. On Gerizim will be his throne of universal dominion. The twelve stones on which the ten commandments were written by Joshua will

be recovered; together with the sacred vessels of the temple and the pot of manna, now buried under what the Samaritans denominate the stone of Bethel, also on their sacred mount. Then again will be established in its primitive purity the worship of the only living and true God, as now observed by them.

The seventh day of the week, the Sabbath of the Samaritans, is observed with all the strictness of the Levitical law. At the setting of the sun, on the day of preparation, each household retires within, suspending all labour, and closing the door against every intruder. No fire is kindled on the Sabbath, nor the slightest preparation made for their customary meals. We were in attendance at their public worship in their synagogue. The services consisted in liturgical, responsive prayers, chants, and rehearsals of their law, with kneeling, bowing, and prostrations, all apparently with the hurried heartless formality of an outward form, without the inward spirit of devotion. As the Mohammedan, in every place, turns in prayer towards the shrine of the prophet, so the Samaritan in his devotions never fails to look and to bow towards his holy mount. From the dust of this mountain Adam was formed. On it Adam, Seth, and Noah, successively erected their altars, and Abraham offered his son Isaac. Here the throne of judgment shall be set, and the Messias will reign from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth.

The great day of atonement is observed by the Samaritans with the severest strictness and solemnity. During the entire twenty-four hours they neither allow themselves to eat, or drink, or sleep, nor indulge in conversation. Silent meditation and the reading of their Scriptures are the appropriate solemnities of the day.

The feast of Pentecost, of Tabernacles, and of the Passover, are solemnized by processions to their holy mountain. But the Passover is the great occasion for their sacred solemnities. On the day preceding, before the setting of the sun, the whole congregation, men, women, and children, are encamped on Mount Gerizim. Six lambs, without spot or blemish, are provided for the sacrifice; the fires are kindled; and a deep pit prepared for the roasting of the victims. At the setting of the sun, the

congregation, gathered around the sacrifical fires, arrayed in white robes, engage in a liturgical chant of prayers and sacred songs, with the whole history of the plagues of Egypt and the appointment of the Passover, during which the lambs are led apart for the slaughter, the young men designated for this service brandishing aloft their long bright knives. At the words, "The whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening," (Ex. xii. 6,) the lambs are stretched lifeless on the ground, their blood streaming from them, the head having been almost severed from the body by one convulsive stroke of the knife.

Dipping their fingers in the blood, these officials cross themselves on the forehead and nose, a rite formerly observed by the whole congregation. The recitation is continued while bitter herbs are handed around wrapped in strips of unleavened bread. "With bitter herbs they shall eat it." Exod. xii. 8. In the meantime the lambs are fleeced by pouring boiling water over them, without flaying them. The entrails and the right fore-legs are cast into the fire; the liver, carefully washed, is returned to its place. The lambs, fastened on long poles as spits, are supported by these over the glowing coals in the pit, over which a hurdle is placed, and covered with wet grass and earth, so as to seal up the oven until the roasting shall be completed. "They shall eat the flesh in the night, roast with fire. Eat not of it raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire." Exod. xii. 8, 9.

Two hours have been occupied with these ceremonials, the shades of evening have gathered fast and deepened into night; the stars have come out, and the Paschal moon throws her pale silver light over these strange scenes on the sacred mount. The congregation retire to rest in their tents, passing several hours in solemn stillness. At midnight announcement is made that the feast is about to begin. The men gather eagerly around the pit, rehearsing their prayers while the covering is thrown off, and a vast column of steam arises up where

> "Smokes on Gerizim's Mount,
> Samaria's sacrifice."

The lambs are laid upon mats prepared for the purpose, each

by itself, and "his head with his legs, and with the purtenance thereof" (Exod. xii. 9) between two lines of men standing with shoes on their feet, staves in their hands, and ropes round their waists: "Thus shall ye eat it, with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand." Exod. xii. 11.

The recitations suddenly cease, each with his fingers tears away the flesh by piecemeals, and eats in rapid eagerness and silence: "Ye shall eat it in haste; it is the Lord's passover." Portions of the flesh are carried to the women in their tents. The bones and the fragments are thrown into a fire kindled for the purpose, and the ground diligently searched with candles for every fragment of the consecrated elements to be thrown into the burning mass. "Ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning; and that which remaineth of it until the morning ye shall burn with fire."

The remaining hours of the night are passed in prayer, and at early dawn the whole community descend from the mountain to their usual habitations in town. "Thou shalt turn in the morning, and go unto thy tents." Deut. xvi. 7.

Thus on this sacred mountain in Samaria the Paschal Lamb is offered year after year—the only Jewish sacrifice that still lingers in the world. But it is worthy of remark that the Samaritans have not the remotest idea of the expiatory nature of any sacrifice, or of the remission of sin by the shedding of blood.

The sacred Scriptures of the Samaritans are the five books of Moses. This is in perfect accordance with their traditions, which date their origin, as a distinct sect, from the revolt of the ten tribes. At that period the Psalms of David, the writings of Solomon, and other portions of our sacred canon, must have been extant, but only the writings of Moses, embodied in the Pentateuch, may have been canonized and universally recognized as divine. These accordingly would be retained, cherished, and preserved by devout Israelites in the revolted tribes; and through all the vicissitudes of their eventful history may have been transmitted down to their latest posterity in the lineage of the Samaritans.

The knowledge and worship of the true God, we must believe

was never wholly obliterated by the idolatries of Israel. Great reformers from time to time arose in Judah and Israel to restore and retain the knowledge of God, and to perpetuate his word and his worship among the apostate tribes of Israel. The reformations under Joash, Hezekiah, and Josiah, extended into the tribes of Israel. At a period of deepest declension, in the time of Elijah and Elisha, there was a school of the prophets at Bethel. One hundred were saved alive by Obadiah when Jezebel sought to exterminate from the land the prophets of the Lord. 1 Kings xviii. 4. Under many of the kings of Israel the Lord raised prophets who exercised their office among the ten tribes. Under Nadab, Jehu the son of Hanani was prophet; under Ahab, Elijah and Micaiah; under Ahaziah, Elijah, Micaiah and Elisha; under Joram, Jehu, Jehoahaz, and Joash, Elisha. Jeroboam, the second, made extensive conquests by which he extended his territory from Hamath to the Dead Sea, "according to the word of the Lord God, which he spoke by the hand of his servant Jonah, the son of Amittai." 2 Kings xiv. 25. Under his reign, Hosea and Amos lived and prophesied in Israel. Now had all these prophets of Israel no copy of the laws of Moses, no standard to which they could appeal to enforce their reproofs or commands? Elijah and Elisha, at the head of the schools, had they no knowledge of the Pentateuch? Read their prophecies, notice their references and appeals to the Pentateuch, and who can doubt that this portion of the sacred oracles was preserved and known in Israel, throughout all the apostacy and captivity of the ten tribes. This series of prophets of Israel, from Ahijah under Jeroboam to Hosea and Amos and Oded under Pekah, 2 Chron. xxviii. 9, extends over almost the entire period from the revolt to the captivity of the ten tribes.

In the great reformation under Josiah over the region of the ten tribes, Jeremiah was contemporary with him, coöperating in this reform. His prophetic office continued through the reign of all the successors of Josiah into the Babylonish captivity. Urijah and several of the minor prophets exercised their office within the same period. And Ezekiel, before Jeremiah ceased his labours, received his commission to oppose the "rebellious house," the people of "stubborn front and hard heart" to

whom he was sent. Many of the ten tribes returned from captivity with those of Judah, and received the instructions of the prophets and reformers of that age. Numerous and unquestionable are the proofs that the knowledge of God, of his word and of his worship, was preserved in the tribes of Israel, not only during the whole of their existence as a separate nation, but throughout their captivity, until their admixture with the foreign residents in their native land under the name of Samaritans, who adopted their sacred books, their faith, and their forms of worship.*

"The Lord testified against Israel and against Judah by all the prophets, and by all the seers, saying, 'Turn ye from your evil ways, and keep my commandments and my statutes according to all the law which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you by my servants the prophets.'" They would not hearken, indeed, and rejected his statutes. Such was the general character of the people, but were there no exceptions? none that set their hearts to seek the Lord God of Israel? none of the true Israel of God who walked still in the statutes of the Lord? The prophet Elijah thought himself left alone in Israel, a solitary worshipper of the only living and true God, when there were found seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal.

Antiochus Epiphanes pillaged and profaned the temple at Jerusalem, desecrated by every abomination its most holy rites, burned the sacred books, forbade the people under pains of death, to retain or read them; and appointed overseers throughout the land who perpetrated the most terrible atrocities in the execution of his decrees, subjecting to torture, crucifixion, and death in every form, those who observed the commandments, or preserved the Books of the Law. But the effect was that the law was preserved with greater care, cherished with deeper affection, embodied in the sacred canon, and delivered unimpaired to future generations. 1 *Maccab.* i. 50—64, *Joseph. Antiq.* xii. 5, *Tacit. Hist.* v. 8.

Even in the archives of his idolatrous ancestors king Josiah

* Compare on this subject North Am. Rev. vol. xxii. New Series xiii., pp. 274—317, by Professor Stuart.

found a neglected copy of the Book of the Law. Such vitality has this incorruptible seed, when once it has taken root, that in climate and soil the most uncongenial and forbidding, it can never be wholly extirpated.

Neither could the people, all, without exception, have been carried into captivity. No record in the Scriptures represents a universal conquest of the tribes. Naphtali was in the line of the invading army and several of her cities were taken, once and again. 1 Kings xv. 20; 2 Kings xv. 29. On one occasion the invaders returned through the country east of the Jordan. 1 Chron. v. 26. In the third invasion Samaria was captured. 2 Kings xvii. Include under this head Ephraim and Benjamin. Even then Asher, Zebulon, Issachar, and Dan, remain exempt, except so far as the enemy may have passed through some of their borders. The entire depopulation of such a country as Palestine moreover is an impossibility. Its strongholds, mountains, caves, and deserts, offer means of concealment and defence invincible by any force. The children of Israel never gained possession of the whole land, nor extirpated the original inhabitants. What motive could the conqueror have to burden his returning army and his country with the aged, the young, the infirm, the helpless, useless consumers, who would only prey upon its production. However desolate the land, many more must have escaped from the spoiler than went into captivity. And among these remained devout Israelites not a few who still adhered to the religion of their fathers.*

They that went into captivity, moreover, would carry secretly with them their Bible; and some would inevitably find their way back to their own native land. The sure word of prophecy had foretold this return: "Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel shall gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock." Jer. xxxi. 10. "And I will gather them out of Assyria, and I will bring them into the land of Gilead [Bashan] and Lebanon; and place [sufficient] shall not be found for them." Zech. x. 10. "And there shall be a highway for the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria;

* Compare Davidson's Connexion of Sacred and Profane History. Vol. i. page 35.

like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt." Isaiah xi. 16.

Such, we believe—all theory, speculation, and learned disquisitions apart—are the obvious deductions of common sense; and such are the declarations of authentic history. In this belief we contemplate the Samaritan Pentateuch as a venerable document that has come down to us from the remotest antiquity. In the line of the revolted tribes and of the Samaritans the Pentateuch must have come down to us. Biblical scholars of vast erudition and research, such as Eichhorn and others, have conclusively inferred the great antiquity of the Hebrew Pentateuch from the Samaritan copy of it. We are not ignorant of theories, more of them anon; but at present leave us to the undisturbed conviction of the venerable antiquity of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Their own undoubted belief indeed severely tasks the most indulgent credulity. With great solemnity they reluctantly exhibit to the traveller the original copy of the sacred scroll written by Abishua, the son of Phinehas, and great-grandson of Aaron! Credat Judæus Apella. Non ego. The real age of this manuscript will probably never be determined, but it has beyond doubt just claims to a high antiquity. Our party obtained from one of the sect two sheets of an imperfect copy of their Pentateuch. These are written on parchment with great beauty and precision, in the Hebrew language, but in the old Samaritan character. They have been submitted to the critical examination of another more competent to describe these fragments of the Samaritan Pentateuch, as to the character and critical importance of this venerable document. To him the reader is indebted for the following paragraphs on this subject.

"The following description of two specimen leaves of the Samaritan Pentateuch purchased at Nabulus, may afford some idea of their sacred manuscripts. They are of folio size, containing Num. xxxi. 21—xxxii. 4, and xxxiii. 4—xxxiv. 4, written in a clear, legible character, of remarkable neatness and regularity. Exactness in the length of lines is secured by separating their initial and final letters from the words to which they belong, an arrangement which presents to the eye the appearance of a narrow border. There is also a noticeable

liking for alliteration. Various devices are used to bring the same letters or words in vertical juxtaposition in successive lines, the most striking instance of which is in the record of the journeyings of the children of Israel, xxxiii. 10—48, where the page has quite a tabular look. Individual words are separated by a single dot; the verses, which for the most part correspond with the Masoretic, by two dots vertically placed. Occasionally the main pause in the verse, which the Masorites indicated by the accent Athnahh, is also marked by two dots placed either vertically or horizontally. Sections generally, though not uniformly agreeing with the lesser Jewish Parashahs, are also noted by dots and spaces.

"The variations from the ordinary Hebrew text exhibited upon these pages, like those of the Samaritan Pentateuch generally, are of four sorts, orthographical, grammatical, critical, and those which are of the nature of glosses. Two or three manifest slips of the pen in the transposition of letters are not reckoned; nor two or three additional instances in which letters or words were unintentionally omitted, which have been supplied in smaller characters above the line or in the margin. The orthographic variations are confined to the vowel letters, the *scriptio plena*, occurring forty times in this brief compass, where the common Hebrew text has the *scriptio defectiva;* the reverse takes place in but four instances. In a few proper names also, Yodh is substituted for Vav, making a change analogous to that of Huram, 2 Chron. ii. 3, for Hiram, 1 Kings v. 2. The grammatical variations are such as the regular insertion of the conjunction *and* between the particulars of an enumeration as xxxi. 22, or a change of gender or number, the more usual construction being preferred to that which is less so, or the omission of the article where it is unessential. The critical emendations, or what seem to have been intended as such, introduce a more exact conformity to some parallel passage, as in xxxi. 28, 'of all manner of beasts,' is added as in verse 30. The glosses are first the simple substitution of one equivalent word for another, this being confined in these pages to the interchange which twice occurs of one preposition for another of the same meaning; and secondly, the insertion of words, or even sentences, to make the sense plainer or more forcible. Thus the word

'all,' is inserted before 'the inhabitants of the land,' xxxiii. 55, which seems to be a peculiarity of this manuscript, as it is not found in the Samaritan Pentateuch as printed in Walton's Polyglot. The word 'so,' however, inserted before 'I shall do,' in xxxiii. 56, is found in Walton, as are the greater portion of the variations above described, and as is also the most remarkable gloss of all, which is now to be mentioned. In Num. xxxi. 21—24, Eleazer, the priest, utters a command which the Lord had given to Moses, but it is nowhere stated that Moses had charged Eleazer so to do. The Samaritan Pentateuch accordingly supplies this imaginary omission by introducing the following paragraph: 'And Moses said to Eleazer the priest, Say unto the men of war which went to the battle, This is the ordinance of the law which the Lord has commanded. Only the gold and the silver and the iron, and the tin and the lead, everything that may abide the fire, ye shall make to go through the fire, and it shall be clean; nevertheless it shall be purified with the water of separation; and all that abideth not the fire, ye shall make go through the water. And ye shall wash your clothes on the seventh day, and ye shall be clean, and afterward ye shall come into the camp.' "

The Samaritan Pentateuch may be of little importance as a codex for the revision of the original text; but if we may accept the alleged authorities for its great antiquity and venerable character, it becomes a remnant of antiquity of great interest as a duplicate copy of the Pentateuch that has come down to us through the long line of three thousand years. Judah and Israel, Jews and Samaritans, have been each the depositaries of this portion of the sacred canon, guarding with wakeful jealousy their own codex of the Law as divine, and rejecting as spurious and worthless that of the other. But after the lapse of many centuries these ancient copies are found, on comparison, to be essentially the same,—one and the same book divine, transmitted down to us from the remotest period of recorded time through separate and independent channels, and still harmonizing in all the essential revelations of the ordinances and statutes of the Lord God of Israel. The argument for the authenticity, genuineness, and antiquity of the four Books of Moses, carries us back through these converging lines of light

up to a thousand years before the Christian era. They were extant at that distant age—received as canonical, divine, by opposing sects, who have severally transmitted them down to us as an authentic and venerable transcript of the Book of the Law as originally given by the Lord to Moses on Sinai. How many elaborate theories and learned discussions would be given to the winds by the discovery of two authentic copies of Homer's epics, preserved separate and entire, from the distant age of this famous Grecian bard? How much learned criticism and controversy would be settled by the universal acceptance of the authenticity of the Samaritan Pentateuch!

But for two hundred years the authenticity of this Book of the Law has been held in earnest controversy. And even by common consent of the learned, sanctioned by the high authority of Gesenius, Hengstenberg, and others, disowned and rejected as spurious and worthless.

The theory is, 1. That our own canonical Pentateuch is not the production of Moses, the leader of the children of Israel, but of some unknown author who lived a thousand years later, about the time of the Babylonish captivity. Such at least is the position of Gesenius, who, during a long life devoted to the study of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, never lost an opportunity of casting contempt upon their inspiration, miraculous character, and divine authority.

2. That when the ten tribes were carried away captive into Assyria, the cities and villages of Samaria were not merely partially but wholly depopulated, so that the whole land was left utterly desolate, without an inhabitant, until "the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel; and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof." 2 Kings xvii. 24.

3. That these Assyrian foreigners, a medley of many nations and various forms of idolatry, took the name of Samaritans from the name of the country to which they were removed, and became the head of the Samaritan sect.

4. That these idolatrous Samaritans abandoned their false forms of religion, through the influence of the judgments of

heaven, and of a priest sent back to them from the land of their captivity, and adopted the religion of the Jews, mixed with certain foreign rites.

5. That the rejection of Sanballat's proposal to assist in rebuilding the temple, after the Babylonish captivity, confirmed the natural hostility between the Jews and Samaritans; and that the latter adopted the Hebrew Pentateuch, with certain modifications, as their own sacred code, and established on Gerizim a schismatical form of worship, expressive of a perversion of the religion of the Jews, sanctioned by a spurious copy of the Mosaic Pentateuch.

We have neither the ability nor the presumption to open anew this controversy, but we must protest against this series of assumptions, all and single, as, in our judgment unsatisfactory, untenable, and illusive, notwithstanding the high authority with which they are promenaded, and the ability with which they are defended.

Confiding in the antiquity, genuineness, authenticity, inspiration, and Divine authority of the Mosaic Pentateuch, we pass without remark the skeptical theory of Gesenius, the great neologist of Germany; but cannot forbear the expression of our regret that others of sounder faith, and more worthy of confidence, should lend their influence, directly or indirectly, to the support of assumptions so derogatory to the sacred Scriptures.

The theory that when Israel was carried away, the country was wholly evacuated, the aged, the young, the infirm, men, women, and children being carried into captivity, is in the highest degree improbable, not to say impossible. Neither is it foretold by prophecy, nor authorized in history, sacred or profane. Of the prophecies foretelling the desolation of Israel, we do not recall any so severe, so sweeping, so expressive of utter extermination as those which the Lord spake by his servants against Judah and Jerusalem: "Behold, I am bringing such evil upon Jerusalem and Judah, that whosoever heareth of it, both his ears shall tingle. And I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of Samaria and the plummet of the house of Ahab, and I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it, and turning it upside down." 2 Kings xxi. 12, 13. But it stands recorded as an

historieal fact, notwithstanding, that the poor of the land were left to be vinedressers and husbandmen. Is not the inference conclusive, that the same was true of Samaria in her deepest desolation?

Moreover, the prophetic promise is to Israel as well as to Judah, of a remnant that should return from captivity to their native land. In addition to passages cited above, note the following: "Lo, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel and Judah; and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers." Jer. xxx. 3. "And I will bring Israel again to his habitation, and he shall feed on Carmel and Bashan, and his soul shall be satisfied upon mount Ephraim and Gilead." Jer. l. 19. Is this indicative of the utter extermination of Israel in Samaria, the original stock of the Samaritâns?

History records many instances of the conquest of a land by a foreign foe, and of the people carried into captivity. "A single city, or village, or petty province, may in consequence have been entirely deserted. But we have yet to learn of an instance within the range of history, of a numerous people over an extensive territory swept utterly away, and the land lying desolate, without an inhabitant for a century or an age. Even from the bloodiest massacres in city, citadel, or fortress, some have survived to tell the story of the carnage.

The history of the kings of Judah, subsequent to the capture of the ten tribes by the siege of Samaria, until the Babylonish captivity, distinctly implies the presence of a remnant of inhabitants still in that waste, desolate land. Josiah, in this interval, destroyed the altar and the high place which Jeroboam the son of Nebat had set up at Bethel. He broke down the altars and images of Baalim, and "burnt the bones of the priests upon their altars, and cleansed Judah; and so did he in the cities of Manasseh, and Ephraim, and Simeon, even unto Naphtali," the remotest of the tribes of Israel, 2 Kings xxiii. 15, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 6, and finally died in battle at Megiddo in the centre of the tribes of Israel. Must we, can we believe that at this time the whole land of Israel was lying desolate without an inhabitant? Further, to repair the house of the Lord, the Levites, at this very time, "gathered

of the hand of *Manasseh* and *Ephraim*, and of *all the remnant of Israel*, and of all Judah and Benjamin." 2 Chron. xxxiv. 9. This specification of Judah and Benjamin most distinctly indicates that the preceding contributions were gathered from the remnant of the ten tribes of Israel who still lingered in the land, adherents to the religion of their fathers, numerous and flourishing enough to give substantial aid in repairing the temple at Jerusalem. As an instance of similar contributions from Israel, compare the forty-first chapter of Jeremiah.

Before the reign of Josiah, the king of Assyria may have "brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel; and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof." 2 Kings xvii. 24. The learned have proposed various theories respecting the date of the settlement of these colonists in Samaria. The most probable conjecture, perhaps, is that they settled in the land at different times from various countries, bringing with them the strange gods and idolatrous rites to which they had been addicted in their native land. The zeal of Josiah may have been directed against their idolatries, but the *contributions* for the restoration of the temple and its religious rites must have been made by devout Israelites remaining in their cities and tribes. The effect of the prevalent idolatries of their invaders, the scorn, contempt and persecution to which they, as the outcasts of Israel, were subject, would be only to bind them more closely to the religion of their fathers, to the law and the testimony of their sacred books.

Next, the theory under consideration presents us with the strange spectacle of a motley herd of polytheists and idolaters forsaking their false gods for the worship of the only living and true God; and receiving and cherishing, with profoundest reverence, the sacred books of their bitterest enemies; adopting the religion of the sect whom they regarded with the most implacable hostility; and that, without political interest present or prospective, without intellectual culture, without development in art or civilization, without religious instruction, save from one ignorant priest sent back from captivity to teach them "the manner of the God of the land." Verily this strange

conversion contradicts all history, and transcends all belief. It reverses the usual process of development and progress of the human race. It supposes a development from ignorance, idolatry, and sin, upwards towards God; whereas the historic fact is, that the development of the race has ever been downward, not upward. No nation or people, brutalized by idolatry and sin, have ever lifted themselves, by their own moral instincts, out of their condition.

"The earliest authentic record that we have, shows that man began his existence pure and holy; that he had knowledge of but one God, the Creator and Sovereign; that the golden age was at the beginning, which he lost by sin; that then the Divine Being was worshipped by sacrifices, each man being a priest; that afterwards the race deteriorated to such an extent that they were swept away by the retributive justice of the Almighty."*

Within four hundred years from the flood, the iniquity of the Canaanites was full. Sunk in sin, they were ripe for the destruction to which they were devoted. They give place to the father of the faithful and his posterity, that secluded from surrounding wickedness by special ordinances, by local position, and the retired pursuits of pastoral life, they might perpetuate on earth the knowledge and worship of God. The whole earth had already apostatized from Him. The entire history of the Jews is a record of their continual degeneracy, which all their providential discipline, and divine instruction, coupled with the combined influence of prophets, priests, and kings, could only occasionally stay for a time, but never effectually resist. The progress of the select seed of Abraham was only downward, in deeper apostacy from God. Have then this medley of Assyrian idolaters cast away their idols in a day, in utter abhorrence of every image or symbol in religious worship, and returned back to God contrary to the course of the whole human race?

Why the adoption of the *Pentateuch* alone as their sacred code of laws and book divine? With one or two exceptions perhaps, the roll of prophecy was complete. If not embodied

* Voices of the Soul, p. 198.

in the canon, it was entire in its several parts. Why all are rejected except those from the hand of the great Jewish lawgiver, this theory of the exclusive origin of the Samaritans from a mixed race of foreign idolaters, fails to explain; and this failure does but expose the more its fallacy.

The Samaritans, on proposing to Zerubbabel and "the chief of the fathers" to unite with them in rebuilding the temple, urge the consideration that their faith and forms of worship are the same as those of the Jews. "Let us build with you: for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esar-haddon king of Assur, which brought us up hither." Ezra iv. 2. Whatever may have been the motive of the Samaritans in making the proposal, with what show of truth or plausibility could they make this declaration on the theory that they had not yet received from the Jews their books pertaining to the Mosaic ritual?

In every particular the theory under consideration is, in our judgment, fallacious, contradictory to history and to the progress of the whole human race in their continual apostacy from God. We marvel at the general acceptance of a theory so preposterous by men of learning and piety. We marvel at the readiness with which even the wise, the learned, the good, follow their leaders; and whirl into rank and file under their literary chieftains.

Foremost among these dictators of popular sentiment, Gesenius* and Hengstenberg† are the acknowledged champions of the learned for the defence of the theory under consideration. The latter has entered upon an elaborate and learned argument to prove, what none can doubt, that when the Samaritans became known and took their place in history as a distinct sect, they were essentially a community of foreigners, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. The ten tribes had gone into captivity. Their land, waste and desolate, had been occupied many years by foreign colonists who were the origin and the founders of the Samaritan sect. Hengstenberg's argu-

* De Pentateuchi Samaritani, origine, indole et auctoritate. Commentatio philologico-critica.

† Beiträge 2te Band. Das Samaritanische Exemplar, und das Vorhandseyn des Pentateuchs im Reiche Israel.

ment accordingly is but a waste of words to prove an historical postulate granted without argument—that the Samaritans as known at the return of the Jews from captivity, were essentially of foreign origin. A nation is known by its rulers. These are its public representatives. But the country is at this time, and has been for almost two hundred years, a foreign province. The officers of state are foreigners. Ezra iv. 7—11. The Samaritans, therefore, as a nation, sect, or people, are collectively of foreign extraction. And the laboured discussion of Hengstenberg only ends in a fact admitted from the beginning.

But the real question at issue is, whether the Samaritans were *purely* a collection of foreigners commingled and blended together in a new religious sect, or whether there was from the beginning a remnant of the children of Israel, who, assimilating with these foreign immigrants, became an integral and influential part of the sect of the Samaritans. This we cannot doubt; and respectfully submit that this theory offers a reasonable explanation of the strange admixture of foreign elements in the Jewish forms of the religion of the Samaritans. The revolt under Rehoboam began with an effort, to which the Jews had ever been addicted, to assimilate their religion with that of other nations. The revolted tribes professed, not to abjure the worship of Jehovah, but to worship him under a new form, in the image of the golden calves. "They set up images and groves in every high hill, and then they burnt incense in all the high places as did the heathen," while professing still to worship the God of Israel.

On the other hand, the idolatrous immigrants were disposed to conform to "the manner of the God of the land," and called from captivity a Jewish priest "to teach them how they should fear the Lord." And yet while seeking to conform to the religion of the Israelites, their captives, these foreign colonists, were not divorced from their false gods. They only sought to blend their own religion with that of the country of their adoption—Paganism with Judaism. "So these nations feared the Lord, and served their graven images; both their children and their children's children." Comp. 2 Kings xvii. 24—41. The result was a corrupt form of Judaism to which they that were

only Jews outwardly would readily conform, while devout Jews would inwardly cherish their national religion, and secretly conform, as best they could, to its sacred rites. Mixed marriages and family alliances with foreigners was the natural result of this coalition; which became a snare to the Jews who returned from the Babylonish captivity. Scandals, in consequence arose, which all the authority, energy, and decision of Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah could but imperfectly correct. These stern reformers saw, in the general degeneracy, reasons sufficient and imperative for steadfastly refusing all proposals from the Samaritans of a confederacy with them. "Let us build with you, for we seek your God as ye do," was the persistent proposal of the Samaritans. "Ye have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God; but we ourselves together will build unto the Lord God of Israel. "Ye have no portion nor right, nor memorial in Jerusalem." Ezra iv. 3; Neh. ii. 20.

The same proposal Sanballat subsequently renews to Nehemiah. What is his motive? As satrap, or governor of the province, he sees the importance of attaching these powerful caravans of colonists to his government as a means of increasing its population and resources. Defeated in these designs by the decision of Nehemiah, his policy is by every expedient to prevent the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the rise of a rival power in his neighbourhood. Conflicting interests, rivalries, jealousies, and feuds, political and religious, enkindle anew ancient animosities, and establish for ever the mutual hatred of Jews and Samaritans.

The mutual relations of these sects at the conclusion of the Babylonish captivity, together with their rivalries, jealousies, and conflicts, resulting from the return of the Jews to repair the desolations of Jerusalem and rebuild their temple, have been sketched with a skilful hand by Juynboll,* to whose delineations on this vexed subject we respectfully request a careful attention, as briefly expressed in the following paragraphs.

Many of the Jews had at this time abated much of their former hostility towards the Samaritans, which subsequently became so rancorous and so universal. Their own depressed

* Commentarii in Historiam Gentis Samaritanæ.

condition had constrained many to seek alliances with the Samaritans as a relief from present and impending evils. At home and abroad they had become familiar with foreigners, and yielding their own exclusive prejudices with their religious scruples, had learned to tolerate foreign customs and habits, in so far that men of Tyre dwelt with them in the midst of Jerusalem, and habitually profaned the Sabbath day by their public markets, and all manner of secular employments. Neh. xiii. 15, 16. With the Samaritans, especially on their borders, they lived on terms of familiar social intercourse. Both the men of Judah (Ezra ii. 25—28, compare Neh. vii. 29 seq.), and men of Israel (Ezra ii. 59), and Benjamites, returning from captivity, dwelt in their cities with those who had previously taken up their residence in them. Neh. xi. 31. Living thus with Samaritans and other foreigners in many cities, the Jews became daily more assimilated to them; and many, not only of the common people, but of their princes and their priests, became connected with them in marriage. Ezra x. 10; Neh. vi. 17, 18, xiii. 23, seq.; Mal. ii. 10—16. Certain of the Levites who had been rejected from the priesthood on failing to establish their genealogy, joined themselves to the Samaritans. Ezra ii. 61—63; Neh. vii. 63—65.

These again were, at this time, favourably disposed towards the religious rites of the Jews. Many under both Ezra and Nehemiah united with the Jews in keeping their feasts at Jerusalem. The children of Israel, an integral part of the Samaritans, were present at the dedication of the temple, and a special "offering, on their account, of twelve he-goats" was made on that occasion "according to the number of the tribes of Israel." Ezra vi. 17.

The Israelitish judaizing Samaritans not only recognized the temple and the city of Jerusalem as a sacred place, but in deference to her prophets and priests sought their counsel in regard to their religious rites; of which we have a remarkable example in the seventh chapter of Zechariah. In the fourth year of king Darius, after the dedication of the temple, *Bethel*, one of the cities of the Samaritans, sends a delegation to Jerusalem "to pray before the Lord," and to enquire of the "priests" and the "prophets" whether the fast commemora-

tive of the *destruction* of the temple should be discontinued, since it had been rebuilt and consecrated to the worship of Jehovah? The Divine reply which the prophet is directed to give to this delegation comprehends the seventh and eighth chapters of Zechariah.* In this connection the alliance of Eliashib the priest, with Tobiah, a Samaritan from a foreign nation, and his entertainment in a chamber in the courts of the house of God, Neh. xiii. 4—7; and the marriage of one of the sons of Joiada with a daughter of Sanballat, should be carefully noted as indicative of the affiliation of Jews and Samaritans at this time.

But there was also another party, composed of Priests and Levites, who had returned from their captivity to reassert their former prerogatives and power, together with devout Jews who truly loved their nation, their country, and their ancient religion. These, regarding with abhorrence the temporizing policy and lax morals of the native residents, zealously united their influence to reëstablish the religion of their fathers, to correct abuses, to rebuke the scandals of the times, and reform the habits of their demoralized countrymen.

Under these circumstances, the policy of Sanballat, as governor of the province, is at first altogether conciliatory towards those immigrants who came in powerful caravans to settle in Jerusalem and the deserted cities of Judea. He proposes to encourage and aid them in rebuilding the city and temple of Jerusalem, on condition that all should build together in promotion of a common cause, which would increase the population and advance the various interests of his province. Failing in this policy, by the stern refusal of the Jews to build with him, to acknowledge his authority, or accept any terms of confederacy, civil or religious, with him, his next effort is by every means to counterwork the designs of the Jews at Jerusalem. By ridicule, Neh. iv. 2, by slander and false representations at the Persian court, Ezra iv. 4, seq.; by private assassination, Neh. vi. 1—14; by open war, Neh. iv. 8. Sanballat in connection with "the people of the land weakened the hands of

* Such is the interpretation which our author, in common with Hitzig Ewald, and Henderson, gives to this vexed passage, Zech. vii. 1, seq.

the people of Judah, and troubled them in building." Ezra iv. 4. Here arose again, with tenfold virulence, the "irrepressible conflict" between Jews and Samaritans, which soon matured into that mutual intolerance, bigotry, and implacable hatred, which subsists between them unto this day.*

But the Samaritans of Shechem, that remnant of Israel, weak and small, lingering around their sacred mountain like a little flock of kids on their native cliffs—what, in the mysterious providence of God, awaits them? Where is "the everlasting love" with which He has loved them? Jer. xxxi. 3. Has his covenant with them for "a thousand generations" expired? Is prophecy a failure? Has its trumpet given an uncertain sound relating to the dispersed of Israel? Will they never be gathered? Will the envy of Ephraim never depart, nor Judah ever cease to vex Ephraim? "Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them unto their own land: and will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all; and they shall be no more two nations; neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all." Ezek. xxxvii. 21, 22. Watchman, what of the night? The watchman said: "The morning cometh, and also the night." Has then the night come on which no day will ever arise to the lost tribes of Israel? or is a cheerful morning dawning on the prophetic vision of the seer?

> "Watchman! does its beauteous ray
> Aught of hope or joy foretell?"

The names of Sychar, Sichem, Shechem, of which Nabulus is the representative, are endeared to us by sacred scriptural associations, as well as by charming natural scenery. In the lofty precipitous crags which overhang the quiet, verdant valley below, the grand, the sublime, the beautiful, are exquisitely blended. The verdant valley extending through this wild cleft in the mountain, the silver stream, the fountains and rills on either side which run among the gardens and groves of

* Compare Prideaux's Connections, part i. b. vi.

olives, figs, pomegranates, and all kinds of fruits, the flocks reposing on the mountain slopes, the shepherd's pipe, the song of the bulbûl, and the merry notes of thousands of singing birds—all combine to lend enchantment to this exquisite vale of Shechem.

Here the father of the faithful first halted, on entering the promised land, and erected its first altar to the God of Abraham. Jacob, returning from his fatherland, set up here his altar to the God of his fathers, purchased the parcel of ground for his son Joseph, whom he loved so tenderly; and sunk his well, the waters whereof he drank, and his children, and his cattle. On these grounds his sons were tending their flocks, while forming their conspiracy against the innocent, unsuspecting victim of their cruel jealousy. Joseph, enthroned in power in Egypt, refused the tombs of the Pharaohs for a lone grave here in his own parcel of ground in this sequestered vale, apart from the sepulchre of his fathers.

High above, on the lofty heights of Ebal and Gerizim, by the command of Moses to Joshua, the twelve tribes of Israel, six on Ebal, six on Gerizim, assembled to avouch the Lord Jehovah to be their God; and to read and ratify the law which he had given to them on Sinai, while the tribe of Levi, with their elders, officers and judges, were standing in the deep valley below, around the ark of the covenant of the Lord. There the tribes read alternately the blessings and the curses connected with obedience and disobedience, as Ebal and Gerizim echo back responsively to each other the loud Amen of the tribes; while from the tribe of Levi, around the ark, arises up again their solemn Amen. So let it be ever more, world without end—the blessing of God upon obedience to his law; on disobedience, his curse. Beyond comparison the most august assembly that was ever gathered, the most impressive scene ever enacted by man on earth.

In commemoration of this covenant, the law was then written out on pillars of stone erected on Gerizim, that the children of Israel might "fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD."

From these cliffs, "in the top of mount Gerizim," Jotham delivered to the men of Shechem, far below him, his parable in

reproof of their folly in making Abimelech their king, "and ran away and fled" before the enraged Shechemites could reach these inaccessible heights by the laborious, circuitous route by which they are still ascended.

These sacred scenes have been consecrated yet again by the presence of the Saviour, in the instructive incidents of his conversation with the woman of Samaria at the mouth of Jacob's well. At the base of the mountain, where the vale of Shechem opens out from the pass, between Ebal and Gerizim, Jesus seats himself by the side of the well at midday, faint and weary, as the traveller still halts, in quiet contemplation amidst the hallowed associations of the scene. His disciples pass up the gorge to the city to buy bread for their midday meal. The woman of Samaria comes down in the mean time to draw water, and the conversation proceeds which the beloved disciple has detailed with inimitable simplicity and force. John iv. 1—43. Above them rises the sacred mountain, crowned by the ruins still remaining of the temple, where, according to the fathers of the Samaritans, men ought to worship, while Jesus informs the wondering woman: "The hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship Him." But these Samaritans are blinded still as to the character and coming of Messias; "for to this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament." In their blindness they still worship, as their fathers did, "in this mountain," in vain expectation of the coming of Messias, "which is called Christ," not knowing that at his coming, "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."

ART. III.—*The Great Schools of England:* an Account of the Foundation and Discipline of the Chief Seminaries of Learning in England. By HOWARD STRATTON. London, 1865.

ENGLAND has no corporate establishments more remarkable than her two grand old universities, and her great collegiate schools. Most of them were the offspring of medieval times, and the birth of some of them belongs to a period so distant from our own, that the most laborious antiquaries have not been able, with certainty, to fix their date. But far back in the Middle Ages as that date may carry us, we have every reason to believe that academic life which was then called into being, has flowed onward through the centuries, in a continuous and unbroken stream, from that day till now. Italy and France could once boast of universities, which had become famous seats of learning long before Oxford and Cambridge existed, of which indeed the latter were copies, but amid the revolutions of continental Europe these most ancient institutions have been destroyed, or radically changed.

At the present day, no country in Europe possesses educational institutions of any sort, which are the copy or the counterpart of the universities, or of the collegiate schools of England. These schools and universities so peculiar in their organization, as well as venerable for their antiquity, though quite independent of each other, are still in various ways interconnected, and have many features in common. Both schools and universities have ever been, and probably are still, the noted seats of the most intense and immobile conservatism, so called. Hence time has made comparatively little change in their corporate constitution, social economy, usages, even in the costume of their members, and their modes of teaching. The striking lines addressed to one of them, by one of the most accomplished jurists and statesmen of England, Sir Roundel Palmer, may be applied to all of them.

> Four hundred years and seventy-one, their rolling course have sped,
> Since the first serge-clad scholar to Wykeham's feet was led;

> And still his seventy faithful boys, in these presumptuous days,
> Learn the old truth, speak the old words, tread in the ancient ways;
> Still for their daily orisons resounds the matin chime,—
> Still link'd in holy brotherhood, St. Catherine's steep they climb;
> Still to their Sabbath worship they troop by Wykeham's tomb—
> Still in the summer twilight sing their sweet song of home.

But earnestly as they have clung to the past, and stoutly as they have for the most part resisted everything that wore the garb of innovation, they have been compelled to yield to the progressive spirit of the present, and reform has, at last, effected an entrance within their sacred and well-guarded precincts. It was high time that such an invasion should be made, and we have no doubt that ere long persons of all shades of opinion and feeling, even those who have been most clamorous in asserting that "things as they are, are just as they ought to be," will confess that the triumph of reform was most desirable for the sake of these venerable institutions themselves, as well as the coming generations of English youth. For long years the condition of some of the most splendid colleges of Oxford, and some of the grandest of the Great Schools of England has shown how completely the spirit of an ancient charter may be lost, while its letter is maintained with pharisaic scrupulosity, and how ingeniously the generous purposes and magnificent gifts of the large-hearted men of other days have been perverted, or defeated by the very parties who enjoy their benefactions and profess to idolize their memory. No intelligent person can doubt that the founders of these colleges and schools, who built palatial residences for their members, and endowed them with princely revenues, intended to open fountains of learning, to which the youth of England should have free access; and that even the restrictions by which some of their foundations were hedged around, originated in no narrow spirit, but were designed to meet some manifest exigency of their times. But however far short these Great Schools may have come of the ideal of their founders, it must be owned that all connected with them may look with no little pride on their past history, for on the rolls of their alumni will be found the names of those, who, during the last three centuries, have been most illustrious among the statesmen and the scholars of England.

Our readers, of course, are familiar with the names of Winchester, Eton, Rugby, Harrow, and of other great schools of England, but many of them, we dare say, have little knowledge of their history, of their peculiar constitution, and of the points in which they resemble and differ from the colleges and academies of our own country. The volume before us contains the most complete and satisfactory account of these schools that we have met with, but as it is not probable that it will be republished here, we propose to give our readers the substance of it. The subject, let us here say, is one not simply of historical interest, but is worthy the attention of all who are concerned with the business of education, and is well fitted to stimulate those among us who possess abundant wealth, to devote a portion of it to the service of coming generations. From the history of these great schools of England, it will be seen that they are not, as many imagine, national establishments, founded and endowed by the church or the state, at the public expense, but that most of them owe their origin wholly to individual munificence. The memory of such men deserve to be held in perpetual remembrance. Dead for many centuries, they still live and speak in their noble works. Their benedictions are as affluent and effective now as they ever were; and in such an age as ours, with its immense material enterprise, and the ever-growing demand of the millions for intellectual and moral culture, such examples of benevolence and beneficence may be very properly pointed out to our princely merchants and other men of wealth, as worthy of their study and imitation.

In our notices of these great schools we shall take them in their historical order.

Winchester was founded in 1373 by William of Wykeham, at that time Bishop of Winchester, as well as one of the ablest and most influential statesmen of his day. His father is said to have been a yeoman or small farmer, though his mother was of gentler blood, and the son seems to have inherited the shrewd sense and aptness for business of one parent, and the refined tastes of the other. Though he had not the advantages of a learned education, he evinced at the early age of twenty-three

such rare talent as an architect and engineer, that he was employed to erect numerous fortifications on the southern coast of England, and to repair and alter the castles of Winchester and Windsor. The latter now appears nearly as he left it. So well did he acquit himself in these occupations, that he won the special regards of the king, and various dignitaries, civil and ecclesiastical.

In 1366, Wykeham was raised to the see of Winchester, and was also made Lord Chancellor, though he resigned the latter office in 1371. When nominated to the bishopric, some of the older prelates reproached him for his want of scholarship. He is said to have made to these objectors the following truly noble reply:—"I am unworthy, but wherein I am wanting myself, that will I supply by a brood of more scholars than all the prelates of England ever showed." The boast proved not to be an empty one.

His college at Winchester was established in 1373, but the splendid structure designed to be the home of his scholars was not completed until 1393; meanwhile he had prepared the way for the erection of one at Oxford, which was to be the complement of that at Winchester, and in 1380 he laid the foundation-stone of "Sainte Marie College of Wynchestre in Oxenford," which took and has ever since borne the name of New College, and is one of the richest and most magnificent in that city of colleges.

Wykeham lived many years after the completion of his two colleges, and enjoyed the rare and supreme delight of seeing them increase in fame, and bring forth those good fruits for which he had founded them.

Of the buildings devoted to collegiate purposes, with their quaint and quiet quadrangles and cloisters, their spacious halls, refectories, common rooms, libraries, chapels with "storied windows richly dight," all of them in the highest style of Gothic architecture, and surrounded by velvety lawns and exquisite gardens, it is not easy to give an untravelled American an exact idea. In a word, they form *un tout ensemble*, on which the eye of no one with scholarly tastes can look, without feeling Milton's wish awakened in his heart—

"But let my due feet never fail
To walk the studious cloisters pale
And love the high unbowed roof,
With antic pillars many proof,
And storied windows richly dight
Casting a dim religious light."

This is true of all the older English colleges, and a more befitting home cannot be imagined for the quiet student and thinker in which to ponder the mysteries of nature and philosophy. From time to time grateful "Wykamists" have enlarged or added to the original buildings. One of these is the School, a so-called "modern structure," though erected in 1687. It is a spacious and finely proportioned room, the walls of which are adorned with the armorial bearings of nobles, prelates, and others who contributed to the building, and also with various symbols designed to excite the ambition, or the fears of the young scholars, such as, a mitre and crozier to represent clerical learning, a pen, ink-horn, and sword, as the insignia of civil and military pursuits, and *a long Winton rod*, typical of the punishment awaiting the indolent. Under each emblem is the appropriate legend, "*Aut disce*,"—"*Aut discede*,"—"*Manet sors tortia cædi!*" which has been jocosely rendered

"Study hard, or else be jogging
Or you'll get a plaguy flogging."

Wykeham made provision for a warden, ten fellows, seventy scholars, a head-master, an under-master, three chaplains, three clerks, and sixteen choristers. In 1857 the constitution of the college was modified by the University Commission, and hereafter it is to consist of a warden, six fellows, one hundred scholars, twenty exhibitioners, the old number of chaplains, clerks, and choristers, remaining the same as formerly. The warden is the official head of the college, and he and the fellows are the trustees, having the entire charge of the collegiate property. They take no part in the work of instruction, yet their incomes are very handsome, that of the warden being £1700 besides an elegant residence, while each fellow gets £550. In one view these offices may be said to be sinecures, but in another they are not, since being prizes won by faithful service

in the school, or by distinction in literature and science, the youngest boy in the college feels their stimulating influence. But the most lucrative and important office is that of the head master, now held by the Rev. Dr. Moberly, one of the most intelligent and successful educators in England. He is practically at the head of the college, and his income amounts to £3000 a year.

The scholars, distinctively so called, are the boys "on the foundation," now numbering one hundred, who are boarded and taught without cost. All the restrictions once connected with the appointment of scholarships have been removed since 1857, and they are henceforth to be open to the free competition of boys, no matter where they may have been born. The expense incurred by the "commoners" or non-foundation boys is £116 per annum. The course of study extends through five years, and the great incentive to diligence in past years was the hope of gaining one of the seventy Fellowships in New College, Oxford, to which Winchester scholars alone were eligible. Henceforth these prizes, as well as others which have been established by various benefactors of later times, are to be open to students of all classes, who have spent one or two years at this school. Down to a quite recent date the curriculum at Winchester was almost exclusively classical, the rising of a boy in school rank depending entirely upon his classical attainments. Until within a few years, with the exception of arithmetic, a boy could learn nothing there but Greek and Latin, and during the greater part of the last century there is reason to believe that the instruction given was as inefficient as it was defective. De Quincey, in his "Life and Manners," mentions that in his boyhood he was attended by Dr. Mapleton, a physician of Bath, who had sent three sons to Winchester, but who had removed them from thence in consequence of that venerable abomination, *fagging*, which still retains its place in many of the great schools of England. The quick eye of the father detected symptoms of declining health in his boys, and on cross-questioning them, he discovered that being *fags* to certain seniors, they were obliged to go out nightly into the town to execute commissions, which was not an easy task, as all the ordinary outlets were closed about nine o'clock. In such a

dilemma, any route, that was merely practicable, at whatever risk, must be traversed by the loyal fag, and it so happened that none of any kind remained open or accessible, except one, and this one happened to have escaped suspicion, simply because it lay through a succession of no less than seventeen cloacinal temples. Through all their mephitic morasses these miserable yet loyal young fags had to thread their way almost every night in the week. The father finding, that even under such circumstances, *faggery* was an abuse too venerable and sacred to be touched, removed his sons from the school—the one sole accomplishment which they carried away from Winchester being a knowledge of the Ziph language.*

During the last twenty years, Winchester, in common with most of the other collegiate schools, has greatly improved in discipline, and in the subjects and methods of instruction. The course of study is still largely classical, but it also embraces mathematics, history, natural science, and the modern languages, which form an essential part of the curriculum, being studied by all the pupils during the entire period of five years.

Eton College was founded in 1440 by Henry VI., one of the most pious and most unfortunate of English monarchs, and was dedicated by him to the "Blessid Marie of Etone beside Wyndsore." It was built at a time when the peculiar force of the Middle Ages was becoming exhausted, and like its older sister Winchester, it has never lost its mediæval and monastic aspect. It has been said of Eton College that "it is eminently a poetical institution." Certainly, its position under the shadow of the grandest of the royal castles of England, and on the banks of the largest of English rivers, is such as a poet would love to describe. The exquisite lines of Gray "on a distant prospect of Eton," will at once recur to our readers.

"Ye distant spires, ye antique towers,
That crown the watery glade,
Where grateful Science still adores
Her Henry's holy shade;

* This Ziph language seems to have been invented by the Winchester boys centuries ago, for the purpose of privately communicating with each other in company. It was described by Bishop Wilkins in 1665, who speaks of it then as ancient, and it is explained by De Quincey. *Life and Manners*, p. 78.

And ye that from the stately brow
Of Windsor's heights the expanse below
Of grove, of lawn, of mead survey,
Whose turf, whose shade, whose flowers among
Wanders the hoary Thames along
His silver winding way,
Ah! happy hills! ah, pleasing shade!"

Perhaps from the fact of its being the erection of a monarch (out of his own private property, however), Eton ran great risks of being despoiled if not destroyed. Henry VIII. had actually taken steps towards the confiscation of its revenues, but his death saved the college from spoliation, and from that day to this, its history has strikingly illustrated the appropriateness of its motto, "floreat Etona," as it has continued to grow in wealth and influence, and is now one of the richest scholastic establishments in the world. The collegiate edifice consists mainly of two quadrangles, made up of chapel, library, schools, dormitories, master's chambers, residences of fellows, and altogether has quite a monastic aspect. Indeed, it looks as if one of the many magnificent establishments of Oxford, which is only about a dozen miles distant, had some how floated away from its ancient moorings.

As originally founded by Henry VI. provision was made in the college for only twenty-five scholars, but, probably through the influence of Waynflete, who was called from Winchester to be its first head, it ultimately consisted of a provost, a head master, a lower master, ten fellows, seventy scholars, ten chaplains, ten clerks, sixteen choristers, and thirteen alms or bedesmen. Since 1857 the constituent body is formed of a provost, a head, and a lower master, seven fellows, seventy scholars, three chaplains, twelve choristers, ten lay clerks, and ten almswomen, who act as servants, and take the place of the ancient bedesmen. The office of Provost of Eton is one of the most highly coveted academic dignities in the kingdom. Lord Bacon, when he ceased to be Lord Chancellor, petitioned for it, and from time to time it has been held by some of the most renowned scholars of England. The provost has a noble mansion and a salary of £2000 per annum, while each of the fellows has a house or lodgings in the college, and £700 per annum. As at Winchester, so here, they have nothing to do directly with the work of

education, but are the trustees of the college, and have the entire management of its vast property. The income of the head master, who has also a house within the college, amounts to £4572, and is derived mainly from the fees paid by pupils; that of the lower master is about half that sum.

The seventy scholars on the foundation were formerly called "Collegers," but are now known as "King's Scholars," the name having been given to them by George III. They are chosen by the provost, vice-provost, head master of Eton, the provost and two fellows of King's College, Cambridge, appointed annually for the purpose. According to the original statutes, their qualifications are, that they be "*Pauperes et Indigentes*, apt for study, of good morals, skilled in reading, plain song, and grammar." No one can be elected who is under eight or over twelve, unless, being under seventeen, he has made a certain measure of progress. They were to be provided with every thing needful for their education, food, lodging, and dress. But for many years, and until within a comparatively short period, the noble design of the founder was defeated by a shameful perversion of their trust on the part of the provost and fellows, who almost entirely monopolized themselves, the vastly augmented revenues of the college. As a consequence of this perversion, the scholars for whom the institution was specially intended, were so grossly neglected, that parents would not send their sons to the college, and it often happened that the number of foundationers or king's scholars did not amount to fifty, while the cost of their education was not much less than that of other pupils.

Within the last twenty years, however, these evils have been to a great extent corrected. A scholarship is now gained, not as formerly by nomination, but through a competitive examination open to all comers, and the consequence is, that the "king's scholars" are the *élite* of the college. They now get their education, board and lodging, free, or nearly so; the quarters of the seniors, especially, are much more comfortable than in past years; and then one of the greatest incentives to exertion is the hope of winning a scholarship and fellowship in King's College, Cambridge, which bears to Eton the same relation that New College, Oxford, does to Winchester.

The students not "on the foundation" bear the name of "Oppidans," so called from the fact of their residing outside of the college proper. At present they number seven hundred, making the whole number of Etonians about seven hundred and seventy. For more than three centuries Eton has been, as it still is, preëminently the aristocratic school of England, and has educated a larger number of the youthful nobility and gentry of the three kingdoms than all the other great schools put together.

Its scholastic arrangements are so much more complicated than those which obtain in our classical schools, being partly those of an academy and partly those of a college, that it would not be possible to give our readers a complete and accurate idea of them without devoting to the subject much more space than we can spare. First of all, there are the upper and the lower schools. The seven hundred and seventy students attending them are arranged, according to a time-honoured plan, into six forms, three for the upper and three for the lower schools, but as these have grown to be too large to be handled by a single master, without disturbing this arrangement, the whole mass has been distributed into twenty-two divisions, viz., seventeen for the upper and five for the lower. As a rule, no boy is admitted to the upper school after he is fourteen; nor can he enter without passing an examination by no means rigid, consisting of translations from Greek and Latin into English, and from English into Latin prose and verse. The lower school is open to boys of any age who can read. Formerly, the ancient languages formed the almost exclusive subject of study in Eton as in other great schools, but now, the course is a much more liberal one, though not equal to that of Winchester. Each pupil is required to have his own personal tutor, who aids him in preparing the lessons of the day, out of school, or who, to use a university term, is his "coach." This usage appears to have grown up by degrees to supplement the scanty instruction which the boy received in the school-room, and it now has the force of law. Hence, if a boy is inclined to be indolent, he can be so and still make a respectable appearance in the class-room, while if he has a taste for learning, and is ambitious of winning the magnificent prizes of academic life, he has all the

help he could desire. This private tutorial usage has, of late years, had the happy effect of inducing all the better class of boys to engage in what is called "private business," and which consists of a considerable amount of reading, independent of the school work, on subjects chosen by the tutor. A studious Etonian will thus have read, under the guidance of an accomplished scholar, some of the finest productions of ancient or modern literature, besides having had the advantage of the training of the schoolroom, by the time he is prepared to proceed to Oxford or Cambridge. Eton, however, is not alone in the encouragement given to her pupils to enter upon a course of voluntary work, or "private business," as the same thing is done in all the English and Scottish schools of the highest order.

Although there is no formal system of physical education at Eton, nor at any other great school, although Gymnasia under that name are things unknown, this most important branch of education is by no means neglected. The boys manage that matter in their own way, yet with the decided approval of their teachers. Of course, cricket holds a high place among Etonian sports, as it does among those of all other schools in England, but as the Thames is so near at hand, rowing is the supreme pastime. The captain of the boats is the greatest man in the school, and next to him stands the captain of "the Eleven." The weekly races by the various boat clubs, and the annual procession of the boats on the river, on the 4th of June, are sights worth seeing. And one of the most intelligent of the masters, who has taken an active interest in the physical education of the Eton boys, bears emphatic testimony to the fact, that their keen participation in athletic sports is productive of very beneficial effects, moral as well as physical. In his judgment, it diminishes the class of idlers and loiterers, to whom too many temptations are presented in the little shops of Eton, and is at the same time an antidote to luxurious habits, to drinking, and to vice of all sorts. To guard against accidents, no boy is allowed to go on the river, who has not "passed" in swimming before a committee of masters.

There is one old Etonian custom which was at once a pastime and a sort of solemn ceremony, dating from an unknown

antiquity, which, although now a thing of the past and not of the present, deserves a brief notice—*The Triennial Ad Montem*. On the Tuesday in Whitsun week, (about the 20th of May,) the whole school was wont to march to an eminence known as "Salt Hill," bearing two banners, one emblazoned with the arms of the college, the other with the motto, *Pro More et Monte*. Here, the boys forming the procession dined together, joined in a Latin prayer, and then returned in the order in which they set out. What the original design of the ceremony may have been is uncertain, but for many years its object was to collect contributions from the crowds of spectators who came to witness the gay scene, among whom were usually some members of the royal family, and great numbers of the nobility and gentry, and personal friends of the boys. The two chief collectors or "Salt-bearers," as they were styled, were a Colleger, and an Oppidan; they were arrayed in splendid dresses, carried a silken bag for donations, and, assisted by other boys in similar dresses, they ranged the country in all directions, exacting tribute, or "salt," from all whom they met. The sum collected on these occasions sometimes exceeded £1000; the half of it went to defray the expenses of the festival, and the other half was given to the Senior Colleger, who was the captain and hero of the day, as his outfit for the university. The introduction of railway travel, however, soon changed the character of Montem, as it gave facilities for crowds of "fellows of the baser sort" to gather there for their own evil purposes, and at length their excesses became so scandalous, and beyond control, that the only alternative was the abolition of the custom, which was done in 1847.

It only remains to add, that extensive as are the buildings of the college proper, they hardly suffice for the suitable accommodation of the seventy Foundation scholars. The seven hundred Oppidans reside in boarding-houses kept by the assistant-masters, and by gentlemen and ladies who are in no other way connected with the institution. There are thirty of these boarding-houses, in all of which, as well as in the college chapel, there are morning and evening prayers.

St. Paul's, London, was founded in 1509, by Dr. John Colet, Dean of St. Paul's, and on various accounts a truly remarkable

man. He was the son and heir of Sir Henry Colet, a wealthy citizen, and twice Lord Mayor of London. Dr. John Colet was the eldest of twenty-two children, and he alone remained to inherit the family estates. Erasmus, in a letter of condolence to his friend Amerbach, who had lost a daughter, refers to this prolific matron. "I knew in England," says he, "the mother of John Colet, a woman of singular piety, who had by the same husband eleven sons and as many daughters, all of whom were snatched away from her, except her eldest son. She herself being come up to her ninetieth year, looked so smooth, and was so cheerful that you would think she had never shed a tear, nor brought a child into the world; and, if I mistake not, she survived her son, Dean Colet. That which supplied her with so much fortitude was not learning, but piety towards God."

Dean Colet was born in London in 1466. He obtained his first education in St. Anthony's parish school, one of high repute in those days and long afterwards, and numbering among its alumni such men as Sir Thomas More, and Archbishops Heath and Whitgift. He removed to Oxford in 1483, and entered Magdalen about a year before his college companion Wolsey took his degree as "the boy bachelor." Colet was a most diligent student, and warmly sympathized with the new life which was then beginning to show itself in the domain of religion and of letters. Having acquired, says Antony Wood, "a most admirable competence in learning at home," he resolved to go abroad in order to enlarge his knowledge; he spent several years in France and Italy, where he made himself a thorough master of the Greek language, and formed an intimate friendship with the most distinguished continental scholars. With his fine talents so richly cultured, his pleasing manners, his wealth, and family connections, Colet might have hoped to win some of the highest prizes of political life; but he seems to have been from his youth a truly religious person, without, however, the least tendency to asceticism. Accordingly he entered the church, in which, unlike most of the ecclesiastics of his day, he did not seek the preferments which were conferred upon him, but accepted them simply because

they supplied the means of accomplishing noble purposes and plans for the good of others.

In 1505, Colet was made Dean of St. Paul's, London, on account of his rare learning and worth. He at once addressed himself to the dangerous task of reforming the lax discipline of the cathedral, denouncing those corruptions prevalent in every department of the church, against which the mighty voice of Luther was so soon to be heard speaking in thunder tones, and, of course, he soon stirred up a nest of hornets. He was charged with various heresies, such as opposition to image-worship—contending that the words addressed to Peter, *Feed my sheep*, had no carnal meaning—preaching against the idle disquisitions which the priests delivered under the name of sermons. His real sin, in the eyes of his bigoted bishop, and persecutor, Fitz James of London, being his habit of reading the Epistles of Paul in the hearing of the people. The Dean defeated the malevolence of the prelate, though Latimer says, in one of his sermons, "that he would have been burnt, if God had not turned the king's heart to the contrary." Instead of dying as a martyr, he was happily spared to become a pattern of learning, and the founder of a seminary which is still training hundreds of youth, and promises to flourish for centuries to come.

About 1509, the first year of Henry VIII., Colet erected suitable buildings for "the school of St. Paul," at a cost of £4500; he endowed it with an income of nearly £150—a large sum for those days*—which has already increased to £12,000 per annum, with the prospect of a further and enormous augmentation; and he drew up a body of statutes for its government, in which, with a noble and unusual catholicity, he declares that it shall be open to "the children of all nations and countries indifferently." The number of children attending the school was *one hundred and fifty-three*, this particular figure having been suggested, as Fuller in his Church History supposes, by the number of fishes caught by Peter in the miraculous draught. None were to be admitted but such as

* An ox could then be bought for six shillings, a sheep for one shilling, a capon for two-pence, and a quarter of malt for three shillings and four-pence.

could say their catechism, and read and write "competently." Each child paid four-pence on his first admission, which sum was to be given to the "poor scholar" who swept the school and kept the seats clean. This trifling sum was the only charge to which the scholars were liable, so that St. Paul's was the first really free school in England, and it has remained such to this day.

The government, or the trusteeship of St. Paul's, was vested by Colet in one of the great civic companies of London, viz., the Mercers. When asked his reason, he is reported to have said, "That there was no absolute certainty in human affairs, but, for his part, he found less corruption in such a body of citizens than in any other order or degree of mankind." The absolute power with which he clothed the Mercers' Company over the school, even to the extent of modifying his own statutes, is the best evidence of his entire confidence in their integrity and wisdom.

The work of instruction is carried on by the high master and six assistants. The stipend of the high master is £1000, and a residence. The three classical assistants also have residences, and salaries varying from £400 to £300. The school is divided into two departments, viz., the classical, which is subdivided into eight classes, and the mathematical. Provision is made for the instruction of all the pupils in French, and it is proposed hereafter to include German, Italian, music, and drawing. In proportion to its numbers, no school is more richly endowed with exhibitions and prizes than St. Paul's, there being no less than sixteen scholarships in various colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, with incomes varying from £120 to £10, besides gold medals and books.

Westminster was founded in 1560 by Queen Elizabeth, who, however, only carried out the plans and purposes of her father, Henry VIII., when the monastry of St. Peter's was abolished by him, and its property surrendered. Elizabeth caused the statutes to be drawn up by which the school has been governed ever since, and she also ordered the Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, annually to elect to their scholarships as many youths as possible from Westminster school, in memory of her father's benefactions to that magnificent college;

but this injunction has long been a dead letter, happily for Trinity College.

As the maintenance of this school is a charge upon the funds anciently belonging to the Abbey, the supervision of it is vested in the dean and chapter. Like most of the other schools, it consists of two departments, or rather of two classes of scholars, those on the foundation, who are known as Queen's scholars, forty in number, and those not on it, who are known as Town boys. The former reside in the college, and are now wholly maintained at the expense of the chapter, the latter reside with their parents, who defray the entire cost of their education, which amounts to about £95 per annum. The head master, whose income is above £1000 per annum, is aided by three classical, three mathematical, and one French assistant. The classical assistants have salaries varying from £600 to £300, and, like the head master, they are also furnished with houses, and derive a large income from boarders.

Merchant Taylors, London. This school was founded about 1560 by the "Company of the Marchaunt Taylors," one of the most ancient and honourable of the London Companies; a society, says Stow, which had a guild from time immemorial, its fellowship having been *confirmed* so far back as the days of Edward I., and which displays upon its roll of membership ten kings of England, four foreign sovereigns and princes, dukes, earls, barons, prelates, and distinguished men in various walks of life, almost innumerable.

Like so many others in England, this seminary had its origin in individual munificence. Mr. Richard Hills, a leading member of the company, gave a sum, in the present day equal to £3000, for the purchase of a part of the "Manor of the Rose," or Pultney's Inn, as it was sometimes called,—a spot made famous for all time by Shakespeare's allusion to it in the first act of Henry VIII.:

> "The duke, being at the Rose, within the parish
> St. Laurence Poultney, did of me demand
> What was the speech among the Londoners
> Concerning the French journey."

Prompted by this generous offer, the Company of Merchant

Taylors bought the half of this property, in 1560 or '61, and at once organized the school which bears this name. Not long ago the company purchased the remainder of the estate, at a cost of £20,000, so that now the whole of the old and renowned Manor of the Rose is occupied by the school. The statutes were copied from those of St. Paul's, and the Merchant Taylors seem to have caught the catholic spirit of good Dean Colet, for, with a noble liberality, they ordained that the scholars should be "of all nations and countries indifferently." Their number was limited to two hundred and fifty. Six years after it was established, Merchant Taylors' School, at a single bound, took its place among the first public seminaries, or the great schools of the kingdom, through the princely benefaction of Sir Thomas White, one of the members of the company. This event occurred in 1566. A few years before, Sir Thomas had founded St. John's College at Oxford, and he now came forward and munificently appropriated forty-three fellowships of that college to the scholars of Merchant Taylors. With such lucrative prizes at command, the school rapidly grew in popularity, and the stipulated number of pupils was soon complete. The boys elected to St. John's were probationary fellows for three years, and then if found qualified in learning and morals, they became fellows for life. In 1861, however, by an ordinance of the Privy Council, the fellowships of St. John's were reduced to eighteen, and thrown open to all candidates, the remainder of the college funds being appropriated to the maintenance of twenty-one Merchant Taylor scholars, and to twelve open scholarships.

The course of study in this school, almost from its foundation, embraced Hebrew, the classics, writing, and arithmetic. Since 1829, mathematics, French, modern history, and drawing have been added. In order to admission, a boy must be at least nine years old, must be able to read and write tolerably, and have learned the "accidence" in Latin grammar, the principal facts in early Scripture history, and the catechism. He is placed in a classical form suited to his age and attainments, and he rises from one form to another according to his diligence and proficiency. Hardly one-fourth of the scholars proceed to the university, and in order to adapt the instruction

to the line of life for which the great mass of them are intended, the company have resolved to enlarge the course of education by introducing a system of mercantile tuition.

Originally the statutes ordained that one hundred boys should be admitted without any payment whatever; but at the present time each scholar pays £3 on entrance, and £10 annually for tuition, besides a small sum when advanced to a new form. The salary of the head master is £1000 per annum. His ten assistants receive stipends varying from £525 to £50. We will only add, that besides the school prizes in the shape of money, medals, and books, there are in the two universities fifty or more scholarships of the average value of £60 per annum, open exclusively to those who have been trained in Merchant Taylors' school.

Charter House, London. This school was founded by Thomas Sutton in 1611, and though situated in the very heart of London, the cluster of buildings belonging to it has a preëminently venerable and monastic air. Thomas Sutton was, in his day, one of the merchant princes of London. He was descended from an ancient family, and on the death of his father, he came into possession of a respectable estate, which was vastly increased in the course of years by marriage and business speculations. In 1611 he purchased the estate and mansion then known as Howard House, of the Earl of Suffolk, and soon after obtained letters patent authorizing him to found his hospital and free school at Charter House. The school takes its name from the fact that its site was once occupied by a monastery of Carthusian monks, and down to 1537, when all these establishments were suppressed, it was *The Chartreux*—Charter House being an English corruption of this ancient title. Its history between 1537 and 1611 is full of romantic interest, and connects the spot with some of the most memorable events of that stirring period.

The care of this truly princely establishment was vested by Thomas Sutton in sixteen persons, who were henceforth to be known as The Governors of the Charter House. At the present time, the corporation includes, besides the Queen and the Prince of Wales, some of the most eminent noblemen, statesmen, and church dignitaries of the kingdom. Charter House

differs from the other great schools in one important respect. Besides being a school for youth, it was designed to be a home for a certain class of the old. Through the munificence, and in accordance with the express purpose of the founder, the governors are able to provide eighty decayed gentlemen, officers in the army and navy, literary and professional men, merchants and tradesmen of respectable character, a comfortable retreat, where they are supplied with all things needful for their support and enjoyment, with the privilege of entire leisure to reflect upon the past, and prepare for the future life.

The school is made up of three classes of boys. 1. The foundation scholars. 2. Boarders in the houses of the head master and of the usher. 3. Day boys, who reside with their parents. Of the first class there are at present fifty-five, though the number will shortly be increased to sixty. They are lodged, fed, clothed, and receive their education in all its branches, including French, German, &c., gratuitously. If at the age of eighteen the scholar passes a satisfactory examination, he gets an exhibition at Oxford or Cambridge of eighty pounds a year, and if he enters the ministry, he has a preferential claim to any vacant living in the patronage of the governors. The only expense to which he is liable while in the Charter House is that of a private tutor, if he chooses to employ one, and four guineas per year to the matrons for the care of his private clothes. The annual charge for boarding and education is from eighty to ninety guineas. For the day boys the annual charge is twenty guineas. The latter may enter the school at any age; but no one can get upon the foundation who is under ten or over fourteen. The whole number of scholars now is one hundred and forty, and by an order of the governors it is limited to two hundred.

The classical and mathematical instruction is given by the head master, who has a house and salary of £1260 per annum, the usher who also has a house and £800, and four assistants supplied with lodgings, and salaries varying from £200 to £150. There are also two French teachers and one German. All the boys are required to learn one of these languages. Among the most eminent living Carthusians—as the Charter

House scholars are called—are Bishop Thirlwall, and Mr. Grote, the two distinguished historians of Greece. Thackeray and General Havelock are among the most renowned, who are recently deceased.

Harrow. This school, which derives its name from the village of Harrow-on-the-Hill, about six miles north of London, was founded in 1571, by John Lyon, a yeoman of the town, and for many years it has been almost as aristocratic a school as Eton. Lyon obtained from Queen Elizabeth a charter recognizing his foundation, and vesting the trustees named by him with corporate powers, under the title of "The keepers and governors of the school called the Free Grammar School of John Lyon, in the village of Harrow-upon-the-Hill." He also drew up certain statutes, showing that his design was to bring a free education within the reach of the children of Harrow, but he wisely empowered the governors to make such changes in them as time might suggest. Our limits will not allow us to dwell upon the earlier history of the school, and we therefore proceed to say, that the income of the property bequeathed by Lyon to it for school purposes is only about £1100, and consequently, while here as elsewhere there are foundationers, to the number of forty, the only difference between them and the great mass of students is, that their tuition bills is somewhat reduced.

For nearly a century, Harrow has been more largely attended than any other great school in England, with the occasional exception of Eton; the number now being about five hundred and ten. They are arranged in fourteen divisions, the maximum number of boys in any one being thirty-five. The number of classical assistant masters is fourteen; then there are four mathematical assistants, and two for modern languages, besides the usher and the head master. The position of the latter, though the endowments are so small, is one of the most lucrative of the sort in the kingdom, as his net income exceeds £6000 per annum. From the governors he gets only £50 annually, but the school, tuition, and boarding fees yield a sum considerably beyond £10,000 per annum; so that after deducting the salaries of his assistants, and other charges, the head master's stipend reaches the large figure above given.

The course of study at Harrow comprises classics, arithmetic, mathematics, French, and German. In the classical department there are, besides the head master, fifteen assistants, and the boys are arranged in fifteen divisions, the highest one being the head master's class. Strange to say, it was not until 1837 that mathematics was made a compulsory study. There are now four mathematical assistants, and the divisions are so arranged that each scholar has three lessons a week in this branch. In the modern languages, which have become compulsory studies since 1851, two lessons are given each week. Here, as at Eton, each boy is expected to have a private tutor, that is to say, an instructor having no formal connection with the school, by whose aid he prepares himself for the work of the class-room, and is guided in his private reading. The cost is about £10 10*s.* per annum. Except in rare cases, no boy is admitted to Harrow after he has completed his fifteenth year. A few are under twelve, but the majority who enter are about fourteen. It must, therefore, be evident that with so large a school, the education given in it would be very superficial if the tutorial system was abolished, unless, indeed, the staff of assistants was quadrupled.

Harrow differs from the other great schools in its monitorial system. The first fifteen boys of the head master's class, and therefore of the school, are the *monitors*, and by them its police affairs are mainly managed. Their authority extends over the whole school; they are bound to keep reasonable order among the boys of the house to which he belongs, to investigate and punish any serious moral offence, such as drinking, or profanity, and any violation of a rule of the school, such as smoking, going to a tavern, &c., and on those belonging to the lower forms, he is even allowed to inflict personal chastisement. If a boy demurs to the decision of his monitor, he can appeal to the whole body, and from them to the head master. If the latter satisfies himself that the monitor was right, the appellant must submit to the penalty, or leave the school. The monitors are, of course, the oldest and best students, verging towards young manhood, and have had a four or five years experience of school life. Whether it is wise to clothe persons so young with so much authority over their companions, is a question which

admits of discussion; but a system of school government which has stood so long as this, and is approved by men so eminent as those who have been at the head of Harrow, must have some merits.

We can only add, that the yearly cost of education at Harrow is for foundationers £17 17*s*., for others, including board, allowances, tradesmen's bills, and extra studies, from £144 to £205.

Rugby is the great school of central England. It was founded by Lawrence Sheriff, a benevolent citizen of London, for the benefit of his native village, Rugby, about the middle of the sixteenth century. He had originally intended to bequeath a certain sum of money for the purpose of establishing the school, but for some reason, he reduced this to £50, and added about eight acres of what was then pasture land within a mile or two of London. To these few acres, now covered with houses, and yielding a revenue of £5000, Rugby owes its opulence and greatness. Like Charter House, Rugby is, on a very small scale, a hospital as well as school, provision having been made by Sheriff for the maintenance of twelve almsmen. But it is only as a school that we are concerned with it.

As a seat of learning, Rugby is indissolubly associated with the name of that prince of educators, Dr. Thomas Arnold, of whom it was predicted when appointed to the head mastership that "he would change the face of public education throughout England," and who nobly fulfilled the prophecy. During the last century and a half, Rugby was presided by many excellent men, and its roll of alumni contained the names of not a few distinguished scholars. Dr. Worll, the immediate predecessor of Dr. Arnold, who held the position for twenty years, though not remarkable for his profound learning, must have been a very efficient teacher and guardian of youth, for he raised the number of pupils to a higher figure than it had ever reached before, three hundred and eighty-one. But the reforms introduced by Arnold, so eloquently described by Dean Stanley, quickly made the name of Rugby renowned throughout Britain, and raised it to a position which it had never before occupied. The work of improvement begun has been continued by his successors, Dr. Tait, now bishop of London, Dr. Goulbourn, and

the present master, Dr. Temple, and it is probably not too much to say, that among the great schools of England, Rugby is now, as for twenty years it has been, the model one.

As usual, the school comprises two classes of pupils: foundationers, or boys entitled to certain privileges in the way of gratuitous education, and non-foundationers, who receive board and education at fixed charges. Of the first class there are, at present, sixty-one. No one is entitled to admission whose parents have not resided two years in Rugby or within ten miles of it. The candidate must be under fifteen, able to read English, prepared to begin the study of Latin, and must bring a certificate from his last teacher. Of the second class there are about four hundred and thirty, making the whole number in the school some four hundred and ninety. They are distributed into three schools, called the upper, middle, and lower. The upper contains one hundred and eighty-seven, the middle two hundred and fifty-five, and the lower forty-eight. Boys in the upper school, who are not destined for the university, may be excused from classical work, so as to pursue a course of mathematics, modern languages, or natural science.

The school is divided into four parts, viz., the classical, mathematical, modern languages, and natural science. The classical again, is distributed into three sub-schools, upper, middle, lower; these are divided into forms, nearly answering to our college classes, and these last are separated into divisions, of which there are twelve. All the boys learn the classics, and are taught in this branch by fourteen masters. The time spent by each boy in the class-rooms, in the upper school, during each week, is fourteen hours; those in the middle school spend twelve. Of course, the work of preparation, as in our colleges, is carried on outside of the class-room, except by the youngest boys of the lower school, under a tutorial system somewhat akin to that which obtains at Eton and Harrow. No boy is allowed to remain at school in the upper form after his nineteenth year, nor in the one next below, after his eighteenth, and so on through all the forms; the evident design of this rule being to make the boys in the several stages of instruction as nearly alike as may be in point of age and attainment.

The mastership of Rugby is a very lucrative position. The

occupant of it has a noble mansion with considerable ground attached to it, and an income of £3000 per annum. The assistant masters, as a whole, are better paid than those of any other great school. Seven of them, one being the teacher of modern languages, receive salaries ranging from £1617 to £1234 per annum, while the salaries of the remaining eleven range from £870 to £286.

Our limits will not allow us to go into further details in regard to this admirable school. Indeed, it is scarcely necessary to do so, as most of our readers, we are sure, must have read Stanley's charming Life of Arnold, in which the methods pursued and the results reached by that eminently successful educator of boys, are so fully described. If any of them have not seen this volume, we cannot do them a better service than to urge them to read it as soon as possible, especially if they have any thing to do with the business of education, or for any reason feel an interest in it.

Want of space compels us also to be content with simply naming *Shrewsbury*, founded in 1562, and *Christ's Hospital*, or the *Blue Coat* School, London, founded about 1550, as well as the four chief modern proprietary schools, Cheltenham, Marlborough, Rossall, and Wellington. The one last named is founded to supply a certain number of the sons of military and naval officers with a free education, and to bring it within the reach of all at a moderate cost. Rossall is designed to do the same kind office to the sons of clergymen.

The history of these great schools is well worthy, as we have already intimated, of the study of those among us who have the means of doing good on a large scale, and especially of those among them who may be wishing to do something to further the cause of popular education. It certainly illustrates how much a comparatively humble individual may do, not simply for his own age, but for after generations. He who founds a school or an academy, under proper conditions, opens a fountain, which shall not refresh with its living waters the inhabitants of his native town, but shall send forth its stream to distant lands. Such a monument is the most enduring one he can erect. If John Lyon had ordered the erection of a mausoleum to receive his ashes after his decease, both he and

it would long since have been forgotten, but no one can get a sight of Harrow-on-the-Hill, and of the school whose fame is spread far as our language extends, without being reminded of its founder. We do not look for the establishment of schools in our country modelled after the precise pattern of those of England; they would not be suited to the state of society here. But the latter have some features, which, to say the least, are worthy of our careful consideration.

We are well persuaded that no better service could be rendered to the cause of education in any of our older states, than by the erection, through private munificence, of an academy (to use our American term), in a well-chosen locality, which should be copied after Winchester, or Rugby, in all points except those which are distinctively English,—an academy in which the education of a certain number would be free, while other pupils paid their own bills: an academy in which the pupils would be stimulated to study diligently, and induced to stay long enough to be thoroughly educated, not only by prizes, but by exhibitions or scholarships in our best colleges, such as Harvard, Yale, or Princeton,—exhibitions which would defray the student's board and tuition during his residence at college. If any of our men of wealth could be excited, as we have said, properly to endow such a school, he would be doing good in two ways, *i. e.*, he would confer a blessing in the locality where the school chanced to be established, and on the college or the university with which he might connect it. In order to raise our colleges and universities to a higher level than that which they have as yet reached, we need collegiate schools thoroughly equipped, in which our youth can be trained, as those are in England, who are preparing for the university, and hope to win some of its prizes; or as the cadets are trained in our own West Point. To make our colleges efficient instruments of a large and liberal culture, the work which they are now compelled to do during the first year of their course, should be done elsewhere. And we are inclined to believe, that if collegiate schools, such as we have suggested, were established, the indirect benefits they would confer upon the college with which they might be wholly, or partially connected, would out-

weigh those produced even by the founding of a new professorship.

The history of the schools and the universities of England furnishes many striking illustrations of the tenacity with which antiquated usages, and even positive abuses, that have become hoary with age, are maintained. In not a few cases, the evident designs of large-hearted men, who lived three or four centuries ago, in a state of society wholly different from the present, have been absolutely defeated by a bigoted adherence to the letter of their statutes. Then there are multitudes of persons, not wanting in intelligence, who dislike change of any sort, though it be from bad to good, or from good to better; and the feeling is strengthened by the notion that the change proposed will interfere with the vested rights of somebody. But great as are the obstacles that have hitherto stood in the way of academic reform, they have begun to yield. There is a growing determination to remodel the schools and universities so as to adapt them to meet the wants of the times, and already improvements have been made in both of them, of which no one dared to dream twenty years ago. In our country, we are never required to fight against men's love for the antiquated. The tendencies here are all the other way. Precedent, prescription, vested rights, are scarcely allowed the weight that belongs to them. Under such circumstances, we should be ashamed if we allow "the old country" to outstrip us in the march of improvement. So far as regards the common school there is no danger of such a result, but we have still much to learn from her, in what relates to the higher order of seminaries,—the schools intended to train and develope the thinker and the scholar.

ART. IV.—*The Raising of Lazarus; treated exegetically with special reference to recent infidel assaults.*

THE raising of Lazarus is, on several accounts, the most momentous of our Lord's miracles. More than any other it sets him forth as "the Resurrection and the Life." In its immediate results it became the outward occasion of his death, and as his last great work it stands out as the presage of his own victory over death.

The omission of the account of this stupendous miracle by the synoptists has been used by hostile critics as an argument against its credibility, and reasoning from the less to the greater, as an argument against the trustworthiness of the fourth Evangelist in particular, and against the credibility of the whole evangelical record in general. The ribald Woolston pronounces this miracle "brimful of absurdities," "a contexture of folly and fraud,"* and Spinoza, on the authority of Bayle,† "said to his friends, that if he could believe the resurrection of Lazarus, he would break to pieces his whole system and embrace without repugnance the ordinary faith of Christians." Of course Spinoza knew very well that the kind of proof he demanded could not be given, and that after all that can be said has been said, the matter finally resolves itself in the veracity of Christ, who declared that Lazarus was dead, John xi. 14; Spinoza did not and would not believe the words of Christ, and his declaration is therefore only an empty bravado.

The explanations of the silence of the synoptists are numerous, but more or less unsatisfactory, and it is doubtful whether a wholly satisfactory solution can be given; this much is certain, however, that the want of a satisfactory solution of the mysterious silence of the synoptists, does not affect the credibility of any or all the canonical Gospels, for that rests on a foundation too firm and too well attested to be weakened by an

* Diss. on Miracles V., cf. N. Lardner's Vindications, Works, ii. 1—54.
† Dict. s. v. "Spinoza."

isolated circumstance of this kind. The most important explanations are:

1. That fear of drawing down persecution on Lazarus and his family during their life-time, caused the first three Evangelists to pass over in silence the account of this great miracle; while John, writing at a later period and outside of Palestine, was not fettered by that reason. This is the view of Grotius, Olshausen, and Lange, who however combines it with other considerations. With certain modifications it is also adopted by Plumptre (in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*,) but rejected as extravagant by Alford and Trench.

2. That the synoptists confine themselves to the miracles wrought by our Lord in Galilee, and hardly touch upon any fact lying outside that limit, (Neander, Meyer); but while this explanation establishes the consistency of the synoptists, it really does not answer the question itself, viz., "Why do all three persist in silence on the miracle?"

3. That the reluctance of Lazarus to draw the veil from his real resurrection from the dead, analogous to a similar reluctance in persons raised from the death of sin, may have induced the earlier Evangelists to honour his sensitiveness in suppressing the account of his miraculous restoration to life. This is the view propounded by Plumptre (l. c.), but although ingenious as a conjecture, will hardly carry conviction to minds of a less speculative constitution.

4. That the nature of the Gospels, each of which being an individual contemplation and composition of the life of Jesus, rendered it necessary that only such historical matter should be received as agreed with and was adapted to the plan of the whole. This is the explanation which Lange superadds to that of Grotius and Neander, without, however, shedding much light on the subject; for while there is doubtless truth in his statement, it is equally true that the synoptists record many things in common, and that the fourth Evangelist narrates many things equally recorded by the synoptists.

The explanations are more or less unsatisfactory, and as they leave the question itself pretty much untouched, we prefer the difficulty unexplained to so-called explanations which increase and complicate it, satisfied that whatever causes may

have operated in the silence of the synoptists, the fact that the bosom friend of Jesus records the miracle is the best and strongest proof of its historic reality and truthfulness. Of the doubts and insinuations of Strauss we shall have occasion to treat by and by.

The question, "Who was Lazarus?" has been variously answered, although the only *positive* data are those derived from the Gospel of St. John, which contain little more than that he was the brother of Mary and Martha, and lived with them at Bethany; that he died, and was by our Lord restored to life. We should content ourselves with the simple recital of these particulars, but in the laboured attempt of Strauss to make out that Lazarus was a mythical character, his reasoning is so characteristic and his conclusions so extraordinary, that we feel constrained to analyze and expose them.

From a comparison of Matt. xxvi. 6, sq.; Mark xiv. 3, sq.; Luke vii. 36, 44, and John xii. 1, sq., it appears that the first two Evangelists narrate that a woman, whose name is not given, anointed our Lord a few days before the last passover, in the house of Simon, the leper, at Bethany, while the third Evangelist records a similar transaction at an earlier period, in the house of one Simon, a Pharisee, by a woman "which was a sinner," without specifying the name of the city or village where it took place, and St. John relates that six days before the passover, Mary, the sister of Lazarus, anointed the feet of Jesus at Bethany. These statements of the four Evangelists, Strauss places in juxtaposition; arranges, disarranges, and rearranges in the most arbitrary manner, and after a great deal of finessing and oracular commenting, reaches the conclusion that the fourth Evangelist combined the notices of the synoptists in order to find a convenient locality for the resurrection of Lazarus, which, according to him, was a myth, invented and fabricated by the author of the fourth Gospel, which, by-the-bye, he pronounces to have been written in the second century. (*Leben Jesu*, l. ii. ch. 2, 77.) If we are to enter the domain of conjecture, the aforesaid data lead to very different results. The anointing related by the first two Evangelists is essentially different from that recorded by the third as to time, place, circumstances, and person, and also in all its

historical and ethical connections and bearings, but agrees in the main with the account given by St. John. The variations are readily accounted for. According to the synoptists, our Lord's *head* was anointed; according to John, his *feet*, but this involves no contradiction, "since both actions are consistent, although both are not mentioned by one Evangelist; unless, indeed, they be so in John xi. 2." (Robinson's *Harm.*) In the synoptical Gospels, *the disciples*, or *some* of them, were indignant at Mary's lavish act of love; in St. John's, it is Judas Iscariot. Here, again, the statements are not contradictory, for we gather from Matt. xxvi. 14, that Judas was the instigator of the discontent of the disciples. Again, the synoptical account lays the scene of the transaction in the house of Simon the leper, whereas St. John says that "they made him a supper" at Bethany, without specifying the name of the person in whose house it took place. But since Lazarus was present, since Martha waited upon Christ, and Mary anointed him, the conclusion is inevitable that the transaction took place in the house occupied by the two sisters and Lazarus. The house may have belonged to Simon the leper, and been occupied by the two sisters and Lazarus; or, if we are to give credence to the apocryphal notice of Nicephorus (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* I. 27,) that Simon the leper was the father of Lazarus, the whole difficulty would vanish. Others suppose him to have been the husband of Martha, which is possible, but not probable; the epithet "*leper*," by which Simon was distinguished, is not so important as some imagine, for neither the synoptists, nor St. John, say that he was present at the feast; the reference is simply to his *house*, and it is altogether immaterial whether he had been cured of his leprosy by Jesus, or not. Most of the conjectures concerning Simon are the result of an attempted identification of Simon the leper with Simon the Pharisee, (Luke vii. 36,) but considering the commonness of the name of Simon, and of the hospitable rite of anointing, the occurrence of a similar transaction at a different time, under different circumstances, and at another place, cannot present a difficulty to those who are not bent upon creating difficulty and confusion, in order to pervert the plain sense of Holy Writ. Putting all these considerations together, we have the general

result that the account of St. John agrees with that of the first two Evangelists, that it must not be confounded with that recorded in the third Gospel, and the minute and undesigned coincidences between the former accounts, brought out by seeming variations, afford the strongest possible proof for the genuine historical character of the Gospel of St. John, and show the slender foundations on which the shadow-building of the mythical theory is made to rest. We have purposely omitted the details of the complicated process by which Strauss works out his theory on the aforesaid data, because we feel sure that the specimen which we are about to give, as having a more direct bearing on the subject under notice, will abundantly justify our strictures and criticisms; but not to anticipate. Strauss (l. c. p. 479) says: "Thus far nothing has been said of the brother of the two sisters, of Lazarus, with whom we are more immediately concerned. The synoptical tradition must also have lost him in the first case," (viz., that the account of the fourth Gospel is true, which Strauss denies;) "which, by reason of the unique miracle connected with his name, is hardly conceivable. But, one might say, it has not lost him; Luke also mentions a Lazarus; to be sure, not a real Lazarus, but only a parabolical one, the poor Lazarus, that is to say, who in this life lay, covered with sores and suffering want, at the rich man's gate, but after death removed to Abraham's bosom, excites the envy of Dives enduring the pains of hell. (Luke xvi. 19, etc.) Both these Lazaruses are indeed not unrelated. The Johannine Lazarus indeed, as far as he can see, is not poor, like the parabolical Lazarus of Luke; but he is also sick, and the introductory words of the narratives of both exhibit a remarkable similarity. 'Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus, of Bethany,' begins John; 'and there was a certain beggar, named Lazarus,' is the beginning of the parable of Jesus in Luke. Both Lazaruses die and are buried; the one, indeed, returns from the grave to life, but—the other, at least, ought to have returned—the boon was asked, but not granted. But why this refusal of the rich man's prayer in the parable, that Abraham would allow Lazarus to go to his father's house that he might convert his five brethren? Because Abraham foresees that

those who refuse to hear Moses and the prophets would not believe though one should rise from the dead. And how rightly did father Abraham foresee? One really rose from the dead, Jesus, but did the Jews on that account believe? Yea, a Lazarus, just as the rich man had desired it, rose from the grave, and the Jews, for all that, instead of believing, formed the resolution to kill Jesus." Strauss might have gone further, and added, that the raising of Lazarus and of Jesus notwithstanding, he also persists in unbelief, and that the more he reads of the evangelical record of the life, the teaching, and the love of Christ, the more determined he grows to crucify him again. But let us hear the further oracular utterances of the destructionist. "What then? Are we to suppose that tradition has turned the historical Lazarus into the parabolical Lazarus, the miracle into a parable, the reality (the return of a dead man) into a mere supposition? Those who have any idea of the manner in which such stories are turned round and enlarged, will think the reverse more probable."

We may hazard here another interruption of Strauss's argument. The last sentence is calculated to suggest the idea, that this practical exhibition of *his* skill in turning round and enlarging the data of the Gospels, affords us an insight into the mythical character of his myths, and the best remedy for the alternative he proposes—that is, its unqualified and indignant rejection. If it be necessary or desirable to establish a connection between Lazarus of Bethany and Lazarus of the parable, the combination of Luke xvi. with John xi. would yield the result that the parable was uttered a day or two after our Lord received the message about Lazarus. If this be so, the name of the sufferer in the parable may possibly have been suggested by the name of Lazarus of Bethany, on whom Jesus may have been thinking at the time, and in whose history there may have been *possibly* some circumstances of resemblance to that of the Lazarus of the parable. (Ellicott, *Hulsean Lect.* p. 243, note.) But let him finish his argument: "The fourth Evangelist had received into his plan two sisters living in a village, who were wont to entertain Jesus, of whom mention is made in the third Gospel, inasmuch as one of them appeared to him to be well

suited for being charged with the anointing and the other with waiting at the meal during which the anointing took place. Obliged for that purpose to locate them at Bethany, the traditional site of the anointing, no place could be better located for the resurrection-story he wanted to give, than just this Bethany. It was designed, as the miracle of all miracles, to conclude the record of the miracles wrought by Jesus, and to bring the bitter hatred of the dominant high-priest and Pharisee-party at Jerusalem to a climax, and must therefore have happened in the last time either in the capital or its environs. Laying the scene in the capital would have contradicted the pragmatism* of the fourth Gospel, according to which Jesus would prefer shunning Jerusalem in that last time, because of hostile ambuscades, and when there, had every reason to be on his guard; a neighbouring village would suit much better, and the anointing story suggested Bethany. The sisters having been once located there, they waited, as it were, for the brother, who is forthwith brought to them in Lazarus. That this is the way in which the fourth Evangelist got his representation, that he first took the sisters from the third Gospel and then associated with them Lazarus, betrays itself in the manner how he introduces the three for the first time. (John xi. 1, sq. "Now a certain *man* was sick, *named* Lazarus of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha. It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick! A brother is described in this manner only if his sisters were better known than himself, and Mary and Martha were better known from the narrative of Jesus lodging with them in the third Gospel, to which incident the fourth Gospel refers also in the words 'the town of Mary and her sister Martha,' for Luke begins his account with saying that Jesus on his journey entered into a certain village, and that Martha received him into her house. (Luke x. 38.) The fourth Evangelist, moreover, adds that this Mary was the woman who anointed Jesus, although he does not relate the transaction until afterwards; this preliminary remark looks exactly as if he wanted to circulate this

* For brevity's sake I retain this German word, which denotes a treatment of history with reflections on the causes and effects of events.

notice for the first time. But he betrays still more obviously that he introduces in Lazarus a new personage into the evangelical history; for this Lazarus was surely not '*a certain man*,' a brother of more celebrated sisters, if he was the subject of the greatest miracle that Jesus wrought, while Jesus loved him as well as his sisters.

"The fourth Evangelist, then, had removed the two sisters to Bethany, which was the most suitable locality for the performance of his final miracle, which was intended to be a resurrection of the dead. The idea, at least, of associating one to be resuscitated bodily with those sisters already resuscitated spiritually, as their brother, lay not very remote. But the two synoptical accounts of persons restored to life did not suit him for the further development of resurrection-story. He wanted to have an unquestionable and certain case of death, at least one in which sepulture had taken place, and this could not be said of the daughter of Jairus, or the young man of Nain. But Luke made mention of a defunct person, although only defunct in the parable, who was buried and unquestionably dead, for his soul had already been carried into Abraham's bosom. He also was to return, but not permitted to do so, because it would have been useless, since he would not have converted the brothers of Dives. But on that very account the fourth Evangelist deemed it worth while to make the defunct person return to life in reality, in order to give the strongest proof of the incorrigible unbelief of the Jewish people. On that account no personage of the synoptical tradition was in all respects better suited to be the hero of the resurrection-story which the fourth Evangelist wanted to supply, than the Lazarus of Luke's parable. Now since these considerations show as clearly whence the fourth Evangelist gets his Lazarus and surroundings, as it is unaccountable where the other Evangelists have put him, if he really did exist and was raised by Jesus from the dead, we may, it seems, consider the investigation on this point brought to a close."

It seems hardly credible that a man like Strauss, who takes such unwarranted liberty with the evangelical record, affects such reverence for historical truth, demands impossible proof for every statement of Holy Writ, and exacts impossible infor-

mation on every point unnoticed by any of the Evangelists, that a man who refuses to believe anything without the clearest and most incontrovertible proof and evidence, can be serious in the expectation that his explanations, founded solely and entirely on arbitrary dicta and unwarranted assumptions, should be accepted by intelligent readers, whom he has taught the use of tests, which, applied to his explanations, statements, and arguments, must scatter them to the winds. If the account of this greatest of the miracles of Christ, as given by the fourth Evangelist, so full of beauty and simplicity, so touching in its human sympathies, so marvellously transparent, replete with self-evidencing truthfulness (Meyer), is to Strauss a rhetorically embellished myth, invented and manufactured of historical and parabolical notices taken from the synoptical Gospels, what shall we say of *his* account, made up of fallacies, perversions, innuendoes, suppressions, additions, fictions, and speculations, which requires not faith, the faith he so much ridicules and scorns, but a credulity bidding defiance to reason, common sense, and historical truth? That account can only be received by those who believe in the infallibility of Strauss, and admit his claims as the apostle of progress, for which he would fain set up. To all others his account will be a veritable myth, and a poor one too; an impossible fiction, an utter failure in its attempt to show the fourth Evangelist to have been an inventor of myths, and in the total absence of a sufficient motive for his assumption of such a character.

Before passing on to the details of the miracle, this seems the proper place for a brief consideration of other so-called explanations which, like that of Strauss, explain the truth away, and give in its stead fictions, myths, and most preposterous solutions.

The explanation that Lazarus was not really, but only apparently dead, is that of Paulus, Ammon, Schleiermacher, Schweizer, *et al.* It rests on an exegesis, by no means redounding to their glory, which reduces the miracle to an accident, and makes Jesus actually sanction a pious fraud. These hints, thrown out by German rationalists, in language ambiguous and obscure, have been turned to good account by the Frenchman, Renan, who avows that something took place

at Bethany, which was considered as a resurrection, which he explains as an intrigue of the family of Bethany. Indignant at the treatment which Jesus experienced at Jerusalem, his Bethany friends sought to give the sickness of Lazarus a turn that should stop the mouth of his enemies, and might benefit his cause. Lazarus is supposed to have improved during the absence of the messengers sent by the sisters to Jesus in Peræa, and to have consented to their proposition to submit to being wrapped up in grave-clothes and shut up in the family tomb. On the arrival of Jesus, Martha took him to the tomb; overcome by profound sorrow, he desired to have a last look at his friend, and the stone being removed, Lazarus came forth in grave-clothes from the tomb. The spectators saw in this a miracle, a resurrection. As for Jesus, Renan continues, he was not more able to control the mania of his disciples and the spectators for miracles than was St. Bernard or Francis of Assisi. He suffered himself to be more charged with the miracles that were expected of him, than that he wrought them. He was no longer master of himself, but at the mercy of his fanatical followers. Death, moreover, would in a few days restore to him his divine liberty, and deliver him from the fatal necessities of a role which grew daily more exacting and more difficult to sustain. (Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, pp. 255—257.)

This preposterous compound is the legitimate outgrowth of the views of Paulus, etc., and not much worse than the explanation of Weisse, who sees in the resurrection of Lazarus a misunderstanding of a conversation of Jesus with Mary and Martha, on the resurrection, occasioned by their brother's death; or that of Gfrörer, who, *á la* Strauss, regards it as a transformed or embellished account of the resurrection of the young man of Nain; or lastly, that of Baur, who turns it into a dogmatico-allegorical representation of the δόξα of Christ. Hase and Schweizer hold the hypothesis of apparent death in a modified but not less repulsive form. Their idea is that Jesus firmly believed that his friend was not really, but apparently dead, and since his confident expectation was fully borne out by the event, which was no real miracle, although there was a miracle, viz., the miracle of justified trust in God. The miracle was not the return of suspended life *per se*, but the coinci-

dence of its return with the confidence of Jesus and the opening of the tomb at his bidding. In plain English, this amounts to nothing more nor less than that Jesus, although informed of the death of Lazarus, conceived the idea that he was only apparently dead, and that God would honour his confident expectation by causing the suspension of life to cease in answer to his summoning Lazarus from the grave. We not only agree with Ebrard (*Weisenschaftliche Kritik*, p. 463), that such an explanation, according to which Jesus would have been guilty of tempting God, (for none of those men are genuine believers in the divinity of Jesus Christ,) contains ten times more improbabilities than twenty critics are able to find in the evangelical record, but also with Strauss, that it reviles Jesus fully as much as deists and scoffers ever reviled him, adding, however, Strauss to the number of the latter, and giving him the full benefit of his own criticism.

The account of the miraculous raising of Lazarus, the moment the *reality* of the miracle is abandoned, amounts, in the opinion of Strauss, to the alternative either of sacrificing the honour of Jesus to the truthfulness of the record, or of sacrificing the truthfulness of the record to the honour of Jesus and sound reason. The last named authors belong to the former category, whereas the latter includes Ewald, who believes Lazarus to have been in a trance, and to have been raised by Jesus from the *grave* (not from the *dead*), but that the Evangelist, recollecting the resurrection of Jesus, and anticipating the general resurrection, writing his Gospel in old age, embellished the account of the *wakening* of Lazarus so as to appear like a veritable resurrection. The language of Ewald, (*Johanneische Schriften*, i. 314 sq.; *Geschichte Christus*, p. 358,) as quoted by Strauss, (l. c. p. 485,) seems certainly to warrant this exposition of his views, and to place him in the category assigned to him by Strauss, although the latter appropriately belongs to both, for he is as ready to revile Jesus as to slander the Evangelist. Turning from those revilers of the Lord and defamers of the Evangelist to the category of believers who acknowledge the reality of the miracle, and the truthfulness of the evangelical record, and adore Jesus as the Resurrection and the Life, we abandon the domain of conjec-

ture and speculation, and enter the hallowed precincts of revelation.

The opening sentences of St. John's account acquaint us with the locality where the miraculous resurrection of Lazarus took place, and incidentally point to the relations of friendship subsisting between Jesus and the family of Bethany. The identification of Mary by an allusion to a transaction which took place *after* the raising of Lazarus (cf. John xi. 2, with xii. 1, sq.) is characteristic of the beloved disciple, (John iv. 46; x. 40; vii. 50; xix. 39; xii. 1; xviii. 14; xi. 49; xxi. 20,) and natural, if it is remembered that he wrote his Gospel long after the event had occurred, and that Mary was a celebrated personage, whose memory lived in the oral tradition of the primitive church. Bethany lay on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, about fifteen furlongs (one and a half miles) south-east from Jerusalem. The etymology of its name is uncertain; according to Simon it denotes "a low place" (*locus depressionis*), according to Lightfoot, Reland, and others, "a house of dates," or "a place of palms," (*locus dactylorum*); here resided the two sisters and Lazarus their brother, to whose house Jesus was wont to retire during his repeated and protracted visits to Jerusalem. Its present condition may be inferred from the following notices of recent visitors. "A wild mountain hamlet, screened by an intervening ridge from the view of the top of Olivet, perched on its broken plateau of rock, the last collection of human habitations before the desert hills which reach to Jericho—this is the modern village of El-Lazarieh." (Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 186.) The traditional sites of the house of Simon the leper, of Lazarus and his tomb, are rather apocryphal. Of the latter, Porter (*Hand-book*, i. 188) says: "This is a deep vault, partly excavated in the rock, and partly lined with masonry. The entrance is low, and opens on a long, winding, half-ruinous staircase, leading down to a small chamber, and from this a few steps more lead down to another, smaller vault, in which the body of Lazarus is supposed to have lain. The situation of the tomb in the *centre* of the village scarcely agrees with the gospel narrative, and the masonry of the interior has no appearance of antiquity." "By the dim light of a taper we descended very

cautiously, by twenty-five slippery steps, to the reputed sepulchre of Lazarus, or El-Azariyeh, as both tomb and village are now called. But I have no description of it to give, and no questions about it to ask. It is a wretched cavern, everyway unsatisfactory, and almost disgusting." (Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, ii. p. 599.) Robinson (ii. p. 101) emphatically denies the genuineness of the site, on the ground that the form of the sepulchre is not that of the ancient sepulchres, and that its position is in conflict with that assigned to it in the Gospel." (John xi. 31—38.)

While our Lord was at Peræa, about twenty-three miles distant from Bethany, Lazarus was taken sick, perhaps with one of the sharp, malignant fevers of Palestine, and the sisters despatch a messenger to Jesus with the simple tidings: "Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest, is sick." This message is a touching illustration of their trust in Him, of whose love they were certain (v. 5), and of whose prevailing power with God they were equally sure (v. 22). Hence they ask Him not to come, they make no request whatsoever, but confine themselves to the simple announcement of their brother's sickness, well knowing that more was not necessary. (Augustine, *Ev. Joh. Tract.* 40: "Non dixerunt, Veni. Amanti enim tantummodo nuntiandum fuit . . . Sufficit ut noveris; non enim amas, et deseris.")

The Lord's reply to the messenger, probably uttered in the hearing of the disciples, must have been, and was probably intended to be, a sore trial of the faith of the sisters, for when the messenger brought back the message of Jesus: "His sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby," Lazarus was dead, indeed the notes of time interwoven with the narrative, seem to render it almost certain that he was dead when the messenger of the sisters came to Jesus, for we read first that after the arrival of the messenger our Lord abode still two days in the same place where he was, (v. 6), and allowing two days for the journey from Peræa to Bethany, we learn further that Lazarus had been dead four days when Jesus reached Bethany. (v. 39.) How then are we to understand these words? Certainly not in any sense, which would make Jesus ignorant of the true condition

of things; they are "purposely enigmatical," designed to try the faith of the sisters, and referring not to death, but to the resurrection of Lazarus. The sickness wes not sent to end in death, but in the restoration of Lazarus to life, "for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby." Jesus knew that Lazarus was dead, before he set out for Bethany, (v. 14), and the dark meaning of his words had been approximately caught by Martha, (v. 22.) The gracious design of the sickness of Lazarus presents an exact parallel to the congenital blindness of the man mentioned, John ix. 3, sq. That design, however, was not exclusive, and doubtless involved the spiritual development of Lazarus himself, and we may say with Trench (*Mir.* p. 315) that "the Son of God was first glorified *in* Lazarus, and then *on* him, and through him to the world." Noteworthy is also the reflection of Hilary on that parable. "Inseparable is God's honour from the honour of Christ. How altogether one and the same they are, may be shown from this very passage. Lazarus dies for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified. What doubt can there be that the glory of God consists in the glory of God's Son, since the death of Lazarus, which was conducive to God's glory, was designed to bring glory also to the Son of God."

The Evangelist's statement that "Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus" (v. 5) between the message he sent back to Bethany and the fact of his abiding two days longer at Peræa, seems designed to contrast the conduct of Jesus with his well-known feelings for that honoured family, to intimate by that contrast that *love* was the cause of his delay, or, in the words of Bengel, to suggest "the motive of the resuscitation and the whole course of action preceding it." Love was doubtless the motive, as it is the best explanation of our Lord's conduct. The hypothesis that he lingered in Peræa, because his spiritual duties there were too important to admit of his neglecting them in order to bring bodily relief to his sick friend (Lücke) cannot for a moment be entertained, for had he so willed it, he might have healed Lazarus by a word without leaving Peræa. The almost certainty that Lazarus was dead when the sisters' message reached Christ and that he knew it, explains his delay on the ground of love—he had determined

to raise him from the dead, and the interval would discipline both the faith of the sisters and also that of the disciples, (v. 15); the delay would be the chastening of love to the former (Heb. xii. 6), and the event confirm the faith of both, and set forth Jesus as Lord of life and death. His conduct towards the family of Bethany is parallel to his dealings with us in providence. This view of the case settles the charge of "revolting inhumanity" which Strauss fastens on our Lord for suffering his friend Lazarus to die in order to restore him to life, when he might have saved him from the first; for the fact seems to have been that Lazarus was dead when the messenger from Bethany came to Christ, and it was his intention from the first to restore him to life. Strauss finds it here convenient not to say anything of the notes of time, which set the matter in the true light, although he does insinuate that the delay was designed to enhance the greatness of the miracle by making the case of Lazarus resemble as nearly as possible that of those who are to be raised at the last day. This remark intended as a *suggestio falsi*, just as the former is a clear case of *suppressio veri*, tells however against him, for it *does* establish the stupendous character of the miracle.

The remonstrance of the disciples at the Master's announced intention to revisit Judæa, where he had but just now (νῦν) escaped death, by stoning, at the hands of his Jewish enemies, (see ch. x. 31—39,) led our Lord to utter the words, "Are there not twelve hours in the day? If any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world; but if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him." The language is metaphorical, taken from the Jewish mode of dividing the period between sunrise and sunset into twelve hours, varying in length according to the different seasons of the year. Those twelve hours of light designate the time of work, the material sun in the heavens enabling men to walk without stumbling during any part of that day; but after night has set in, men, for want of light, are apt to stumble. The metaphor applies both to the Lord and to the disciples, whose fears he wished to allay. They were wont to hear Him compare himself with the natural sun, and would not find it difficult to catch his meaning. The day,

consisting of twelve hours of light, had not yet expired; the time of work and security was still continuing; his work was not yet done, and while he was doing his appointed work, he was safe, and they, having him with them as their spiritual Sun, were safe also; but when he, their spiritual Sun and Light, should be no longer with them, then it would be night, and then it was for them to walk cautiously, because then they would be in danger of stumbling. The words, "because there is no light in him," implies that their safety lay, as ours does, in absorbing the light within ourselves; the light must be *in* us, would we pass in safety through the darkness of this world. (Cf. John ix. 5, xii. 35, xxxvi. 46.*)

The supposition of Neander that Jesus received a second messenger is purely arbitrary. Christ knew, in virtue of his superhuman knowledge, that Lazarus was dead; he knew it from the first, and his present conversation with the disciples is partly the explanation of his message sent to Bethany, (v. 4,) partly the preparation of the disciples for the resurrection of Lazarus. Very touching is the manner in which he speaks of Lazarus—"*our friend, Lazarus.*" The friendship he bore to him was shared by the disciples. Already assured by the Master that there was no danger in store for them, this appeal to their feelings for Lazarus, doubtless allayed all fears and misgivings for Jesus and themselves. The sad intelligence of their friend's death is first conveyed to them in the *celestial tongue*, as Bengel beautifully expresses himself. *He sleepeth.* But as yet they knew only little of that celestial tongue, for they understood not his meaning when he said, "but I go, that

* Calvin: Vocatio Dei instar lucis diurnæ est, quæ nos errare vel impingere non patitur. Quisquis ergo Dei verbo obtemperat, nec quidquam aggreditur nisi ejus jussu, illum quoque habere cœlo ducem et directorem, et hâc fiducia securè et intrepidè arripere potest. Cf. Ps. xi. 11.

Bp. Hall (*Contemp.* iii., p. 382.) "Are there not twelve hours in the day, which are duly set, and proceed regularly for all the motions and actions of men? So in this course of mine, which I must run on earth, there is a set and determined time wherein I must work, and do my Father's will. The sun, that guides these hours, is the determinate counsel of my Father, and his calling to the execution of my charge: while I follow that, I cannot miscarry, no more than a man can miss his known way at high noon: this while, in vain are either your dissuasions or the attempts of enemies; they cannot hurt, ye cannot divert me."

I may awake him out of sleep." "They thought that he had spoken of taking of rest in sleep," a well known favourable symptom in many diseases, and use the Lord's words as a further argument for dissuading him from the journey to Judæa,* for both ideas are implied in their answer: "Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well."

Bengel gives a peculiar turn to the former in describing the disciples as believing Jesus to have sent this sleep to Lazarus, that the event might be as he had predicted, (v. 4.) Death represented as *sleep* was quite a common mode of expression, and must have been familiar to readers of the Old Testament. (Cf. Job xiv. 12; Sir. xlvi. 19; Matt. xxvii. 52; Acts vii. 60, xiii. 36; 1 Cor. vii. 39, xi. 30, xv. 6, xviii. 20, 51; 1 Thess. iv. 13—15; 2 Peter iii. 4.) Olshausen (*in loco*) remarks that the nearest motive to this metaphorical expression may have been the likeness of a dead body to one sleeping, but that the more remote idea, however imperfectly apprehended by the many, of the dead person being also *spiritually* in a sleep-like state, may have been connected with it; and that without advocating the doctrine of psychopannychism,† it may be maintained that the separation of the soul from the body, as the necessary organ of its activity, must bring about a certain depression of its consciousness; wherefore, the Scripture describes the life of the soul without the body as a mere transition state, and acknowledges no purely spiritual immortality apart from the resurrection of the body. The image itself, therefore, could not present much difficulty to the disciples, but the *sense* of our Lord's language, admitting a figurative and a literal construction, was misunderstood by the disciples. But the Lord speedily corrected their error, informing them in plain language that Lazarus was dead, adding, "And I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe." Here we have *one* of the key-notes to the right understanding of our Lord's delay. He was training and disciplining the faith of the disciples as much as that of the family

* Thus Chrysostom and Grotius: Discipuli omnimodo quærunt Dominum ab isto itinere avocare. Ideo omnibus utuntur argumentis.

† "The doctrine that at death the soul falls asleep, and does not awake until the resurrection of the body."—*Fleming.*

of Bethany. Step by step, line upon line, the gentle Master educates their faith, and prepares them for the exhibition of his Divine power, which was intended to raise their faith to a higher stage, for "every new step of faith developes faith as to degree." (Meyer.) Our Lord was glad for their sakes that he was not present at Bethany before, not because his presence would have prevented death, but because the raising of Lazarus from the dead would strengthen their faith to a much greater degree than a mere raising him from a bed of sickness. Our Lord's resolve to visit Bethany, the death of Lazarus notwithstanding, suggested the beautiful comment of the devout Hall, which we cannot withhold from the reader: "Even those that write the longest and most passionate dates of their amity, subscribe but, 'your friend till death;' and if the ordinary strain of human friendship will stretch yet a little further, it is but to the brim of the grave; thither a friend may follow us, and see us bestowed in this house of our age, but then he leaves us to our worms and dust. But for thee, O Saviour, the grave-stone, the earth, the coffin, are no bounders of thy dear respects; even after death, and burial, and corruption, thou art graciously affected to those whom thou lovest. Besides the soul (whereof thou sayest not, let us go to it, but let it come to us), there is still a gracious regard to that dust, which was and shall be a part of an undoubted member of that mystical body, whereof thou art the head. Heaven and earth yields no such friend but thyself. O, make me ever ambitious of this love of thine, and ever unquiet till I feel myself possessed of thee." (*Contempl.* iii. p. 387.)

The exclamation of Thomas to his fellow disciples, "Let us also go, that we may die with him," is very characteristic. "He comes before us prominently on only three occasions, of which this is the first, (the other two are John xiv. 5; xx. 24—29,) but from the very expressive indications which the Gospels supply, we have sufficient materials to enable us to conceive his character. He appears to have been a man of earnest mind; capable of strong and disinterested attachments; but of that temperament which looks habitually to the darker side of things; which, out of several future events equally possible, is ever disposed to consider the least welcome as the most

probable, and to distrust extraordinary good news all the more from the circumstance of its being good. This habit of mind we find strongly exemplified on the present occasion. The twelve, with one accord, deprecate our Lord's self-exposure to the powerful enemies in the capital who had so lately threatened him with stoning; and, doubtless, those of the number who shared in any degree the sanguine temper of their chief member,—his willing disbelief of the possibility of the Lord's subjection to shame and death,—must have remonstrated in the hope either that their dissuasions would be effectual, or that their Lord, if he chose to brave the danger, would, by his experienced power, surmount it. But not so thinks Thomas. He is the first to recognize the adverse determination of his Master, and while perceiving, despairingly acquiesces in it; and he says immediately to his fellow-disciples—'Let us also go, that we may die with him;' thus uniting, with a feeling of entire self-devotion, the anticipation that the worst must follow; that in the death of their beloved Master all hope was gone; and that it was well for them who had contentedly shared his fortunes hitherto, to perish also contentedly with him by the hands of his triumphant enemies." (Dr. W. H. Mill.) Chrysostom (in *Joh. Hom.* 62) says of him, that he who now would hardly venture to go *with* Jesus as far as the neighbouring Bethany, afterwards, *without* him, travelled to the ends of the world, to the farthest India, daring all the perils of remote and hostile nations.

The Evangelist's statement that Jesus, on reaching Bethany, found that Lazarus had lain in the grave four days already, must not be construed as betokening our Lord's ignorance of the fact, but as the first announcement of it by some one whom they met in the outskirts of the village, or perhaps by one of the disciples sent by Jesus to apprize the sisters of his arrival. All this is not expressed, but seems to be implied in the evangelical record, (cf. v. 17 with v. 20). Jesus did not enter the village, but tarried outside, (v. 30,) probably because the tombs were there, (cf. v. 31.)

The Evangelist affords us a glimpse of the scene in the house of mourning. The nearness of Bethany to Jerusalem had brought out many friends who had come to Martha

and Mary to comfort them concerning their brother, (*αἱ περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν*, is a later Grecism, and may signify the two sisters only, but denotes more probably Martha and Mary *with* their female acquaintance or companions). "The term has here a peculiar decorum, because those who had come to the sisters were men (*πολλοί*), and indicates a household of the higher sort." (Meyer, cf. Winer, *Grammar*, p. 425.) The conventional and formal condolences and consolations lasted from seven to thirty days. The Mishna prescribes seven days' mourning for a father, a mother, a son, daughter, brother, sister, or wife, (Bartenora, on *Moed Katon*, iii. 7). It was customary for the bereaved to receive their "comforters" (generally veritable Job's comforters) in a sitting posture, (Geier, *de luctu Hebr.*) This seems to be intimated in the notice that "Mary *sat* in the house," while Martha went to meet Jesus. The latter probably received the tidings of his arrival outside the house, or, as housekeeper, was more in the way of hearing news than Mary; at all events she hastened forth to meet Jesus without communicating the intelligence of his arrival to Mary her sister.

The first words uttered by Martha on meeting Jesus were, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. But I know that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee." The first clause was also the exclamation of Mary, when she fell down at Jesus' feet, (v. 32). This coincidence is instructive in several ways. It shows that the two sisters had much conversed on the subject and reached the same conviction; and, indeed, the words of Jesus addressed to the disciples before they left Peræa imply as much: "I am glad for your sakes that I was not there"—*i. e.* Lazarus had not died. Trench says of Martha's speech: "High thoughts and poor thoughts of Christ mingle here together;—high thoughts, in that she sees him as one whose effectual fervent prayers will greatly prevail—poor thoughts, in that she thinks of him as *obtaining* by prayers what indeed he *has* by the oneness of his nature with God." (So Grotius, "Et hic infirmitas apparet. Putat illum gratiosum esse apud Deum, non autem in illo esse plenitudinem Divinæ potestatis.") It is difficult to portray the exact state of Martha's feelings. Both she and her sister felt

convinced that their brother would not have died, if Jesus had been present; this was "the bitterest drop in their whole cup of anguish;" her mind seems to have oscillated between hope and doubt; the presence of Jesus inspires her with hope, for she expresses implicit confidence in the efficacy of the Master's prayers; moreover, she prefers no *request*, but leaves the case in his hands; still the dimness of her expectations and the weakness of her faith come out in her misunderstanding the assurance of Jesus: "Thy brother shall rise again." Doubtless for the purpose of exercising her faith and raising it from a lower to a higher stage, our Lord clothed this his first intimation of the miraculous resuscitation of Lazarus in indefinite language; he said not "I will raise him *now*," but "he shall rise again." His words are to her but cold comfort, and her answer, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection of the last day," shows that she expected more, that she hoped or longed for something more than the consolation arising from the belief in the general resurrection of the last day. She seems to have thought her brother's immediate restoration to life possible; but her yearning for receiving back the loved dead brother, "contained much that was material and selfish, and had to be thrown aside if the raising of Lazarus was to be profitable to her. For had she received back *Lazarus* merely as a *mortal* from the jaws of death, the peril of soon losing him again by the same enemy would have been most harrowing to her feelings. Hence it was necessary that she should regain him without the possibility of ever losing him, and be rooted with him in the element of the eternal; and to this the deep words of Christ would lead her. He draws her attention from a *lost brother* to a *present Saviour*, both to him and to her, and shows that in him only could she find the perfect remedy of carnal and spiritual death." (Olshausen.) Her reference to the general resurrection at the last day led our Lord to say in reply the glorious words of Christian consolation: "I am the Resurrection and the Life," the deep import of which requires to be considered. They are emphatic and antithetic. *I* am the Resurrection; the resurrection to which you refer is not a future impersonal accident, but the personal operation of Myself, already existing and even now operative. Trench seems to

misunderstand Olshausen when he says that the resurrection "which he attributes to himself is in one aspect *more*, in another *less*, than the life he claims. It is more, for it is life in conflict with, and overcoming death; it is life being the death of death, meeting it in its highest manifestation, of physical dissolution and decay, and vanquishing it there; it is less, for so long as that title belongs to him, it implies something still undone, a mortality not yet wholly swallowed up in life, a last enemy not yet wholly destroyed, and put under his feet, (1 Cor. xv. 25, 26)." This is hardly so, for *the Resurrection* and *the Life* are really equivalent terms, the one stating *negatively*, what the other declares *positively*. Christ calls himself the *Life*, not because he *makes* alive (*ζωοποιεῖ*, John v. 21) but because he is (as Philo says of the Logos, *πηγὴ τῆς ζωῆς*) the *fountain of Life*, because he *is* the fountain of absolute being (*ὄντως εἶναι*). In like manner Christ calls himself the Resurrection, not only because he raises others, but because he *is* the resurrection from the very nature of his being. The resurrection (*ἀνάστασις*), as Olshausen puts it, is Life (*ζωή*) in conflict with and triumphing over death (*Θάνατος*); *ζωή* denotes *absolute being* without reference to *Θάνατος*, and is the *positive* statement of this glorious truth, *ἀνάστασις* is life killing death (in the person of Jesus and in others), and this is the *negative* statement of the same truth. "In this victorious manifestation, life appears in the person of the Lord." The connection of the words that follows with those just noticed presents a difficulty. "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?" Faith in our Lord as "the resurrection and the life" is the medium through which Christians are made partakers of both. Where faith is, *physical death* is no obstacle to *spiritual life*, and *physical life* is sure to terminate in *eternal, spiritual life*. The first clause seems to be an expansion of the words "I am the Resurrection," the second, of "I am the Life." Both clauses portray the effects of faith in Christ as "the resurrection and the life" with reference to the dead and the living, primarily with reference to *physical* death and *life*, secondarily, probably with reference to *spiritual* death and *life*. The second clauso is not a mere repetition, but denotes a

progress of the first. We must resolve them after the manner of the older commentators into the parallel; To *dead* believers I am the resurrection, to the *living* the "remedium mortis," nor interpret with Bengel: "Magna differentia inter *mortem* credentium ante mortem Jesu Christi et inter *obitum* credentium post mortem Jesu Christi,"—but

a. Dead believers in Christ are not dead absolutely, they shall live, or rather they continue to live, physical dissolution notwithstanding, and they shall be raised from the dead (as was Lazarus physically and spiritually, and the prodigal spiritually.)

b. Living believers in Christ, who in the midst of physical life become by faith partakers of the *spiritual* life, shall *never* DIE, physical death will be a *sleep*, but they shall live *physically* and *spiritually* forever, (as in the case of Martha and Mary.)

As we understand this difficult passage, the second clause "and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die," unlocks the meaning and denotes the absoluteness of that life which Christ imparts, in the highest form of its manifestation, including the conquest of physical death. (Olshausen).

Strauss (p. 473) asserts that the foregoing words, beginning with "I am the resurrection and the life," etc., are as much the theme of this Johannine resurrection-story, as the words "The maid is not dead, but sleepeth," are the theme of the common synoptical resurrection-story, and the words "weep not," the theme of that of Luke. Baur, who considers the whole account *invented* by the Evangelist for the purpose of *illustrating* a christological proposition, says of the same words, that they are the real substance, with which the Evangelist is solely concerned, and that everything else is bare external, accidental and illustrative, but really unimportant *form*. But both Strauss and Baur, in their anxiety to invalidate the evangelical record, are involuntary letting out the truths we have endeavoured to illustrate. The former says that the theme of John is distinguished from the said synoptical themes by the general difference between the synoptical Gospels and that of John, who not only represents Christ as Him who in very deed turns death into sleep and dries the tears shed for the departed, but sets forth the Son of God in these attributes as the express object of faith, and this faith as the condition of participation in eter-

nal life, and that the life imparted by him neither denotes only the future, *general* resurrection of the body, nor the present resurrection of an individual, but also the new spiritual life emanating from him; while Baur, referring to Christ's statement that the sickness of Lazarus was not unto death, says: "Jesus therefore here expresses at once the view that he would not allow death to become real and *permanent.*" These statements of Strauss and Baur afford an illustration of the valuable uses to which even the confessions of avowed enemies of the evangelical record may be turned.

Our Lord asked Martha whether she believed the glorious truths he had propounded to her. And her reply embodies the truly marvellous confession: "Yea, Lord; I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, which should come into the world," which reminds us of that of Peter, (John vi. 69,) "We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." Martha's reply is sometimes regarded as not being the *explicit* confession which Jesus had required of her; but this view cannot be sustained, seeing that she gives an unqualified "*yea, Lord,*" in reply to his question; as we take it, her "*yea, Lord,*" affirms the belief of the sublime truths which had just been announced, while the words which follow denote the views she entertained then, and had entertained before, of the person of Christ. We do not propose to weaken the force of the words after "yea, Lord," but consider these to *imply* more than is generally thought to be the case. Paraphrasing her reply, we may suppose her to have said: "Yea, Lord, I *believe* all thou hast said, though I hardly understand it yet, but as I have believed heretofore, so I believe now, that thou art the Christ (the Messiah), the Son of God, 'He that should come into the world.'" She names Jesus by three of his great names, and as one of the offices of the Messiah was, according to Jewish expectations, to raise the dead, we may say that Martha, in believing Jesus to be the Messiah, believed also that he was the resurrection and the life, and that he that believeth in him, though he die, yet shall he live. At the same time, the words of Jesus seem to have raised her faith to a higher stage, and filled her with a holy enthusiasm, for her reply (v. 27) indicates an advance both of faith and of

intelligence upon her first greeting (v. 22), in which she seemed to regard Jesus rather in the light of a human being than in that of the Son of God.

Full of blissful expectations, and eager to make her sister partaker of them, she hurried off to Mary, calling her aside, and secretly communicated to her the glad tidings of the arrival of their longed-for friend. Mary, it is to be remembered, was still within doors, surrounded by her mourning friends. *Λάθρα*, "*secretly*," denotes that Martha whispered the words into Mary's ears, perhaps fearing the unfriendly disposition of some of the Jews present (and the event showed that her fears were not unfounded, v. 46), or simply desiring a confidential interview between the Master and themselves, or both. The words themselves form no part of the *recorded* dialogue of Jesus with Martha, but the Evangelist acquaints us thus incidentally with this feature of the history of the miracle, even as v. 40 seems to refer to another unrecorded portion of the Lord's conversation with Martha. "The Master," or rather "the Teacher," (*ὁ διδάσκαλος*,) was the term they were wont to apply to Jesus. Mary rose forthwith without acquainting the mourning friends with the cause of her sudden departure, but as it was customary for Jewish women to visit the graves of their kindred, especially during the first days of mourning,* the visitors, seeing the two sisters start in the direction of the grave, naturally inferred that in the depth of her sorrow Mary had gone to give vent to it in tears shed at the tomb of her lamented brother, and followed her. And following *her*, they came to Jesus. Very graphic and characteristic is the account of the interview between Jesus and Mary. He had remained outside the village, probably not far from the burial-ground, "in that place where Martha met him." Mary drew near in haste, and the moment she *saw* him, in the transport of her joy at seeing him, and in the anguish of her grief at the death of Lazarus, fell down at his feet and greeted him with the identical words, spoken before by Martha: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." On this point the sisters were fully agreed. This had been the controlling thought of their minds, the constant

* Wetstein, ad loc.; Geier, *de luctu Hebræorum*, c. 7, 26. This is still the Oriental custom. (Niebuhr, *Reise nach Arabien*, i. p. 186.)

theme of their conversation, the most bitter ingredient in their cup of sorrow. (See the observations above on v. 21.)*

Meanwhile the Jews, who had come to comfort the sisters, had reached the spot, and their lamentations blended with those of the sisters. They were all weeping. The scene must have been overwhelmingly touching and well-nigh baffles description. There are doubtless circumstances connected with it, which are not recorded by the Evangelist, or implied in his statements, although we cannot catch them. This is evident from the effect the scene produced on our Lord, who, "when he saw her weeping, and the Jews also weeping which came with her, *groaned in the spirit and was troubled.*" As the words stand in English, they suggest the ideas of excessive sorrow and profound sympathy with the bereaved sisters, but it is very difficult, if not impossible, to gather that sense from the Greek original, which reads: "*ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν.*" *Ἐμβριμάομαι* (from *βρίμη, βριμώ* a name of Proserpina or Hecate, and signifying the wrathful, cognate with *fremo, βρῖθος, φριμάω*), involves the ideas of anger and indignation, wherever found in the writings of the Classics or the Fathers. Applied to horses it denotes snorting, to other beasts, roaring with anger, to Hecate muttering, and in general both in this and other forms, to be wrathful, to be moved with strong indignation, to be wroth at, threaten. But the anger is explained very differently by commentators. Origen and Chrysostom regard Jesus to have been indignant with himself because he wept, but that view originating in Stoical maxims cannot be entertained for a moment. Augustine, Erasmus, and Trench, take the indignation of Jesus at the power of sin and death. Theodoret, Mopanestia, and Lampe, explain his indignation of the unbelief of the two sisters (but they were not unbelieving); De Wette, because he could not have prevented the death of Lazarus and the consequent grief of the sisters, (but he could have done so, had he willed it); Brückner, because enemies prevailed and friends misunderstood his words, (insufficient); Meyer, because the hypocritical tears of the conventional

* Bengel. "Ex quo colligi potest, hunc earum fuisse sermonem anti fratris obitum ; utinam adesset Dominus Jesus."

mourners were mingling with those of Mary, (contradicted by v. 45); Strauss caricatures this indignation into an expression of anger because the Jews did not implicitly receive him. On the other hand, Bucer, Grotius, Nonnus, Lücke, Ewald and Tholuck, think that ἐμβριμάομαι denotes not only anger and indignation but also *pain*, not indeed according to the usage but the *analogy* of language (τῷ πνεύματι being made equal to ἐν ἑαυτῷ, v. 38, and στενάζειν, Mark viii. 12, vii. 34, compared with ἐμβριμάομαι and the Hebrew זָעַף rendered by Gesenius "fremo," but the *analogy* of language must yield the place to usuage, and the other passages in the New Testament where ἐμβριμάομαι is used, express indignation. "Twice it is used of our Lord *commanding, under the threat of his earnest displeasure*, those whom he had healed, to keep silence, Matt. ix. 30, Mark i. 43, and once of those who were indignant at what Mary had done in the matter of the ointment, Mark xiv. 5." (Trench.) Lange adopts a combination of both meanings, by making the word ἐμβριμάομαι signify a general affection of the spirit consisting of different and alternating emotions. Tholuck (7th ed.) thinks that the term involves the sensation of shuddering, and that κινεῖσθαι is its proven philological meaning, after the example of the translator of the Peschito version. Lange supports his view by the following considerations:

"1. The selection of the word, because the Evangelist was familiar with other terms denoting the more definite affections of anger and pain.

"2. The words τῷ πνεύματι, which forbid the prevalence of any one *psychical* affection in *the spirit*, the spirit being the all-embracing unit of the variously divided life of the soul.

"3. The psychological experience that the most different affections concur in the greatest excitement of soul-life. He quotes here the lines of Gœthe's *Iphigenia.*

> There rolls a wheel of joy and grief
> Through my soul. A certain awe draws me
> Away from the stranger man; but my inmost
> Soul draws me strongly to the brother.

"4. The situation. The weeping of Mary could not but excite the most profound sympathy. But the weeping of the

better Jews was mingled with that of the unbelieving. There arose a scene of human lamentation of death, a sympathy with the sense of the power of death. While Jesus needed not to shut himself against that sympathy, he had to struggle with it and be indignant at it. But thereby his feelings passed into an enthusiastic presentiment of victory. The profound *emotion* of his spirit was perceived by the disciples in his outward appearance, hence *he troubled himself*. A divine thunderstorm of the Spirit passed through his breast, which shook his human nature."

We have given these different explanations, and think that on the whole the preference lies between the combination view of Lange and that advocated by Augustine, Erasmus, and Trench. We cannot agree with that of Lange on account of its purely speculative and poetical character. The metaphysical distinctions are beautiful, but founded not so much on the legitimate meaning of ἐμβριμάομαι as on the combination of that word with ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν; in like manner the situation is more imaginary than real, and the reference to the *divine* thunderstorm passing through the breast and shaking the *human* nature of Jesus, savours somewhat of the Nestorian separation of the divine and human in the person of our Lord; we accept, therefore, the explanation of Augustine, etc., and say with Trench: "Much better is it to take this as the indignation which the Lord of life felt at all which sin had wrought; he beheld death, in all its fearfulness, as the wages of sin; and all the world's woes, of which this was but a little sample, rose up before his eye,—all the mourners and all the graves were present to him. For that he was about to wipe away the tears of those present did not truly alter the case. Lazarus did but rise again, to taste a second time the bitterness of death; these mourners he might comfort, but only for a little while; these tears he might stanch, only again hereafter to flow; and how many had flowed, and must flow, with no such comforter to wipe them, even for a season, away! Contemplating all this, a mighty indignation at the author of all this woe possessed his heart," adding, however, that his indignation at the author of all human woe did not exclude his sympathy with the painful anguish of the bereaved sisters, for though

now he was about to resuscitate him, he had to die again, and his being raised from the dead did not put an end to universal woe and suffering. This seems to follow from the further incidents related by the Evangelist, for when the people, in answer to the Lord's question where they had laid Lazarus, bade him come and see, Jesus *shed tears*, the "Fountain of pity" weeping with those that weep. These were the tears of sympathy, not tears of *anger*, as the profane Strauss maintains, or tears of *joy*, as Chrysologus and others have held. Blessed tears of human sympathy, shed by the living, merciful Jesus, as he went to assert his empire over death. The bystanders construed his tears differently. Some saw in them the evidence of his affection for Lazarus, and exclaimed, "Behold, how he loved him." "But others (τινὲς δὲ) said, Could not this man, which opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that even this man should not have died?" There were two classes of persons present, those of a friendly and those of a hostile disposition. The captious spirit of the latter comes out in their reference to the miraculous cure of the man blind from his birth, which had taken place at Jerusalem, and made a profound impression on the minds of the people; it was evidently the general theme of conversation, for this is the second time that the Jews publicly referred to it. (Cf. John x. 21 with ix. 7.) That this reference was made with evil intent, appears 1. From the manifest reproach expressed in the words, which imply either the assumption of his inability or unwillingness to prevent the death of Lazarus; 2. From the effect of their words on Jesus, who experienced a second shuddering, or holy indignation; 3. From the use of the adversative particle δὲ, which distinguishes the latter class from the former; and 4. From the subsequent conduct of those Jews, (v. 46). The supposition of Meyer, that their assumption of Christ's inability to have prevented the death of Lazarus was intended to cast a slur on the miraculous cure of the blind man, seems to be proble. The characteristic objection of Strauss, who sees in their reference to the cure of the blind-born an argument against the truth of the evangelical record, because he thinks that they ought to have referred to other raisings from the dead, mentioned by the synoptists, is readily removed by the considera-

tion that it is very doubtful whether those Jews had heard any thing of the miracles which Jesus wrought at an earlier period in Galilee, whereas the publicity which the judicial proceedings subsequent to the miracle on the blind man had given to that mighty act, renders reference to it both natural and apposite. This circumstance, so far from injuriously affecting the truthfulness of the record, corroborates its fidelity, for if those Jews had cited the Galilean miracles, Strauss would not have been slow to charge the fourth Evangelist with manufacturing his account from synoptical notices; their reference to the miraculous cure of the blind man, as to an event with which they were well acquainted, affords therefore incidental proof of the truthfulness of the narrative.

The tombs of the Hebrews were without the cities and towns, (Luke vii. 12,) and in this respect they conformed to the universal custom of eastern nations. Only kings and prophets were permitted intermural burial, (1 Kings ii. 10; xvi. 6, 28; 2 Kings x. 35; 1 Sam. xxv. 1; xxviii. 3). They were generally caves, either natural (Gen. xxiii. 9) or artificial, that is rock-hewn, (Isa. xxii. 16; 2 Chron. xvi. 14; Matt. xxvii. 60;) situated in gardens or groves. Respectable families had their family vaults, (Gen. xxiii. 20; Judges viii. 32; 2 Sam. ii. 32; 1 Kings xiii. 22,) which were constructed either horizontally or perpendicularly, in the latter case there was a descent by steps. They consisted of several chambers, or divisions, sometimes one above the other, with openings in the sides for the reception of the bodies. It is difficult to determine whether the grave of Lazarus was perpendicular or horizontal. It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it. The use of the stone was to prevent jackals and other beasts of prey to enter the tombs. The circumstance that the stone is said to have lain *upon* the cave, as it is rendered in English, does not prove anything, for ἐπέκειτο ἐπ' αὐτῷ may mean both *upon* and *before*. The traditional locality is equally indecisive, but the apparent ease with which the people removed the stone favours the idea that the reference is rather to a *loculus*, or side-opening, closed with a stone, than to an entire tomb closed with a stone or door, say six feet by three feet, weighing some three or four tons, and

impossible to be moved without machinery. (See Winer, R. W. art. *Gräber;* Smith's *Dict. of the Bible,* art. *Tomb.*

Arrived at the grave, the Lord bade the people remove the stone, when Martha interposed, saying, "Lord, by this time he stinketh; for he hath been dead four days." The manner in which the Evangelist introduces Martha is significant and suggestive. "Saith to him the *sister of the dead, Martha.*" Why this particular account of a matter which is abundantly plain from the former notices? "Probably to explain her remonstrance at the taking away of the stone. She, as a sister of the dead, would naturally be more shocked than another at the thought of the exposure of that countenance, upon which [she feared], corruption had already set its seal; would most shudderingly contemplate that beloved form made a spectacle to strangers, now when it has become an abhorring even to them that had loved it best." (Trench.) The remonstrance of Martha is very characteristic, she hesitates, doubts and speaks, while Mary remains a silent spectator. The fearful reality of the grave and the loathsome concomitants of death arise before her and cause her faith to waver. It is to be borne in mind that her words are merely expressive of her fear, purely conjectural, uttered before the grave was opened, and not founded on experience in that particular case. It was rather the application of her experience from other instances of mortality to the case of her loved brother, that led her to conclude that the usual phenomena had set in. This is evident from the reason she adduces for her opinion: τεταρταῖος γὰρ ἐστι; it is the fourth day since he was buried. That the change she dreaded might have ensued is rendered highly probable by the well-known rapidity with which decomposition sets in in that country ("the Talmud and the Targums refer proverbially to decomposition taking place on the third day after death"); but that it had ensued in the case of Lazarus cannot be proven; indeed the language of the Evangelist and the season of the year (it was winter) forbid such an hypothesis, which would, as Olshausen justly remarks, give to the miracle a *monstrous* character, and it is certainly better and more congenial to a Christian mind, if suppose we must, to assume with him that the body of Lazarus was divinely guarded from corruption, and to argue with

Trench, who adopts the suggestion of Olshausen, from the less to the greater, that "if the poet could imagine a divine power guarding from all defeature and wrong the body which was thus preserved only for an honourable burial (*Iliad*, xxiv. 18—21), by how much more may we assume a like preservation for that body which, not in the world of fiction, but of reality, was to become again so soon the tabernacle for the soul of one of Christ's servants;" the hypothesis that the body of Lazarus had already undergone corruption, would be *monstrous*, for even in respect of the general resurrection it is not the corruptible that shall be *raised*, but the corruptible shall *put on* incorruption, and mortality shall be *clothed* with immortality.

The remonstrance of Martha we understand to imply want of faith on her part, a departure certainly from the lofty belief to which she had so recently given utterance, and this unbelief the Lord rebukes in the words which follow. "Said I not unto thee, that, if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest see the glory of God?" There is no record of these words in the dialogue between Jesus and Martha at their first meeting (v. 28, as has been intimated above); but we may either regard this a further record of that conversation "on the power of faith as the means of making our own the fulness of the powers residing in Christ" (Olshausen), or connect that conversation with the first tidings Martha received in reply to her message, to wit, "this sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God," and suppose that those mysterious words formed the theme of their dialogue.

This gentle rebuke of Christ had a most salutary effect on Martha, her unbelief gave way before the comforting and encouraging words of Jesus, for her silence, taken in connection with the obedience of the company, implies that now she did fully and freely acquiesce in the commandment of the Lord. "Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid, and Jesus lifted up his eyes" (cf. Mark vii. 34; John xvii. 1,) from the object of mortality to heaven, as Bengel beautifully puts it, and said: "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." This is really a thanksgiving, not a prayer; but thanksgiving in the case of our Lord does

not imply a previous prayer, still less an inferiority and dependence of Christ; it is to be taken rather as an assertion of the unity of being and will of God the Father and God the Son (Maldonatus), and the union of the Divine and human nature in the person of Christ. It is immaterial whether we take the first words: "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me," spoken in tones so loud as to be heard by the whole surrounding multitude, and the rest in a lower key and heard only by the disciples, or the whole uttered in the same key; the great truth, they assert, remains unchanged. In ch. xii. 30, a similar thought is addressed immediately to the people and that analogy renders the latter hypothesis probable in the present instance. Doubtless the thanksgiving was uttered by the Lord on account of the surrounding multitude, the scope of this the greatest of his miracles being to persuade the people of the true character of his mission, that his power was from above, not from beneath, that his will was in perfect union with that of the Father, and that the Omnipotence of the Father was in perfect union with the Son. He needed not to pray for himself, "He prayed for our sakes, that we might know him to be the Son. His prayer did not benefit himself, but it benefitted our faith. *He* did not want help, but *we* want *instruction.*" (Hilary.)

The real *animus* of Strauss comes out in his comment on this passage. The condescending, loving regard of our Lord for the spiritual needs of the spectators of the miracle, his patient and considerate enlightening their minds, and thus weaning them from the prejudices and false views of the expected Deliverer, is to that irreverent man "an accommodation." He says: "Now if an accommodation is to have the desired effect, the person accommodating himself must not say that it is only an accommodation, while a prayer said only for the purpose of accommodation is an *offensive grimace.* They thought themselves witty who said, against the view stated by the critics, 'that John's Christ is only a personified dogmatical conception,' that a conception does not attend a wedding, or show compassion and such like. But here one may say on the contrary, that no real man, though he were God-man, would act as John's Christ is said to have acted near the grave of Lazarus, that only a personified conception composed of two contradictory

marks could have acted in such a manner. John's Christ is on the one hand the eternal creative Word, one with God; he therefore needs not pray or thank the Father for any specific thing, seeing that the whole of his doings is only the successive streaming forth of that which eternally streams into him from the Father; but, on the other hand, he walks as a man among men who is to lead them to the Father, point them on every occasion to the Father, and least of all must not omit doing this in the performance of a work which, as the raising of a dead person, so peculiarly manifests the glory of the Father. He therefore utters a loud prayer to the Father, and rather a prayer of thanksgiving than one of supplication, which, because of the seeming uncertainty of being heard, would be more liable to be misinterpreted; but inasmuch as he is both man and the incarnate Logos, prayer with him is mere accommodation, and inasmuch as he also wishes to be acknowledged as the Logos, he says himself that he did not utter the prayer for himself, but solely for the benefit of the surrounding spectators. Taken as a real being, as a man, the Christ of the fourth Gospel appears in this praying from accommodation as *an actor*, and his confession that his prayer is mere accommodation shows him moreover to have been *unskilful at that;* but even taken as a personified conception, he here exhibits in a peculiar manner the contradictory marks which are combined in him in an inconceivable unity."

It is difficult to determine which is worse, Strauss's logic or blasphemy; the two are so well matched and so closely interwoven that their separation is well nigh impossible. This deliberate perversion of the truth into caricature, this adding insult to injury, is a species of argument which infidels and profane men may call ingenious, but which the lovers of truth will brand as malicious blasphemy. The explicit declaration of Jesus that he thanked God for hearing him, not because himself needed to pray, but because the people needed to know and to believe that he was sent by the Father, ought to disarm all suspicion, for it is the language of truth in beautiful consistency with the whole account of his Divine origin, both as given by this Evangelist and the synoptists, foretold by the prophets, and commented upon by other inspired writers of the New Testa-

ment. As we read the words they betoken at once the Lord's confession of oneness with the Father and exceeding tenderness of regard for those he came to save, to whom he was sent, but who received him not; the company at the grave of Lazarus included some who even resisted the stupendous proof of Christ's words furnished by the resurrection of Lazarus, but the many were convinced thereby of his Divine mission, and believed on him. The construction put upon this thanksgiving of Christ could only occur to a man like Strauss, who among all possible explanations are sure to select the most unnatural and degrading, and never scruple to suggest ideas, not so much the result of sober reasoning as of morbid speculation, which too often show that the author's wish is father to the thought. Strauss wishes to explain away the reality of our Lord's existence, and the tyranny of that wish makes him a miserable reasoner, a sophist, a caricaturist, and a blasphemer. We can only lament that so much learning and ingenuity should be wasted in the bootless and hopeless attempt of destroying the faith of the people—no wonder, that the man whose set purpose is to *destroy* belief should be peculiarly bitter in a comment on a passage like this, expressly declared to have aimed directly at the assurance, establishment, and building up of the belief of the witnesses of the raising of Lazarus.

The words of Pearson on this subject are very apposite: "Whatsoever miracle Moses wrought, he either obtained by his prayers, or else consulting with God, received it by commandment from him; so that the power of miracles cannot be conceived as inhering in him. Whereas this power must of necessity be in Jesus, 'in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily' (Col. ii. 9), and to whom the Father had given 'to have life in himself.' (John v. 26.) This he sufficiently showed by working with a *word*, commanding the winds to be still, the devils to fly, and the dead to rise. . . . Once indeed Christ *seemeth* to have prayed, before he raised Lazarus from the grave, but even that was done 'because of the people which stood by.' Not that *He* had not power within himself to raise up Lazarus, who was afterwards to raise *Himself*, but 'that they might believe the FATHER had sent him.'" Chrysostom in the same spirit bids us remark that he does not say "'In my

Father's Name come forth,' or '*Father*, raise him,' but throwing off the whole appearances of one praying, he proceeds to show his power by acts. This is his general way. His words show humility, his acts power."

"And when he had thus spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth." We notice here first the loud voice, which may betoken the strength of our Lord's affection for Lazarus, or answer to the greatness of the work (Hall), but more probably had reference to the witnesses of the miracle, who would know thereby that no other agency but the word of Jesus was employed in this stupendous unheard of work; Jesus crying with a loud voice would be heard by all, and all would know that no magical incantations, but plain words were used. We may also regard the loudness of the voice as typical of the voice of the Son of God in the general resurrection, when "all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth" (John v. 28), of the *shout* with which the Lord shall descend when "the dead in Christ shall rise" (1 Thess. iv. 16), and perhaps "of the last trumpet" (1 Cor. xv. 52), which seems to be identical with this voice of the Son of God. The words themselves are remarkable, both as to form and substance. They are an authoritative command, couched in terms of familiarity. "Here is no suit to the Father, no abjuration to the deceased, but a flat and absolute injunction" (Hall), a simple summons addressed to the dead man in the language of familiar discourse. "He calls Lazarus *by name*, lest he should bring out *all* the dead," says Augustine, but it is doubtful whether that remark, however beautiful and striking, can be sustained, for the economy of grace has its appointed season for every stage of its development. Origen and Chrysostom suppose that Lazarus was already reanimated before the Lord uttered the thanksgiving prayer, and simply issued from the tomb in answer to the summons to come forth, but it is better to regard the summons itself, "this divine and royal command," as the moment of reanimation. The pious reflection of Hall points out the personal application Christian readers are apt to make of the call to Lazarus: "O Saviour, that is the voice that I shall once hear sounding into the bottom of my grave, and raising me up out of my dust; that is the voice that shall

pierce the rocks and divide the mountains, and fetch up the dead out of the lowest deeps. Thy word made all, thy word shall repair all. Hence, all ye diffident fears; he whom I trust is omnipotent."

In answer to the majestic summons, "Lazarus, come *out*," (*Λάζαρε, δεῦρο ἔξω*, literally, "Lazarus, hither! out!") he that was dead *came out* from the dark recess of the cave, "bound hand and foot in grave-clothes; and his face was bound about with a napkin." Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, and among modern writers, Lampe and Stier, see here a "miracle in a miracle," (*θαῦμα ἐν θαύματι*, Basil.) "Processit ille *vinctus:* non ergo pedibus propriis, sed virtuto producentis." (Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* ci. 21), inasmuch as Lazarus, though bound hand and foot, was able to answer the summons, but this supposition seems to conflict with the words that follow, "Loose him, let him go," and can hardly be borne out by the terms rendered "grave-clothes" and "napkin," which are apt to mislead the English reader. The *grave-clothes* (*χειρίαι*), denote narrow strips of linen which the Egyptians used to wind round every limb, and the *napkin* (*σουδάριον*), the *sudarium*, was a linen cloth or handkerchief wound round the forehead, which in the case of mummies reaches down to the chest. If this was the manner in which the body of Lazarus had been prepared for the grave (and the terms used decidedly favour such a preparation) there is no difficulty as to the mode of his progression. He could move—but the *sudarium* depending from his forehead and all his limbs tightly wrapped up with linen bandages put a restraint upon his motions, and we may imagine him to have walked with the hesitating, uncertain motions of a somnambulist. Certain it is, that he did walk, either in the manner described, or in some other way, and that the grave-clothes and the napkin impeded his progress. (v. 44.)

The feelings with which Mary and Martha, the disciples of Jesus, and the Jews, must have gazed upon the passing wondrous spectacle of a dead man, summoned from the grasp of death by the voice of Jesus, advancing in the habiliments of the grave from the dark recess of the tomb, we are hardly in a position to describe; joy, ecstatic joy, commingling with fear on the part of the sisters, amazement and awe on the part of

the others; all doubt must henceforth vanish from their minds as to the Divine mission of Jesus, now they knew that he is the Resurrection and the Life, and though even some of the spectators of this greatest of miracles seem to have persisted in unbelief, *many* believed on Him. And if it is difficult for us to enter into the feelings of the sisters, it is well-nigh impossible for us to conjecture those of Lazarus who, after an absence of four days in the world of spirits, was suddenly recalled to the world of sense, to be greeted by loving friends and blessed with the welcome of Jesus. Of the eagerness with which the sisters welcomed him, or of his anxiety to fly to their loving arms, we have perhaps a hint in the words of Jesus addressed to the spectators of the miracle: "Loose him, and let him go." He that could break the adamantine fetters of death might easily have burst the linen ligaments which encumbered the body of Lazarus, but his bidding others perform that office may have been from a desire of giving to *all* the opportunity of handling Lazarus, while it affords incidental proof that his rising again was real and not phantastic.

Beyond the solitary notice that Lazarus was present at the supper prepared for Jesus at Bethany (John xii. 1), Scripture is silent concerning him. According to an old tradition mentioned by Epiphanius, Lazarus was thirty years old at the time of his resurrection and lived thirty years longer. (Epiph. *Hær.* bk. 34, p. 652). In the ninth century his bones were pretended to have been found in Cyprus, (Suicer, *Thes.* 2. 208); but this seems to conflict with the Western tradition that he, accompanied by Martha and others, went to Gaul and became bishop of Massilia, (cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apoc. N. T.* 3, 475 sq., and his *Lux Evang.* p. 388, sqq., Thilo, *Apocryph.* p 711, and *per contra* Launoii *diss. de Lazari, etc., appulsu in Provinciam*, Op. ii. 1). All these notices are of course apocryphal and unreliable, nor is it necessary to dwell on them at length, although the reader may be interested to know one circumstance connected with these legendary notices, namely, "that the first question Lazarus asked the Lord after he was come back from the grave, was whether he should have to die again, and learning that it needs must be so, that he never smiled any more." (Trench, l. c., p. 332.)

Here the history of the miracle itself closes, and as it is foreign to our purpose to trace its connection with the subsequent part of the life of our Lord, we close our account with a passing reference to the allegorical interpretation of this miracle, which was very prevalent in the ancient church, and with writers like Bourdaloue and Martin. Bourdaloue, after the example of Augustine, Jerome, Bernard, and others, has a very ingenious sermon based on the history of this miracle, entitled, "*Sur l'eloignement de Dieu et le retour à Dieu,*" in which he traces the different steps of a sinner's death and resurrection to life. The first step towards spiritual death is sickness, (John xi. 1,) the second, lethargy, (v. 11,) terminating in death, (v. 14,) burial under the stone of evil habits, (v. 17,) and corruption spreading to others, (v. 39). Then follows a description of his conversion, beginning with the zeal and prayer of the sisters, (vs. 3, 22,) followed by the condition enjoined by the Lord, (v. 39,) the removal of the stone denoting the casting away of the beggarly elements of the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life; the summons of Christ and the obedience of Lazarus, (vs. 43, 44,) showing the necessity of sinners leaving, at the bidding of Jesus, the darkness of sin and making open confession, and lastly, receiving absolution, (v. 44.)

This specimen is sufficient to show the arbitrary character of the allegorical interpretation, which frequently sets aside historical veracity and exegetical correctness. We do not wish to be understood as absolutely condemning it, for it often serves a good purpose—*but only where it adheres to fidelity of statement, and follows a sound exegesis;* these are clearly the bounds it must not transgress, or we shall have fiction instead of truth, and the thoughtless may imperceptibly and undesignedly drift into skepticism and infidelity, from the habit of hearing the literal and historical sense, if not explained away, at least made subordinate to the allegorical instruction based thereon. It is quite true that so early a writer as Augustine said, "We do not, because we trace an allegorical or mystical meaning in facts, forfeit our belief in them as literal occurrences," but the synopsis of Bourdaloue's sermon, founded on that father's interpretation, shows the danger of a forced appli-

cation of the allegorical sense to *every* part of the history. The resurrection of Lazarus, *as a whole*, may be considered as emblematic of the restoration of a soul at the voice of Jesus sounding in the gospel, even as the other two instances of Christ raising the dead may be illustrated in the same way, without any phantastic disfiguring of the language of Holy Writ, which warrants us to see in death a metaphor of sin, and to deduce the great truth that Christ raises to newness of life sinners of all degrees; that his grace extends even to the most abandoned. The case of the ruler's daughter, who had just died, may be taken as symbolical of the spiritual restoration of one who has just sunk into sin; that of the widow of Nain's son, carried out by the gate, as emblematic of the conversion of an open and hardened sinner; but that of Lazarus, who had lain four days in the grave, as typical of the spiritual regeneration of one who was, to all appearance, irrecoverably lost.

This miracle has always been considered as the greatest miracle which Jesus did; it was a favourite subject of early Christian art in all its stages, which sometimes represented Martha kneeling at the feet of Jesus, sometimes the Lord touching with his wonder-staff the head of Lazarus, who is placed upright (which is a mistake, and a transfer of Egyptian customs to Judæa,) and rolled up as a mummy, (which was nearly correct [?],) in a niche of the cave; and sometimes he is coming forth from thence at the word of the Lord. (Münter, *Sinnbilder der alten Christen*, ii. 98.) Trench calls attention to the curious custom of the Byzantines, as mentioned by Chrysostom, and of the contemporaries of Asterius, to have this and many other miracles of our Lord woven on their garments. The extract from Asterius is by no means flattering to the spirituality of the Christianity of that day. "Here mayest thou see the marriage in Galilee and the waterpots, the impotent man that carried his bed on his shoulders, the blind man that was healed with clay, the woman that had an issue of blood and touched the hem of his garments, the awakened Lazarus; *and with this they count themselves pious, and to wear garments well pleasing to God.*"

ART. V.—*Personal Reminiscences of the Life and Times of Gardiner Spring, Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the city of New York.* New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

THE appearance of these volumes has been eagerly welcomed by the Christian, and especially the Presbyterian public. Various circumstances invest them with peculiar interest. Dr. Spring is an octogenarian. His public life runs back nearly to the beginning of the present century. He has been the distinguished pastor of one of the most prominent churches in the country for more than fifty-five years. In this conspicuous post he has, from the first, been in the very front rank of American preachers, and among the most successful of pastors. Born, reared, educated in New England, the son of a leading Hopkinsian divine of eminent piety, who took a prominent part in founding and shaping Andover Theological Seminary, himself a participator in the Hopkinsian and New Haven, and various other controversies connected with the disruption of the Presbyterian church, he is not only the strongest living link between the ecclesiastical past and present, but between the Presbyterian and Congregational bodies, once maintaining an intimacy of mutual fellowship which, if it has abated, has not utterly ceased. All these and many other circumstances impart a special interest to the reminiscences of Dr. Spring, and will lead a wide circle, particularly of Presbyterians, to examine its contents with avidity.

The preparation of such a book, by a man past eighty, is a phenomenon. It has its advantages and disadvantages. It gives something of the charm which attaches to the marvellous. Of course, it is no disparagement to say that tokens are not wanting, that the work is not what it would have been had it been written earlier, occupied a longer time, and had more pains-taking elaboration. Of this the venerable author seems to be fully sensible. "Another embarrassment which I deeply feel, is the fact that I am too far advanced in years to have

any very strong expectation that my life and health will be prolonged to the completion of that which I have undertaken. I am driven to the work; I am running a race with time; it is too hasty an effort. Could I have had two years for it, instead of the four months it has occupied, it might have been more interesting, as well as more instructive." Vol. i. pp. 8, 9.

Notwithstanding any drawbacks on this account, however, we are thankful for the many valuable documents, precious mementos, instructive reflections, and important testimonies which the book contains. To know simply the personal history, training, habits, methods, development, of such a man, the results he has achieved, and the relation between his personal characteristics and ways, on the one hand, and his great public achievements on the other, is itself a treasure. The light, too, shed on great public events and questions with which the distinguished author has been connected, is, of course, important. We shall proceed to call attention to such matters, practical and doctrinal, brought to view in these volumes, as most concern our readers.

Dr. Spring's lineage was of the "seed royal" of heaven, and in the line of the covenant. His mother's ancestors, for several generations, were ministers of the gospel, Nonconformists and English Puritans. Her grandfather, Rev. Samuel Hopkins, D.D., of West Springfield, Mass., (not the author of Hopkinsianism,) was the son of a sister of the elder President Edwards. His father was the Rev. Samuel Spring, D.D., pastor of an important church in Newburyport, Mass., descended also from some of the best Puritan stock. He was educated at Nassau Hall, a thing not uncommon at that period for the sons of New England. He studied theology for a time with Dr. Witherspoon, whom he greatly admired. He, however, afterwards studied with Bellamy, West, and Hopkins, and, as the result of the whole, became a determined Hopkinsian, quite a leader in his day of that more moderate portion of this school that did not follow Emmons, who, by marriage, appears to have become his kinsman. At all events, Dr. Emmons addresses Dr. Gardiner Spring as his nephew. While in College, he was the roommate of President Madison. His tutor was the younger Edwards, who stimulated his metaphysical powers. He also fell

under the influence of a resident graduate, named Periam, brilliant both in physical and metaphysical philosophy, for whom he cherished the warmest admiration. This man, of such great early promise, appears to have either died early, or otherwise fallen into obscurity. But he, like many others of that day, became a Berkleian, and for a time succeeded in inoculating Samuel Stanhope Smith, afterwards President of the College, and young Mr. Spring, with his views. Says his son: "My father was interested in Berkley's philosophy; and but for the influence of Dr. Witherspoon, might have adopted the opinion that the objects of perception are not real existences, and are simply ideas which exist only in the mind." So it appears that discussions on "Hard Matter," of which Dr. Spring complains as unprofitable in our present periodicals, were current in the days of our fathers.

Dr. Gardiner Spring was born in Newburyport, February 24, 1785. Few men have enjoyed a more thorough Christian training, or, during childhood and youth, breathed an atmosphere of purer domestic piety. The letters of his mother, published in the first volume, and the high-toned religious character of his father, are sufficient proof of this. The effect is apparent in repeated seasons of seriousness and alarm, not without occasional intervals of trembling hope, especially under impressive sermons, and in times of revival, through his childhood, youth, and early manhood. He entered Yale College in 1799. His eyes becoming weak, through severe study, his father wisely withdrew him at the end of Freshman year, and, after a year's absence, permitted him to return to a lower class. He was a severely diligent student, and graduated with the highest honour of his class. The topic of his valedictory oration, *Aut Cesar aut nullus*, was significant. His father, after the conclusion of the commencement exercises, took an affectionate leave of him, and threw him upon his own resources, he having but four dollars in his possession. He cordially accepted the allotment: at once commenced the study of law, and sustained himself by leading singing in church, and teaching sacred music: while Moses Brown, Esq., one of his father's parishioners, whose name is inseparably connected with the munificent endowment of Andover Seminary, at his request,

loaned him two hundred and fifty dollars, on his own terms. Afterwards he accepted an invitation to teach a classical and mathematical school in the island of Bermuda. Meanwhile he was married. He earned enough to support himself and family until he was established in the successful practice of law in New Haven. Having reached this point, his religious impressions were revived and developed into such clearness of Christian faith and hope, that he made a profession of faith in the Centre church, New Haven, then under the pastoral care of Rev. Moses Stuart, afterwards the celebrated Professor of Biblical Exegesis and Literature at Andover.

He soon found his mind dissatisfied with the law, of which he had been a very thorough and zealous student, and in which he had already won an encouraging practice. His heart yearned for the ministry. He found himself interested in attending and addressing religious meetings in the suburbs of the city, and was ill at ease in the prospect of devoting his life to secular occupations. At length his mind was brought to a decision in the following manner, which is well worthy of record:

"At the following Commencement of Yale College, I was to take my degree of A. M., and to deliver an oration. My theme was the 'Christian Patriot:' nor were my views as yet decided with regard to the change in my professional career. Early on the morning after the Commencement, the Rev. Dr. John M. Mason preached his great sermon on the text, 'To the poor the gospel is preached.' As I led the choir, I sat immediately opposite the preacher. And never did I hear such a sermon. I could not refrain from weeping. Hundreds wept. Dr. Dwight wept; Dr. Backus wept like a child; senators wept. When I left the church, I could think of nothing but the *gospel.* I crossed the green exclaiming, 'the gospel! the gospel!' I entered the little parlor where my lovely wife was nursing her babe, and exclaimed, 'the gospel! the gospel!' I thought, I prayed, I resolved, if the providence of God should prepare the way, to become a preacher of the gospel. I said nothing but to Mr. Evarts. My purpose was formed." Vol. i. pp. 97–8.

These details we have selected and condensed out of an indefinite number, scarcely inferior in interest, for the purpose

of bringing to view the early moulding influences, and personal characteristics, which contributed to form the future pastor of the Brick church. His purpose once formed, in dependence on God, ways and means were quickly found for carrying it through. A wealthy lady of Salem, Massachusetts, Mrs. Mary Norris, learning his circumstances and plans, took his family, now consisting of a wife and two children, under her hospitable roof and provided for them, while he pursued his studies in Andover Seminary, then just established. In less than a year he was licensed. He received formal calls or informal overtures for settlement in a number of important churches in New England, but for various reasons declined them. Soon, however, passing through New York, and preaching an evening lecture for Dr. Romeyn in his absence, he was heard by some members of the Brick church. They soon procured him to preach a Sabbath, and immediately gave him a unanimous call, which he accepted. Having experienced some friction in his examination before Presbytery, on account, as he says, "of the views I THEN entertained on the subject of human ability," he was duly ordained and installed in the pastorate, which he has so honourably filled, during the life-time of two generations.

We will now ask the attention of our readers, first to the practical, and then to the doctrinal points, which deserve notice in these volumes. There is nothing in Dr. Spring's life and history more instructive and profitable, than his methods of preparation for the pulpit, and of manifold pastoral labour. His transcendent success, in these respects, renders his example worthy of all consideration by junior ministers and candidates for the ministry. The following extracts speak for themselves. They show no royal road, but only the beaten track of incessant toil, and a wise husbandry of time and resources, as the only and sure condition of ministerial success or eminence. After his ordination, he says: "By solemn oath I was pledged to my work, and set about it in earnest, though with fear and trembling. I neglected everything for the work of the ministry. I had a strong desire to visit the courts, and listen to the arguments of the eminent jurists of the city; but I had no time for this indulgence. I had none for light reading, none for even-

ing parties, and very little for social visiting or even for extensive reading. Everything was abandoned for my pulpit ministrations. I had warm friends in the Presbytery, in New England, in New Jersey, and in the eastern section of Long Island. And more than all, I had good courage. Three of the eight sermons I had prepared before I left Andover, I had preached in New York already, and the remaining number was kept good for several years. Under God it was this laborious and unintermitted effort that saved me from shipwreck. . . . . Not every man, either among ministers or their hearers, is aware of the incessant and severe labour that is called for in the successful prosecution of the ministerial office. He must be thoroughly a working man. It is work, work, work, from the beginning of the year to the end of it. There is nothing of which I have been constrained to be more economical and even covetous than *time*. I have ever been an early riser, and even in mid-winter used to walk from Beekman street round the 'Forks of the Bowery,' now Union square, before I broke my fast. I usually went into my study at nine o'clock, and after my removal to Bond street, more generally at eight, though my study was opposite the City Hall, and more than a mile from my residence. . . . . Nor have I ever been the advocate of night studies or night parties. These last would long ago have been the death of me. In whatever else I have been wanting, my habits have been habits of industry." *Id.* pp. 105—6.

The following passage presents the same fact in another important aspect. The habits and modes of preparing for the pulpit, of such a man as Dr. Spring, reveal the true secret of success in himself and others.

"I have preached many, very many, very poor sermons, but very rarely one that was hastily written. I have found that my mind was uniformly most active at the close of my Sabbath services; and for a series of years I rarely retired to my pillow of a Lord's day evening without having selected my subject for the following Lord's day. I found great advantage in doing this, in that my mind was not embarrassed by conflicting subjects, or no subject at all; in that I had a subject to think of, to pray over, and sometimes to dream about; and in that one

subject naturally led to another. More generally, and almost uniformly, I began my sermon on the morning of every Tuesday; so that if I finished it by Friday noon, I had one day to spare for general reading. If my subject required more than a week's study, I gave it two weeks, sometimes three, sometimes four, and in one instance *six* weeks, and was greatly the gainer by so doing. One sermon, thus elaborated and prayed over, is worth to the *settled pastor* and to his people more than a score of hasty discourses. In order to carry this arrangement into effect, I obtained help from my brethren, or fell back upon the old store, or preached with no other preparation than a few outlines of thought treasured up in memory and delivered without notes. I say 'delivered without notes,' because I found by experience, that when my mind was divided between my notes and my invention, I was more embarrassed than when my invention was left unshackled. I have reason to believe that some of my best and most profitable discourses, saving a few outlines of thought, were truly extemporaneous, and so literally extemporaneous that from beginning to end I did not know beforehand what would be my next sentence. I say 'literally extemporaneous.' In one view only is this true, and in another, it must be borne in mind, that they are the result of some mental discipline, and express the thoughts laid up by previous study and the use of the pen. If he has self-possession and the use of language, attained by reading, writing and study, and any interest in the object of his vocation, any man can preach extemporaneously, and preach well." *Id.* pp. 110—11.

In regard to preaching with or without written preparation, we find the following additional judicious observations, which seem to us quite timely as respects this important but much mooted question.

"On the subject of preaching with notes or without them, it is difficult to express any satisfactory views. A minister's mind needs the careful and laborious culture of the pen; when this is attained and persevered in, the more he preaches without notes the better. If he has the spirit of devotedness to his work, intellectual resources, self-possession, a free command of his mother-tougue, intense interest in his subject, and confidence in God, he will preach far better with nothing before

him but God's Bible and the God of the sanctuary. If a man can lose sight of himself in preaching, and rise above the fear and applause of his hearers; if he can be so thoroughly master of his subject that in his illustrations his memory shall not embarrass his invention, he will preach better without notes than with them. The danger with extemporaneous preachers is, that they are not students; the defect and danger of written discourses, that the preacher has not the confidence to look his audience in the face unless he is endorsed and sustained by his manuscript.

"My own discourses on the Lord's day have been for the most part written out, and with care, because I am conscious that I lack those prerequisites for a purely extemporaneous preacher. My weekly lectures have never been written; I have rarely carried anything in the form of paper into the pulpit in these services. They have cost me no labour except a solitary walk, or a ride on the saddle; yet they have been among my best discourses. They have been *studied* discourses, not of the day, but of years of study long since past, gathered up and concentrated for the hour. A fanatical and ranting preacher once appointed a religious service in the town of Bethlehem, where Dr. Bellamy was the settled pastor. Dr. Bellamy went to hear him; but in the presence of this distinguished man, the interloper refused to open his lips. After much disappointment, Dr. Bellamy was urged to conduct the service, and he did so, and preached without notes, and with great power. 'Mr. Bellamy,' said the stranger, 'did you never study that sarmont?' 'YES,' vociferated Dr. Bellamy, '*twenty years ago.*'" *Id.* pp. 115, 116.

The main point here signalized is thoroughness of preparation for each particular exercise, so far as circumstances admit, supported by that general study and mastery of topics which renders one *semper paratus* on occasions for which there can be little or no special preparation. As to the mode of preparation, whether by writing out in full, and then memorizing or delivering from a manuscript, or by otherwise making one's self fully master of the subject, and the occasion, as to manner and matter, no uniform rule can be laid down. Here everything depends upon the peculiarities of the minister and his people.

The method best for one man is worst for another. Only one thing can be laid down of universal application. That is the necessity of incessant and wisely directed study, both for the general furnishing of the mind, and the best practicable preparation for each particular public exercise. This is the sure and only means of permanent success and usefulness in the ministry. Others may boast of what they can achieve by the force of genius, by off-hand, unstudied, rambling effusions. The great and mighty preachers and pastors, who have sustained themselves in widening usefulness, and brightening fame, till past three-score-and-ten, have been thankful, if they could instruct and profit their hearers by means of study. Dr. Spring made all things bend to, and subserve his pulpit preparations. He says:

"I have rarely been embarrassed for want of subjects. The wonderful facility with which one subject leads to another—the state of the congregation—an interview with some individual or family—a watchful observance of the leadings of Divine Providence—intercourse with ministerial brethren—some unexpected suggestion during the night-watches—a solitary ride on the saddle—my 'index rerum'—and the inexhaustible treasures of the Bible—furnished me with subjects which I have not yet overtaken. My reading has been uniformly with a view to enrich my mind for my pulpit ministrations. To this end I have not slighted the works of the great Errorists; and have felt strong for the truth of God the more I have possessed myself of their sophistical reasoning."

In regard to the themes and tone of his preaching, he says:

"I have generally aimed to preach on *important subjects*. The more important they were, the better were they suited to my taste and my wishes. I have laboured to distinguish between the precious and the vile; to insist largely and earnestly between the friends of God and his enemies, and 'say to the righteous it shall be well with him, and say to the wicked it shall be ill with him.' I began my work rather with the view of being instrumental in the conversion of sinners, than of comforting the people of God. I have found, too, that the discourses prepared for unrepenting men more generally interested,

and, indeed, comforted the people of God. I early found that I could more easily prepare a good sermon from an awakening and alarming subject, than from one that is more comforting. The fact is, I knew more of the terror of the law than the preciousness of the gospel. My own obligations to holiness, the strength and the evil of sin, my absolute dependence upon sovereign grace, my infinite and everlasting desert of God's displeasure, were subjects with which I was familiar. I knew much about them from my own experience. Of other and less distressing thoughts, though they have not been hidden from me, and have sometimes made my bosom warm and my tongue glow, I knew less, and felt less deeply. I could never understand why the great body of ministers preach with less embarrassment on fearful themes, than on those which are more attractive, unless it be that an alarmed conscience has more to do with our preaching than a loving heart; nor how this can be except that the heart is by nature desperately wicked. The difficulty of *preaching well* on the more attractive and winning themes, has sometimes alarmed me, and made me fear lest after having 'preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away.'" Id. pp. 109—10.

Again:

"I endeavoured to exhibit the fundamental doctrines of grace as the great means of bringing the benighted and lost out of darkness into God's marvellous light. I dwelt largely on the Divine attributes: upon the spirituality and obligations of the Divine law: upon the unmixed and total depravity of man: upon the all-sufficiency of the great atonement, the fulness there is in Christ, and the unembarrassed offer of pardon and life to all that have ears to hear: upon the great wickedness of unbelief: upon the absolute dependence of saint and sinner upon the power of the Holy Spirit: upon the Divine sovereignty and electing love: upon the perfect righteousness of Christ as the only ground of the believer's acceptance with God," &c., &c. Pp. 129—30.

It is this class of topics that alone can permanently give body and force to preaching, or penetrate the souls of men. He who brings such truths home to the hearts and consciences of his people, will find that the word so preached by him is "quick

and powerful." He will not need to discourse of secularities in order to interest his hearers. The sinners in Zion will be afraid. Fearfulness will surprise the hypocrites. Troubled souls will hang with breathless attention on the preacher's lips. Others will rejoice in hope, as they are pointed to Christ and him crucified, by him whose speech and preaching are not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.

All who have observed the earlier and later sermons and publications of Dr. Spring, have doubtless observed the gradual mellowing of his tone, by the benignity of the gospel, so that, without ceasing to persuade men by the terrors of the Lord, he was in his later ministry wont, more and more, to constrain them by the love of Christ. This is a welcome change. No doubt, the theology in which he was trained accounted, in part, for this predominance of the alarming and terrific in his early preaching. This, however, is to be observed, that it is quite easy and common for ministers to lose sight of the denunciations and threatenings of the word of God against the sinful and impenitent, regarding them as overshadowed by the attractions of the cross; to overlook the lightnings of Sinai, as they charmed with the benignant radiance of Sion: to forget that the law gives us a knowledge of sin, and is a schoolmaster to lead us to Christ. We have often had a painful impression, that many ministers would rejoice in more conversions, and greater fruits of their labours, if they would unfold the law more fully in its precepts and penalty, so searching the hearts of sinners, and extinguishing every hope of salvation out of Christ. Unless the preacher echoes and re-echoes the scriptural warnings and threatenings to the impenitent, few of them will realize their ruin, danger, or the urgent necessity of fleeing from the wrath to come to the hope set before them. All one-sided presentations of the Divine attributes are mischievous. Sinners must be made to "behold the goodness and severity of God," or they will stand on slippery places, till they slide down to perdition. The degree of prominence which should be given, at any period, to these respective phases of scriptural truth, depends on circumstances. When men have long spurned the love of God in Christ, it may be needful to reiterate the terrors

of the Lord, till obdurate souls indeed feel that "he is a consuming fire." The great power of Dr. Spring's early ministry, the repeated and great revivals with which it was blessed, seem to indicate a then state of the public mind, that was not harmed by what, under other circumstances, might have been an undue preponderance of alarming, startling, or even "legal" preaching. Not that he ever lost sight of the gospel as the balm for wounded sinners—but that he found it powerless upon men, until they were made conscious of wounds and bruises and putrefying sores that needed such Divine medication. Our observation has led us to the belief, that very many preachers at this time would find the evangelism of their preaching more powerful, if they would rouse their hearers to a better appreciation of it, by more abundantly and earnestly warning them to flee from the wrath to come.

One other extract on this subject, upon which Dr. Spring has a right to speak with an authority second to no living man, puts in a strong light a truth well worthy of the prayerful consideration of all ministers, especially those who are mourning over a barren and fruitless ministry. It is necessary to be not only industrious in the preparation of sermons, but to shape them all to the accomplishment of the great end of preaching, the conversion of sinners, and the edification of saints.

He says:

"The *great end and object* of the ministry, though very imperfectly, I have endeavoured constantly to keep before my mind. I have generally found that laborious ministers gain their object. If it is to write *elegant* sermons, they write them, and gain their object. If it is to write *learned* sermons, they write them, and gain their object. If it is to *enrich their discourses* with the pithy and concentrated sentences of other days and great men, they do it, and gain their object. If it is to be popular, they are popular, and there the matter ends. They look no further. They gain their object, and have never thought of any thing beyond it. It was not the conversion of sinners they were aiming at, and therefore they never attained it. I know a most worthy minister who preached more than a year to the same people, and his preaching was sound in doctrine, logical, and able; but during that whole period I have

yet to learn that a single sinner was alarmed, convinced, or converted to God. And the reason is, that was not his object. He did not study for it, nor pray for it, nor preach for it. He gained his object most effectually, but it was not the conversion of men.

"I have adverted to this kind of preaching, because, as it seems to me, this is the snare of the modern pulpit. I have listened to not a few sermons within the past ten years, in which there was no want of instruction; they were full of solid and weighty truths; great pains were taken, in the use of metaphor and illustration, to indicate the preacher's progress in science, and to show that he stood abreast with the improvements of the age; but in which the great end of preaching was lost sight of—the turning of the wicked from the error of their ways—the salvation of the immortal soul. The preachers had power, but their minds were not directed to this great object. With all their intellectual effort, there was a want of amplification and earnestness in addressing the different classes of their audience, and crowding the conscience of the impenitent. Why is it that there is so little adaptation in so much of the preaching of the present day to produce the conversion of men? Too many ministers preach now as though they thought all their hearers were Christians, overlooking the multitudes who are dead in trespasses and sins, and pressing on in the broad way that leads to destruction!" Pp. 206—8.

Preaching to be seen of men is one thing, to save souls another, and, as in the case of praying and almsgiving, is apt to gain the reward it seeks, and to fail of that which it does not preëminently seek.

Among the embarrassments of his early ministry, was the practice of his predecessors relative to infant baptism. Dr. Rodgers, Dr. McKnight, and Dr. Miller, had been in the habit of baptizing all the children of the congregation without regard to the Christian character and profession of either of the parents. He felt constrained to adopt a different course, and to baptize only those children, one of whose parents was a professed Christian. Of course the introduction of the strict practice encountered some antagonism, which he, however, speedily surmounted. Dr. Spring expresses his warm approval

of the celebrated Report on Infant Baptism, prescnted to the General Assembly, and prepared by Dr. Romeyn.

Fashionable amusements presented a difficulty more insuperable. Says Dr. Spring, "in this matter, 'old Adam was too hard for young Melancthon.' It is a foregone conclusion that our young people will dance. I regret it in Christian families, but I cannot prevent it. Our mercurial youth live for folly and fun. 'The heart of fools is in the house of mirth.' I have observed one thing, however; that when the Spirit of God is poured out upon us, there are no balls and assemblies; there is more prayer and praise than dancing. It is a grief of heart to the ministers of Christ that Christian families arc so extensively the patrons of fashionable amusements. The giddy companions of the world, the sons and daughters of pleasure, give little proof of a Christian training." *Id.* p. 128.

The next topic of high moment handled in these volumes, is Revivals of Religion. In regard to the first season of refreshing under his ministry, he writes as follows:

"This season of mercy was an emphatic expression of God's goodness to the youthful minister. He had been but six short years in the ministry, but God foresaw that he was to occupy a place in his earthly sanctuary for more than half a century. It was a weary wilderness he was appointed to traverse, and the God of Israel refreshed him with some of the grapes of Eshcol. Poor a thing as I have been, and still continue to be, with devout gratitude I record it here, that it was this work of gracc that made me what I am; which enlarged my heart, gave vigour to my thoughts, ready utterance to my tonguc, new views of the great object of the ministry, made my work my joy, and stimulated me to reach forward to greater measures of usefulness. I loved preaching the gospcl before, but never as I have loved it since. But for this early season of mercy during the summer of 1814, I should have changed from placc to place, and turned out what the Scotch call a 'sticket minister.' It was the Lord's doing, and marvellous in our eyes. The ingathering was not great, but it was the 'finest of the whcat.'" Pp. 163—4.

We havc oftcn observed that nothing so perfects ministerial and pastoral education as a great baptism of the Spirit in a

powerful revival of religion. This experimental teaching gives an insight into the true method of dealing with souls, in public preaching and private intercourse, which no amount of scholastic attainments or severe study can supply. For this, as well as so many other reasons, the young pastor should crave, pray, labour for a revival of religion, as the most inestimable of blessings. This great revival brought into the Brick church a large number of people in middle and advanced life, who, although they had been regular attendants upon and supporters of the church, had never yet consciously or professedly embraced salvation. During the next winter a visitation of grace still more powerful prevailed, especially among the youth of the congregation whose parents had been gathered in the previous summer. Besides this, there were other seasons of general awakening and revival in the old Brick church. But this appears to have been the most powerful and extensive of all. As Dr. Spring's account of it is not only extremely interesting and instructive, but brings into strong relief the measures employed, which stand in contrast to the fanatical measures and Pelagian preaching of Mr. Finney and other Western revivalists, elsewhere strongly reprobated by the venerable author, we will give it entire. In regard to all the revivals under his ministry, he remarks that, judging by the fruits, they were the work of the Spirit. The subjects of them, with few exceptions, have turned out intelligent and active Christians. Some are sceptical in regard to these seasons of special and prevailing religious attention, apprehensive that they will evaporate in fleshly excitement, without any pure and enduring fruits. This may be true of superficial and spurious excitements, got up by artificial machinery and unscriptural devices. These often give birth to an Ishmael, instead of an Isaac, the real child of promise. But in regard to those profound and extended awakenings, which arise from and are guided by scriptural truth, we apprehend that there will be vastly more irreligion and false religion in any congregation without them than with them. As one fruit of these revivals in Dr. Spring's church, it at one time contained sixty members, whom he could call upon to lead in prayer, and who, in little companies, held weekly meetings in different neighbourhoods of the congrega-

tion. We now give his account of the second great revival in his congregation.

"The commencement of the year 1815 was the dawning of a still brighter day. The last Sabbath of the 'old year,' and the evening services of that Sabbath, will be long remembered. The 'New Year's sermon,' preached on the 'last day of the old year,' and printed under the quaint title of 'Something Must be Done,' has been widely circulated, and, by the Divine blessing, I have reason to believe, was of some service beyond the limits of our own congregation. Among our own people, eight or ten persons, during the following week, were found to be anxiously inquiring for the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward; weeping Marys and bold young men, startled from the grave of trespasses and sins. The whole winter proved to be a 'day of the right hand of the Most High.' There was murmuring, indeed, lest the young minister *should carry things too far;* and there was open hostility. Nor were there wanting serious and conscientious apprehensions on the part of some of my honoured brethren in the ministry, lest the work should savour more of fanaticism than sober thought, and ultimately show that it was the result of overheated and practised mechanism, rather than the work of God. But they were good men, and soon saw that their apprehensions were groundless. Amidst the greatest seriousness there was no outbreak, and no disorder of any kind. The sacred influence was silent as the dew of heaven. There was PRAYER. There was solemn and earnest preaching. There was frequent pastoral visitation. There were private circles for religious conversation, and prayer, and praise, and these scarcely known beyond the individuals who composed them. There were no 'new measures,' no 'anxious seats,' and no public announcement of the names or the number of those who were striving to enter into the strait gate. Yet there were unexpected and unthought-of instances of seriousness among the gay and frivolous, in the families of the rich and the poor, among the moral and immoral, and many were the triumphs of victorious grace.

"*The third Thursday of January*, by a private arrangement, was set apart by about thirty members of the church as a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer. It was at a private house

in Church street, just in the rear of St. Paul's; and such a day I never saw before, and have never seen since. Such self-abasement, such confession of sin, such earnestness and importunity in prayer, and such hope in God's almightiness, I have rarely witnessed. And what deserves to be recorded is, that as the devotions of the day were drawing to a close, there was a *strong and confident expectation* that the Holy Spirit was about largely to descend upon the people. And so it was. He was even then descending. That cry: 'Where is thy hand, even thy right hand? Pluck it out of thy bosom,' was heard in heaven, and echoed by our great High Priest. A delightful impulse was given to the work by this day of prayer. The promise was made good, 'Before they call I will answer, and while they are yet speaking I will hear.'

"Our weekly lecture occurred on the evening of the same day; and I may say, it was the most solemn service of my ministry. The subject of the lecture was, 'Marvel not that I said unto you, Ye must be born again.' God was with the hearers and the preacher; his Spirit moved them as 'the trees of the wood are moved with the wind.' There is good reason to believe that *more than one hundred persons* were deeply impressed with their lost condition as sinners, and their need of an interest in Christ, on that evening. It was not then with us as it is now. *Now* few attend our weekly lectures except the professed people of God; *then* the impenitent rushed to the house of prayer. Enemies were silenced; members of other churches came among us, some to spy out our liberty, and some to mark the character of the work for themselves, and all classes were constrained to confess, 'This is the finger of God.' Between one and two hundred attended the private meetings for religious instruction, and great solemnity pervaded the whole people. The work was rapid; awakening and conviction in many instances so short that older Christians began to doubt its genuineness. Yet some of the brightest and most enduring Christians among us were those whose conversion was as sudden as that of Saul of Tarsus. The gathered fruits of this protracted harvest were rich; consisting sometimes of thirty and forty, and at one communion season more than seventy, filling

the broad aisle of the church—a lovely spectacle to God, angels, and men." *Id.* 166—8.

May such gracious and glorious visitations be multiplied in all our churches until all flesh shall see the salvation of God. May the ministers, office-bearers, and private Christians, incessantly labour and pray for these outpourings, even the great rain of God's strength. And may the remembrance of these years of God's right hand quicken the zeal of God's people to promote his work.

Before proceeding to set forth the theological import of this work, we take occasion to say that the chapter of "Affecting Incidents," and the account of the religious experience of his daughter, Mary Norris, are not only graphic and interesting, but they are highly instructive and edifying—as far as they go, quite akin to the celebrated "Pastor's Sketches," of the late Dr. Spencer. There is also much epistolary matter between the author and distinguished correspondents, such as Drs. Miller, Emmons, Stuart, Richards, Humphrey, and his honoured parents, which is valuable and interesting. In regard to Missions, Domestic and Foreign, it is only necessary to say that while he was among the founders or earliest supporters of the American Board of Foreign Missions, and the American Home Missionary Society, and was never otherwise than friendly to them, he nevertheless became an earnest supporter of the Boards of our own church; in these matters, being at once a loyal and a catholic Presbyterian.

The theological interest of these volumes arises from the author's early Hopkinsian training; his consequent difficulties in coming among the old Calvinists of the Presbytery of New York; his uncompromising aversion to the New Haven Theology; and the gradual modification of his views, till the shades of difference between them and Old Calvinism are altogether slight, almost imperceptible. In this connection, we feel bound to signalize one noble trait of character, which is as conspicuous in Dr. Spring, as it is deficient in many, if not in most, good and great men. We refer to the candour with which, while remarkable for independence, firmness, and freedom from fickleness, he has opened his mind to new light in correction of his past opinions, and to his ingenuous acknowledgment of

any errors of opinion or conduct, of which he has thus become convinced. We see much in these volumes to bear out and illustrate the following statement of the venerable author:

"*Truth* has been my object, the truth as God has revealed it in his word. I never, consciously, had any reluctance to abandon a wrong view because I had long cherished it, nor to adopt different views because they countervailed my former opinions. I have often thought that if men of different theological sentiments, but of fair and ingenuous minds, would prosecute their inquiries under the impression that they are equally interested in ascertaining the truth, and that nothing is gained, but much is lost, by their adherence to error, there would be very little religious controversy." Vol. i. p. 106.

We shall see illustrations of this in the author's doctrinal opinions. But there is one instance, of a practical kind, so marked as to deserve particular notice. In the height of the controversy about Taylorism, Dr. Spring, being in New Haven, was invited to preach in the College chapel. He had a discourse on "Native Depravity," antagonistic to Dr. Taylor's views, which Dr. Nettleton had listened to in the Brick church with great approbation. He hesitated about preaching it in the chapel upon "so courteous an invitation." Upon the somewhat wavering advice of Dr. Thomas H. Skinner, he at length concluded to preach it. Of course, it gave great offence, and made no little stir. "And," says Dr. Spring, who might have omitted all reference to the matter whatever, "I much doubt the propriety of so doing, nor do I now judge that I was prompted to do it by the meekness of wisdom." A like magnanimous change of front was shown by him in reference to the proposed new version of the Bible by the Bible Society.

Dr. Spring repeatedly assures us that he "did not adopt the *peculiarities* of Hopkinsianism" in his early ministry. And speaking of the present time he assures us, "I am no enemy to Hopkinsianism, though I have no fellowship with its peculiarities." Vol. ii. p. 15. What he means by this, more fully appears in the following passage:

"We have no sympathy with the two peculiarities of Hopkinsianism. The position that *God is the author of sin*, and the doctrine of *unconditional submission* to the will of God, as ex-

plained by Hopkinsians, and enforced by a willingness to be damned for his glory, as essential to true piety, appear to me to have been inconsiderately adopted. I myself was early educated in this belief, but, with all reverence for my early training, I could not retain it in my creed. Many are the discussions on these subjects I have listened to when under my father's roof, and I shall never forget the impression made upon my mind by listening to the outline of a discourse upon the words, 'The wrath of man shall praise thee; the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain.' The *doctrine* of the discourse was, *There is no more sin in the world than God wants.* Though I was but a boy, the thought struck me painfully. My father disapproved of it, though he smiled; I felt it could not be true. Many a time has the thought occurred to my mind, that if God is the efficient cause of all the sin in the world, then is he the author of much more sin than holiness. I cannot believe it. . . . In regard to a *conditional consent to be damned*, even if the hypothesis it involves be admissible, I have no confidence in it as a practical test of Christian character. The strong attachment to a particular system of theology, and the deceitfulness of the human heart, are too operative to allow any man to trust himself with such a test of character. . . . It is *absurd* because it makes the Christian character an absurdity. . . . To be willing to be damned, is to be willing to sin and suffer eternally. . . . Is it possible for a good man to consent to such a perfect abandonment to all wickedness?" Vol. ii. pp. 10, 11, 12.

The author's theological attitude at the beginning of his ministry, called forth the celebrated polemical work, entitled the *Contrast*, by the Rev. Ezra Stiles Ely, in which the Hopkinsian peculiarities, and some exaggerations and caricatures of them disowned by many of its adherents, and emphatically by Dr. Spring, were set in offensive and disparaging contrast with old Calvinism. Dr. Spring's course was eminently wise, and might well be imitated by many others in like circumstances. "I had no other way of quieting the alarm excited by the 'Contrast,' than by preaching the truth as it is in Jesus, and more plainly and pungently. This I was enabled to do. . . God's Spirit came down, and in a succession of outpourings . . .

enlarged, and beautified, and perpetuated the church, and gave it a name among the more useful and honoured churches of the land." Vol. i. pp. 129—31.

The conflict related mainly to the doctrines of original sin, human ability, and the extent of the atonement. Dr. Romeyn, in behalf of himself and other members of Presbytery who stood in doubt of him, presented to him twelve written questions, which he explicitly answered in writing: and then three supplementary questions arising out of three of his answers to the first series of interrogatories, which he also explicitly answered. This appears to have nearly or quite terminated the difficulties between Dr. Spring and his co-presbyters, growing out of this conflict. "On the subject of atonement, Dr. Romeyn, and the brethren in whose behalf he addressed me, were satisfied, and the controversy ended." The result of the whole was, that Dr. Spring's doctrine and that of his brethren might be summed up in the formula, that Christ's atonement is "sufficient for the whole world, efficient only for the elect," for whose sure salvation it was designed and provided.

In regard to ability, and particularly the distinction between natural and moral ability and inability, the author says: "I have never changed my views on this subject; but I have modified my statements, and, as I think, more in accordance with the word of God. The distinction is valuable; and though I do not now say that the sinner can repent *if he will*, because the assertion implies that an unholy volition produces holiness, yet I still maintain that his duty stands abreast with his intellectual powers, and his faculty of moral discernment. . . Those pulpits which teach that it is impossible for the unrenewed man to repent and believe the gospel, rarely urge this duty upon the impenitent, and never with the earnestness with which it is urged in the word of God. No man is required to perform *impossibilities*, nor is there any impossibility in the case, except that which arises from unmingled wickedness, and which leaves the sinner without excuse. . . . God makes no allowance for a wicked inability. . . In view of their perception, their reason, and their conscience, impenitent men *can*, and in view of their unconquerable depravity, they *cannot*, repent and believe the gospel." *Id.* pp. 136—7.

Although the author has corrected some of his earlier modes of statement on this subject, there is still a tinge of them left in those phrases which, after asserting a real, sinful, inexcusable inability, seem to assert that, in any view, the unregenerate "*can* repent and believe the gospel," by any power of their own. That this inability consists in a sinful moral state, not in the want of natural faculties which would suffice for all rectitude, if their sinful state were removed, is undeniable, and admitted by all. But then it is a real inability. The sinful heart cannot make itself holy. Depravity cannot eradicate itself. The dead soul cannot make itself alive. This Dr. Spring insists on. If then sinners cannot, on account of their depravity, make themselves new creatures, in what way, or by what powers, can they do it? And, if they have no power by which they can do it, although they have all power for all duty, if this sinful and inexcusable inability were removed, why say that, so long as this remains, they have anything that really amounts to the power requisite and adequate to the doing of it? Dr. Spring, in various phrase, states his belief in everything that we hold on this subject. And this seems to us inconsistent with anything that can properly be called ability in the sinner to anything spiritually good, or accompanying salvation.

In regard to "principle and exercise," he prints *inter alia*, a letter from Dr. Emmons, in which that acute reasoner says, "I suppose that perception, reason, conscience, memory, and volition, constitute the essence of the human mind; and I cannot conceive of any *substratum* in which these mental properties exist." In regard to this whole subject Dr. Spring says very frankly and explicitly:

"I have never entered deeply into this question. That fallen man is responsible for his sinful *nature* as well as his sinful *acts*, I have not a doubt. Did I not believe this, I should be driven to the conclusion that God is the author of sin. As the judicial visitation for Adam's first sin, the native tendencies of the race are to evil and not to good. I never was an acute metaphysician, and I am too old to attempt to become so now. Yet I cannot help thinking, though I once thought otherwise, that there is something in man's moral character besides the acts of the will. Are not love, hatred, hope, fear, the spon-

taneous acts of the mind, instead of being produced by any efficient acts of the will? Is not their moral character derived from the character of the mind or heart from which they flow? The tree is known by its fruits. Is it not the heart that gives character to its exercises, rather than its exercises that gives character to the heart? Do effects produce their causes, or do causes produce their effects? 'Keep *thy heart* with all diligence, for *out of it* are the issues of life.' Evil things come from *within*, and good things come from *within*. My own consciousness teaches me that there is something that lies deeper than the acts of my will." *Id.* pp. 158—9.

Dr. Spring says, that with respect to original sin, the difference "between old Calvinists and Hopkinsians is two-fold. Hopkinsians regard this arrangement in respect to the imputation of Adam's sin as simply a procedure of *sovereignty*, while the old Calvinists regard it as a measure of moral *government*. I once thought it was a procedure of mere sovereignty, but on more full examination of the language of the apostle, '*judgment* was by one to *condemnation*,' I became convinced that it was a procedure of moral government, and a judicial decision. *Judgment* and *condemnation* refer to judicial rather than to sovereign acts."

"The other point of difference relates to *mediate* or *immediate* imputation." Vol. ii. pp. 7, 8. Dr. Spring then goes on to argue at some length in favour of mediate imputation. We have no space to follow or examine his reasonings. The contrary view is so clearly asserted above, when he says, "as the judicial visitation for Adam's sin, the native tendencies of our race are to evil and not to good," that nothing more requires to be said on the subject.

The author, while discarding the offensive peculiarities of Hopkinsianism, quite naturally seeks to present the whole system, (not for the errors, but for the great amount of scriptural and Calvinistic truth it contains), and especially its advocates, in a favourable light. Doubtless, estimates of it must vary according to the light in which it was viewed; first, according as it is viewed with reference to the errors, or the truths it contained; secondly, according to the degree in which its peculiarities were developed and pushed to extremes in the persons

of its various adherents, embracing, as they did, men who, like Dr. Woods and Dr. Spring, never diverged widely from that old Calvinism which they more and more closely approximated through life, down to the school of Emmons, teaching that the soul is only a chain of exercises, and those exercises, alike the sinful and the holy, the immediate work of God. Says Dr. Spring, "the late Dr. Miller, of Princeton, once remarked to me, 'I should hesitate to lay hands on Dr. Emmons; but, though I do not approve of all Dr. Hopkins has written, I would ordain any man, otherwise qualified, who could honestly say, that he believed every word of Dr. Hopkins's system.'" *Id.* p. 6.

Dr. Spring was, as is well understood, opposed to the Dissolution of the Four Synods, and some other antecedent measures, which issued in the disruption of the Presbyterian Church. He belonged to the class who believed that the heresies and disorders which led to them, might have been surmounted with less violent remedies, while, as we have already seen, he, especially thirty years ago, adhered less closely than some to every one of the *ipsissima verba* of the Confession of Faith. His attitude on these subjects is sufficiently apparent in the following language:

"I love the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian church, and always loved it. I have not altered in my preaching; my publications speak for themselves. I do not concur in all the peculiarities of old Calvinism, nor did I ever; nor do I with any of the New Haven Theology. If I must choose between old Calvinism and the New Haven Theology, give me old Calvinism. Old-fashioned Calvinists and old-fashioned Hopkinsians are not far apart: the more closely they are united in opposing modern errors, the better. These sentiments were uttered more than thirty years ago." Vol. i. p. 271.

Dr. Spring makes some noteworthy memoranda regarding the founding of Andover Seminary, in which his father had a leading part. Some letters from Dr. Woods to his father, here first published, put it beyond doubt, that Dr. Woods was a moderate Hopkinsian, and under pledges to the Hopkinsians when appointed to the Chair of Theology at Andover. He was to teach Hopkinsianism, but so prudently as not to alarm or

rouse into opposition the old Calvinists. He, however, himself gradually, as he advanced in life, "sustained a change in favour of the Calvinism of the Westminster Assembly," as abundantly appears from his writings. It still further appears, that, according to the constitution of that Seminary, its professors as well as its students may be either Presbyterians or Congregationalists; while some of the more rigid Independents were at one time disposed to force their own ecclesiastical polity exclusively upon the institution.

Dr. Spring has two chapters on the Southern rebellion, and its suppression. His indignant and eloquent denunciations of this mad and wicked insurrection are well known. It is unnecessary to repeat them, or to repeat the discussion concerning the propriety of making a declaration to that effect by the Assembly of 1861. But we wish to record on our pages his sentiments on two subjects growing out of the rebellion, which are now of deepest concern to us—sentiments which seem to us to be alike the dictates of Christian wisdom and love. The first respects the spirit to be cherished towards the conquered.

"But our nationality is saved, and we can afford to be magnanimous. While I hope that the leaders of the rebellion will be for ever disfranchised, I still hope that, in the exercise of a sound discretion, the Government will see fit to extend to them all the lenity which is consistent with the welfare of the nation. Times have altered; the South has altered; the spirit of the North has altered; there has been suffering enough; no man calls for blood now. Our 'erring sisters' have seen their error, and all we ask of them is to return to their first love. One thing is obvious, and that is, if we remain a prosperous, peaceful, and happy people, *we must treat our Southern friends with kindness*. The demon of secession cast out and purged of slavery, we ask of them nothing but loyalty and confidence." Vol. ii. p. 214.

He gives the following judgment as to the political status and franchises of the freedmen:

"There is one thought on the subject of slavery, which I may not omit. Utterly rejecting the doctrine of human servitude, or the right of property and ownership in man, I would not be in haste to elevate the coloured race to a position for

which they are not fitted. I would not, from an enthusiastic attachment to 'liberty and equality,' violently thrust them into offices of trust and responsibility, or give them the elective franchise, until they are prepared for it. Their own welfare, and the safety of our own institutions, would, in my judgment, be imperilled by such a policy. I would make them *free*, but I would treat them as servants, and just as I would treat the white races from abroad, and in our own land, who seek and are fitted for no higher position. Let them go when and where they will, and enjoy all the protection of law; let them serve whom they will, and in the capacity which they themselves may select, and receive recompense for their labours; but let them not aspire to a seat on the bench, nor to the pulpit, *until their intellectual culture and moral qualifications shall have fitted them for these responsible positions.* 'Wisdom is justified of her children:' the results will show that this is the true policy towards the coloured race. When *Christian* men and women are found among them, I would treat them with Christian love, which is 'without partiality and without hypocrisy.' I would treat them as 'Paul the aged' would have Philemon treat Onesimus, not as 'a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved.' I would not assign to them the lowest place at the communion table, nor the highest, but a place where they are acknowledged as brethren and sisters in Christ." Vol. ii. pp. 202, 203.

We here take leave of the patriarchal counsels, records, and testimonies which the venerable author has embalmed in these volumes. Our remarks have necessarily been as discursive as the topics brought under review in such an autobiography. We sincerely rejoice that the author has been spared to prepare this memorial of himself, and these contributions to the ecclesiastical history of his times.

SHORT NOTICES.

Essays on the Supernatural in Christianity, with Special Reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tubingen School. By Rev. George P. Fisher, M. A., Professor of Church History in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

The current objections to supernaturalism, *i. e.*, to Christianity itself, as they have been voiced by Strauss, Baur, Renan, and Theodore Parker, are very ably handled in this volume. The author constantly betrays the scholarship, culture, metaphysical and theological insight, together with the judicial mind, which the proper execution of the task he has undertaken requires. We are glad to observe that he finds the true secret of incorrigible Rationalism and Scepticism in an inadequate sense of sin, and consequent inadequate appreciation of supernatural deliverance from it, of which disease Divine illumination is the only adequate cure. He also has penetrated and grasped the true nature, not only of Pantheism and Positivism in general, but of the collateral and subordinate issues implicated with them and supernaturalism. The book is a decidedly valuable contribution to what is now a most important side of Christian apologetics.

History of Rationalism; embracing a Survey of the Present State of Protestant Theology. By the Rev. John F. Hurst, A. M. With Appendix of Literature. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

This work deals with Rationalism historically. After quoting various definitions of it from different writers, the author proceeds to test it by its fruits, as shown in its history, in which he comes down to the more prominent rationalistic sects of our own time, not excluding those of our own country. He thus proves that, while Rationalism has indirectly led to a revision of the doctrines and defences of Christianity that has freed them from erroneous and enfeebling modes of presentation, its direct fruits have been anti-religious, corrupting, and demoralizing. This book is likewise a valuable addition to the Christian armory.

History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe. By the Rev. W. E. H. Leckey, M. A. In two volumes. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

We have here another able and elaborate treatise on Rationalism. But its tone and scope are quite opposite to the two published by the Messrs. Scribner, which we have just noticed. The author is in full sympathy with rationalizing tendencies, and a decided enemy of Christian orthodoxy. His sceptical views have a strong tinge of Positivism, and are utterly one-sided and destructive. We are more brief in our notices of these important works, as we hope in our next number to treat at length of the great subject they discuss.

History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By James Anthony Froude, M. A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Volumes III. and IV. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1865.

The character of the first two volumes of this work, which we noticed when they appeared, is maintained in these. This history is copious and minute, and sheds a light on the interior history of the Reformation and Reformation-period in England, which is not easily accessible elsewhere.

The Structure of Animal Life; Six Lectures delivered at the Brooklyn Academy of Music in January and February, 1862. By Louis Agassiz, Professor of Zoölogy and Geology in the Lawrence Scientific School. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

Whatever comes from Agassiz, in his own department, will of course command great attention and respect. This work is no exception. Besides the zoölogical and scientific knowledge, which it so vividly and lucidly imparts, the truths of science are presented in their relations to Theism. Professor Agassiz finds in the several animal species evidence of the forth-putting of a distinct Intelligent and Almighty Creative Power. We count the distinguished author a much safer guide here, than in regard to the unity of our race. The volume is a beautiful specimen of typography and pictorial illustration.

Elements of Political Economy. By Arthur Latham Perry, Professor of History and Political Economy in Williams College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866.

Professor Perry is a vigorous thinker, a clear and forcible writer. Political economy in his hands is freshly, yet thoroughly and judiciously treated, and in a form not ill-suited to the class-room. Many subjects of present interest in the legislation of our country are discussed by him in a manner which leads us to wish that our legislators would master his book. We do not, however, intend by this to endorse all his opinions.

Children in Heaven, or the Infant Dead Redeemed by the Blood of Jesus, with Words of Consolation to Bereaved Parents. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This beatifully printed and bound volume, prepared by the respected Secretary of the Board of Publication, is a copious treasury of gems, didactic, argumentative, persuasive, poetic, in regard to the salvation of the infant dead. They are from a large number of authors, and afford, as no other volume does, access to the most precious parts of the literature of the subject. Bereaved parents will find it a rich source of consolation.

Spiritualism Identical with Ancient Sorcery, New Testament Demonology, and Modern Witchcraft; with the Testimony of God and Man against it. By W. McDonald. New York: Carlton & Porter.

This book grew out of a Dissertation read before two associations of Methodist ministers in New England, who requested its publication. Before it got through the press, it expanded to quite a volume, which the title-page correctly describes. The book is timely and important. The description, or rather the authenticated facts, which it gives, showing the disastrous effects of this delusion, have a melancholy interest and value. We are inclined to concur with the author's main doctrines, viz., that the only spirits concerned in spiritualism are fallen angels; that it is identical with ancient sorcery and demonology; and that whatever phenomena may be accounted for by jugglery or sleight-of-hand, no theory of modern spiritualism is adequate which separates it wholly from diabolism.

The Shepherd and his Flock: or the Keeper of Israel, and the Sheep of his Pasture. By J. R. McDuff, D.D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1866.

Bible Blessings. By the Rev. Richard Newton, D.D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1866.

These are evangelical and interesting books, by authors well known, and of that wholesome kind to which the publications of the Carters usually belong.

The Laws of Thought, Objective and Subjective. By Alexander Robertson. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts & Green. 1864.

It might be conjectured from this title, that it is designed to indicate a treatise on Logic. We find, however, that it relates to Ethics, and attempts to give the Laws of Thought relative to this great science, or a kind of Organon for its due investigation. It is a brief treatise, and discarding Utilitarianism and other schemes, comes to build on the Scriptures as the true standard of moral duty and authority in ethical principles.

Vital Godliness: a Treatise on Experimental and Practical Piety. By William S. Plumer, D.D., LL.D. Published by the American Tract Society.

There is no subject on which Dr. Plumer writes better than on experimental religion. Few men can write more to the purpose on this subject than he. In this volume he goes through all the stages of vital godliness, from the first awakening that precedes conversion, till he portrays successively the several Christian graces. The impenitent, the awakened, the new convert, the doubting Christian, the afflicted, the backslider, the tempted, the strong and assured believer, may all gather light and strength from this treatise.

While They are with Us.

Wee Davie. By Norman McLeod, D.D.

The Titles, Attributes, Work, and Claims of the Holy Spirit, according to the Scripture.

Individualized Religion, as Related to the Power and Prosperity of the Church. By William Adams, D.D.

The Power of Truth. By Rev. John Gray.

How George Neumark sung his Hymn for the Church of Christ. From Guthrie's Sunday Magazine.

The above are recent publications of the American Tract Society. They are excellent of their kind. The last is one of the most precious tracts we have ever read. Dr. Adams's discourse especially, is of great value, and should be widely circulated.

Fonthill Recreations. The Mediterranean Islands: Sketches and Stories of their Scenery, Customs, History, Painters, &c. By M. G. Sleeper, author of "Pictures from the History of the Swiss," &c. With Illustrations. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1866.

No better description of this book can be given than that furnished by this title-page. We will only add, that in drawing these sketches the author appears to hold a facile and graphic pen, and to present vivid and readable portraitures.

The Works of Philip Lindsley, D.D., formerly Vice-President and President Elect of the College of New Jersey, Princeton; and late President of the University of Nashville, Tennessee. Edited by Le Roy J. Halsey, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary of the North-west. With Introductory Notices of his Life and Labours, by the Editor. Vol. I. Educational Discourses, pp. 648. Vol. II. Sermons and Religious Discourses, pp. 720. Vol. III. Miscellaneous Discourses and Essays, pp. 731. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866.

The writer of this notice was three years under the instruction of Dr. Lindsley in the College of New Jersey, and twenty years his fellow-townsman. He is one of the numerous body

of those still living, who cherish his memory with affectionate regard, not only because of his talents, learning, and devotion to the cause of education, but because of the personal benefits and manifestations of kindness received at his hands. Dr. Lindsley's bearing and manners were imposing, yet being connected with a free and sociable disposition, they secured the respect, without exciting the fear of his pupils. He always magnified his office. To be an educator, and especially an educator in the department of the Classics, was his pride and delight. He successfully endeavoured to impress upon his students a measure of his own sense of the importance of the work in which he was engaged. His zeal led to untiring efforts, not only in acquiring learning, and in teaching, but in his attempts to arouse and enlighten the public mind as to the importance of large and liberal plans of culture. It was to this end he principally devoted his energies; and these large and elegant volumes contain abundant evidence of the ability and varied learning, as well as zeal, which he brought to bear upon his object. Few men of the passing generation have been so useful in the cause of liberal education, and a lasting debt of gratitude is due for his distinguished services. Dr. Lindsley's friends and the public are under great obligations to the Rev. Dr. Halsey for the manner in which he has discharged his duties as editor. He has erected an elegant and lasting monument to the memory of his friend.

Primeval Symbols; or, The Analogy of Creation and New-Creation. By William Fetherston H. Barrister-at-Law, formerly Scholar, Gold Medalist, Mathematical and Ethical Moderator, and Hebrew Prizeman, of Trinity College, Dublin. Dublin: Hodges, Smith & Co., 104 Grafton street.

The design of this work, as the title imports, is to trace the analogy between the six-days of creation and the new-creation effected by the Spirit of God. The natural state of man, since the fall, is dark and chaotic; from without, and not from within, by the immediate power of God, light begins to dawn, and with light struggle and conflict; on the second day, from within, but still by Divine power, the atmosphere is developed, which gradually lifts the dense dark clouds from the surface of the waters, and prepares the earth to bring forth its fruits. This idea is carried out ingeniously, with much spirituality, and with the aid of a cultivated and well-informed mind. The writer shows himself to be a devout Christian, a decided Augustinian or Calvinist, and yet on points not immediately connected with practical religion, he departs not only from the Augustinian scheme, but from the common faith of the church.

For example, while holding to the strict idea of a creation *ex nihilo*, he assumes that there has always been a universe. Our globe, and system, are comparatively recent affairs, but from eternity God has had a universe for the exercise and revelation of his power. This anti-scriptural doctrine is assumed simply because he cannot otherwise answer the question, What was God doing from eternity before he created the world? He is well aware that this difficulty is purely subjective, that the question has no meaning in its relation to a Being with whom there is no before and no after. This satisfies him when he speaks of God's foreordination, but not when he treats of creation. Another example of his departure from the common faith, is his maintaining that those who do not hear the gospel in this life will receive its offers after death. This he endeavours to prove from Scripture, but advances nothing which has not often before been presented, and which by the church, as a whole, has been pronounced unsatisfactory. With these drawbacks, the book is one to be read with profit and delight.

The Centenary of American Methodism: a Sketch of its History, Theology, Practical System, and Success. Prepared by order of the Centenary Committee of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By Abel Stevens, LL.D. With a Statement of the Plan of the Centenary Celebration of 1866, by John McClintock, D.D. New York: Carlton & Porter, 200 Mulberry street. 1866. Pp. 287.

The American Methodists propose to celebrate, in the year 1866, the completion of the first great cycle of their history, its centenary jubilee. In answer to the question, What entitles Methodism to this solemn, this national commemoration? Dr. Stevens, the able and accomplished historian of this branch of the church, has prepared this volume to show, What Methodism is; What it has achieved that commends it to such general and grateful recognition; and, What are its capabilities for the future, and the consequent responsibilities of its people. This task he has well accomplished. The volume before us is a compact, authentic, and therefore, most convenient, compend of the history, the theology, the practical system, and working of this remarkable organization. Methodists have undoubtedly a wonderful record. The census of their church for 1864 reports nine hundred and eight thousand eight hundred and nine members and probationers; five thousand seven hundred and forty-three preachers; nearly ten thousand churches; church property to the value of between twenty-six and twenty-seven millions of dollars; and eight hundred and fifty-three thousand four hundred and seventy-one Sunday-school scholars. They

report also twenty-three colleges, two biblical institutes, and seventy-seven seminaries, female colleges, and academies.

A Highland Parish. By Rev. Norman Macleod, D.D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1866. Pp. 318.

"The sketches and stories that compose this volume are selected from Dr. Macleod's 'Reminiscences of a Highland Parish.' Those who feel an interest in a remarkable people who are rapidly passing away, will read these truthful sketches and simple tales with great delight, while such as have witnessed scenes akin to those described, will acknowledge that the pictures are drawn by a master-hand." From what we have read of this volume, we judge the above to be a fair estimate of its character. The Highlanders are indeed a remarkable people. "The one island of Skye," says the author, "has sent forth from her wild shores since the beginning of the last wars of the French Revolution, twenty-one lieutenant and major-generals, forty-eight lieutenant-colonels, six hundred commissioned officers, ten thousand soldiers, four governors of colonies, one governor-general, one adjutant-general, one chief baron of England, and one judge of the Supreme Court of Scotland. I remember," he adds, "the names of sixty-one officers being enumerated, who during the war had joined the army and navy, from farms which were visible from one hill-top in the parish."

Sermons and Expositions. By the late John Robertson, D.D., Glasgow Cathedral. With a Memoir of the Author, by the Rev. J. G. Young, Monifieth. Alexander Strahan, Publisher, London and New York. 1865. Pp. 306.

Dr. Robertson was born in 1824 and died in 1865, before the completion of his forty-first year. He was educated at St. Andrews, and studied for the ministry in St. Mary's Hall. He was so distinguished for his attainments and abilities during the whole course of his academic training, that the highest expectations were entertained of his success in the ministry. These expectations were not disappointed. He was settled first over a rural parish, and afterwards in the Cathedral church, Glasgow. In both places he secured the respect and confidence of the people in a high degree. He seems to have been a zealous pastor, fertile in devising schemes for the moral and religious improvement of the sixteen thousand souls committed to his charge in Glasgow. His labours were too great for his impaired health, and he sank in the prime of life. His sermons are simple, clear, and direct. They are entirely free from all attempts at display, and were evidently written to

make an impression of the truth on the minds of his hearers. The doctrine of the Divinity of Christ; of his expiatory sacrifice; of the corruption of our nature; of the absolute neeessity of a supernatural influence of the Spirit, to regenerate the soul and to enable it to turn unto God, are elearly presented. Christ is made the only way of access to God, and his Spirit the only source of life, but he held that the benefits of his death and the saving power of his Spirit might be, and in many cases were, experienced by the heathen, who had never heard his name.

The Hebrew Lawgiver. By John M. Lowrie, D.D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian church, Fort Wayne, Indiana. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street. Vol. I. pp. 288; Vol. II. pp. 353.

This work is not designed as an exposition of the Mosaic institutions, nor as a vindieation of the authenticity and inspiration of the Pentateueh, although these important topics are not overlooked. It relates to the personal history of Moses; and eonsists of a series of diseourses, or chapters, on the great events of his life. The book is written in a clear and familiar style, and not only tends to elueidate a most important period of the history of the ehureh, but to bring out the great lessons taught by the events of whieh it treats. We doubt not it will prove an acceptable and useful eontribution to the religious literature of our church.

The Life of the Rev. Robert Baird, D.D. By his son, Henry M. Baird, Professor in the University of the City of New York. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, No. 770 Broadway. 1866. Pp. 347.

Few men of the passing generation have been more prominently before the public than the late Dr. Baird; and few have been more eminently useful. From the time he was lieensed to preaeh the gospel, he devoted himself with intelligent zeal to promote the cause of Christian education, of temperance, and of the evangelization of the people ineluded in the decayed churehes of the old world. In the prosecution of this work he travelled all over the United States and Europe; almost living, for years, on the road or on the sea. His courteous manners, the conspieuous purity of his motives, and his persevering zeal, gained him access to the highest classes of society in Europe, and enabled him to accomplish results whieh few men would have ventured to attempt. His son has done a good work in putting on record the simple facts of the useful life of his revered parent.

The Tabernacle; or, The Gospel according to Moses. By George Junkin, D.D., LL.D., late President of Washington College, Virginia. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 166.

This volume exhibits in a clear light the well-known characteristics of its venerable author. It has his vivacity, his point, his fertility of imagination, his unwavering confidence in the truth of what he teaches, and the wonderful power which his imagination and feelings have over his convictions. "This tiny book," he says, "is a compend of Christian theology. I say *Christian* theology; for I have, long ago, been forced into the conviction that without a diligent study of the tabernacle, no man ever acquires clear, transparent, and practical views of evangelical truth in systematic order."

Man and the Gospel. By Thomas Guthrie, D.D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1866. Pp. 455.

Dr. Guthrie's name is a passport. Any book from his pen is sure to command readers. This volume, the title of which is too general to reveal definitely its nature, is a series of discourses on the bearing of the gospel on man in the varied circumstances of his life; in trial, in temptation, in childhood; in his relations to the poor, to society generally, to Christ and futurity. It will sustain the reputation which its author has already so richly earned.

The Word. Walks from Eden. By the author of the "Wide Wide World." New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1866. Pp. 426.

This is another book whose title needs explanation. By the "Word" is meant Christ; and by "Walks from Eden" are intended a chronological survey, from the beginning onward, of striking facts and incidents in the early history of our race. The design of the author is to gather from the discoveries of travellers and science, whatever may tend to illustrate the sacred narrative, and especially to show how everything converges towards Christ, the centre of the whole system of Providence. The present volume continues the review to the time of Abraham and his sons. A second on the Old Testament, and the first volume of the life of Christ are in preparation.

The Resurrection of Christ historically and logically reviewed. By Richard W. Dickinson, D. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 142.

The design of this work is to embody the facts and testimony in relation to the resurrection of our Lord; vindicate the credibility of the witnesses; rebut the positions, and expose

the sophistries of infidelity. As the resurrection of Christ is the central fact of our religion, that on which the validity of the whole gospel depends, the exhibition of the evidence on which the truth of that fact rests, and a refutation of the objections of infidels, must be a service acceptable to all Christian people. It is a service which needs to be often rendered; not only because new objections are from time to time presented, but also because the books of a former generation are often inaccessible to the mass of readers of succeeding times. We think, therefore, that Dr. Dickinson has put his time and talents to a valuable use in preparing this comprehensive discussion of the subject.

Massachusetts Ecclesiastical Law. By Edward Burk, of the Suffolk Bar. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard & Co. 1866. Pp. 310.

The relation of the church to the state in New England, and specially in Massachusetts, and the consequences of that relation, form an interesting chapter in American history. Upon this subject this volume throws a clear light, and will on that account be welcomed by a large class of readers.

Jehovah-Jireh: a Treatise on Divine Providence. By William S. Plumer, D. D., LL.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866. Pp. 233.

This is a practical and devotional, rather than a theological work. It presents one of the most important of the doctrines of natural and revealed religion in a manner adapted to edify and comfort the people of God.

The Daily Public School in the United States. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866. Pp. 158.

The writer of this pamphlet has devoted forty years of his life to the intelligent prosecution of the cause of education. No man in the country is better entitled to be heard on that subject. His views are the result of long experience and of extended observation. With some of them we may not agree, as we cannot but recognize it as the duty of the state not only to educate the young, but to provide the means for rendering that education effectual. The establishment of normal schools, therefore, for training teachers, we regard as a legitimate object of state patronage. The amount of information and of wise suggestions contained in this volume, should commend it to the serious attention of the friends of education.

The Jewish Church in its Relations to the Jewish Nation and to the Gentiles; or the People of the Congregation in their relations to the People of the Land and to the Peoples of the Lands. By Rev. Samuel C. Kerr, M. A. Cincinnati. 1866. 16mo. Pp. 237.

This is certainly a very extraordinary book. Its author claims to have discovered that the Israelitish church and nation were not coextensive, as has always been supposed hitherto; but the church was simply the body of regenerate persons comprising the truly pious of the nation. The reasons urged in support of this novel theory, which is at variance with uniform scriptural representation, with tradition, and with the universal belief of both Jews and Christians, are, so far as we can gather them from the confused and repetitious manner in which they are stated, the five following:

1. The word קָהָל *congregation*, is in the Septuagint rendered ἐκκλησία *church*, p. 26; whence it is inferred that this term is more limited in its application than the people or nation of Israel. This proceeds, of course, on the tacit assumption of a false definition of the visible church; that it is not composed of those who profess the true religion with their children, but is "a separate body of true saints." (P. 156, comp. p. viii.) This modern idea of a small fragment of Christendom is transferred to the Old Testament, just as the American notion of the elective franchise and the appointment of civil officers by the people on p. 116. The author supposes himself to be erecting new and impregnable intrenchments in defence of pedobaptism, not perceiving that he has abandoned its citadel. Of course this imaginary distinction between the congregation and the people cannot be carried out. As a specimen of the absurdities to which it leads, we read, p. 121, "the expression *all the congregation* is not the equivalent of the expression *all the congregation of Israel.*"

2. The construction of the temple, p. 29. There was the court of the Gentiles, the court of the Jews, and the holy place, answering severally to foreign nations who had access to the first, to the Jewish nation who had access to the second, and (singularly enough) to the Jewish church or congregation who were *not* admitted to the third. One would think that the argument, so far as it had any force, lay in the opposite direction. Since no place was at the temple allotted to the church as distinguished from the nation, no such distinction existed, or was recognized there.

3. The proselyte system. And here we are treated to a rare collection of novelties, archæological, exegetical, and philological. No foreigner born outside of the jurisdiction of the

covenant people, it is alleged, p. 25, *et passim*, could under any circumstances be admitted to the Jewish church. And this in the face of the circumcision of Shechem and all the men of his city, (Gen. xxxiv. 24,) of the statement (Esth. viii. 17) that "many people of the land (of Persia) became Jews," of the mention (Neh. x. 28) of such as "had separated themselves from the people of the lands unto the law of God," immediately after the captivity; of the declaration (Matt. xxiii. 15) that the Pharisees "compassed sea and land" in their zeal to make proselytes, and of the well-known historical facts, to mention no others, of the enforced circumcision of the entire nations of the Idumeans and the Itureans, who had never set foot upon the soil of Palestine.

The sons of resident foreigners born in the holy land might, however, upon giving to the masters in Israel satisfactory evidence of regeneration, become members of the church. Pp. 36, 171. The proof of this lies in the talismanic words כִּי יָגוּר אִתְּךָ גֵּר Exod. xii. 48, which our poor unfortunate translators are soundly berated for having rendered according to their obvious and undoubted sense, "When a stranger shall sojourn with thee." Our author oracularly declares the meaning to be, "When a land-born shall be born again with thee," and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, etc. It is alleged that גֵּר must mean *one born in the land*, for no others could partake of the passover (according to the new doctrine). And this conclusion is held fast though Abraham will then declare, Gen. xxiii. 4, that he was born in Canaan, and Moses, Exod. ii. 22, that he was born in Midian, and Lev. xx. 2, will teach that the children of Israel and "land-borns born again," were alone punishable for giving their seed to Molech; foreign residents and their unregenerate descendants, it may be inferred, might do so with impunity. The signification *to be born again*, is attributed to יָגוּר because "in one instance, Num. xv. 14, it is rendered in the Septuagint *προσγένηται*—*πρός over and above*, and *γένηται to be born*." P. 34. "Donnegan or Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon," is referred to in proof, either of which would inform him that *προσγένηται* means no such thing. But whatever it may signify, יָגוּר means *to sojourn* or *dwell*, and can mean nothing else in such a connection. It might be vain to refer to commentaries and Hebrew lexicons, which are so contemptuously spoken of, p. 18, but the Bible and concordance will compel to the same conclusion.

It might seem to be difficult to reconcile with these new views of proselytism the directions, Gen. xvii. 12, Exod. xii. 44, to circumcise servants "bought with money of any stranger which is

not of thy seed," and to admit them to the passover. But nothing is easier; and these passages taken in connection with Lev. xxv. 44, afford an opportunity to do away with the impression hitherto well-nigh universal, that involuntary servitude existed among the patriarchs and in Israel. These servants could in no case be foreign born, p. 103, for none such were ever allowed to eat the passover (according to the new doctrine); for strangers we must therefore substitute their descendants. Moreover, they were not servants at all; for עֶבֶד is translated παῖς in the Septuagint, and παῖς sometimes means *son*, hence these were adopted sons. P. 185. They were children of unbelieving foreigners, who upon their conversion left their parents and sought admission to pious Israelitish families, where they were adopted. P. 166. And as to their being "bought with money," this simply means that they were "endowed" by some present made to them on their reception, or that some pecuniary recompense was made to their parents by the adopting father, just as a dowry was customarily given to the parents of a bride. P. 191. To what lengths will not men go, when they have a theory to sustain!

4. The word אֶזְרָח, or as it is spelled in this volume *azurah*, which might be thought a mere slip like "Melchisedeck" and "Elisha the Tishbite," p. 146, but for the uniformity with which it occurs. This term, which means simply a native Israelite, is, in defiance of etymology, usage, and authority (including even his favourite Septuagint), translated "a Hebrew of the Hebrews," and this is arbitrarily assumed to mean one who belongs not only to the Hebrew nation, but to the Hebrew church. P. 108. The proof offered is the occurrence of the phrase, "native born among the children of Israel," in contrast with those of foreign descent. "If the Hebrew word *azurah*, which I render 'Hebrew of the Hebrews,' means home-born, as generally rendered, I ask who 'in Israel,' 'among the children of Israel,' 'among you,' were not home-born?" P. 107. It must, therefore, he argues, denote a class, and what class can it be but the members of the church as distinguished from the nation? "The *azurah* was a class among the children of Israel; or, in other words, there were two classes of the Jewish nation, so far as that nation was made up of the stock of Israel, viz., the *azurah* who was 'of the people of the congregation,' who was clean and ate the passover; and 'the Hebrew man thy brother,' who was only of the Hebrew nation, who was unclean and did not eat the passover, was only of 'the people of the land.' P. 108. It were idle to spend words in refutation of such an argument. We simply ask what is to be done with those numerous passages, in which גֵּר and אֶזְרָח are combined

to denote all who reside in the country, whether of foreign or native extraction, *e. g.*, Lev. xxiv. 16? or was blasphemy tolerated in those who were not members of the church?

5. The ecclesiastical penalties of temporary or permanent separation from the church. P. 127. The confusion of ideas, which the book betrays upon this subject, presents abundant matter for comment, in which we might indulge, if this notice were not already too long. To be unclean until even, or for a longer period, was not an ecclesiastical penalty. Ceremonial uncleanness is in the law carefully distinguished from sin. No one of its causes or occasions involved any act of sin. It might even arise from doing what duty required or the law itself prescribed, as the burial of the dead or the ceremonies connected with the red heifer or the day of atonement. It stands in no imaginable relation, therefore, to the suspension of an offender from church privileges. To be "cut off from among (מִקֶּרֶב) his people," is in defiance of lexicons and commentaries improved into "cut off from the drawing nigh of his people," p. 129, and this "is at least to be held as a heathen man," p. 130, the secret of which rendering is revealed on p. 15. He imagines that נִכְרַת in the phrase in question, is from the verb נָכַר, confounding Nun of the Niphal species with a radical letter, and to this he assigns the meaning "made a נָכְרִי, a foreigner"!

A Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes. By the Rev. Loyal Young, D. D. Presbyterian Board of Publication. 8vo. Pp. 276.

The perplexity which besets the study of Ecclesiastes, lies not so much in the obscurity or intrinsic difficulty of single passages as in its general plan and texture. The work of harmonizing all its parts and utterances into one consistent and connected whole, is attended with many and serious embarrassments. Hence the opinions entertained respecting its structure and design have varied more widely perhaps than in the case of any other book in the Bible. In the judgment of Dr. Young it is "a treatise on the question, what profit is there in this life, if there is no other? and this question is preparatory to the great doctrine of a future life, and a future judgment." He accordingly finds in it "an argument for a God, for immortality, for a future reward." The exposition, though warped in some instances, by the assumption of this governing idea, is in the main sound and judicious. The practical reflections, to which considerable space is devoted, are good and appropriate. We trust that this volume will have the effect of directing increased attention to a portion of Scripture which is too often neglected or undervalued.

The Life of John Brainerd, the brother of David Brainerd, and his successor as Missionary to the Indians of New Jersey. Par nobile fratrum. By Rev. Thomas Brainerd, D. D. Philadelphia.

A valuable addition to the stores of religious biography. Although the author gives various reasons why he should be comfortably independent of public opinion, approval should not be withheld from the work for its own sake. It is full of interesting information touching early missionary effort on behalf of the Indians; and of Christian life and culture in this country one hundred and twenty or thirty years ago. Although in a few instances indulging in phraseology perhaps a little overstrained, it is well written and entertaining. The description of boyhood in a New England family, in the youthful days of the missionary Brainerds, reminds one of some of the pictures in Whittier's Snow Bound. David Brainerd, already well known to fame, is the principal figure in the first hundred pages. The remainder of the volume is chiefly occupied with matter entirely new to the public, from the manuscript journal and letters of his brother and successor in the missionary field.

John Brainerd, although not marked by the force of intellect, or the heroic enterprise of David, was a self-sacrificing and successful missionary, of high Christian attainments, whose labours associated him intimately with the best and greatest in the churches of his connection. The author, in editing the remnant of Mr. Brainerd's journal, with the letters which have been preserved, wisely gives them as they stand. They are worth more for history than anything which now, at the end of three generations, could be written to illustrate the labours of the missionary, his own character, or that of the times.

We hope the book will be estimated by the reading public as it deserves, as a valuable contribution to the history of the church in our land. But, whether it meets with immediate encouragement or not, its importance will remain unchanged. For its subject matter is information, otherwise unpublished, of a kind which the Christian world, once in possession of, will not willingly suffer to perish.

The Old Flag. American Sunday school Union.

An interesting story, well written, and illustrating the power of religion and patriotism as related to the recent civil war.

Isa Greame's World. American Sunday-school Union.

This volume is beautiful in its mechanical execution, and equally beautiful as a narrative, founded mainly on fact, which, in fascinating style, shows the benign influence of true piety on individual and social life.