
No. 1748.

THE

BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW

FOR THE YEAR

1867.

EDITED BY

CHARLES HODGE, D. D.

VOL. XXXIX.

PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED BY

PETER WALKER, 821 CHESTNUT STREET:

AND SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED BY

R. CARTER & BROTHERS, New York; Rev. A. KENNEDY, London, C. W.;

Rev. WILLIAM ELDER, St. John, New Brunswick;

Rev. ROBERT MURRAY, Halifax, N. S.;

and TRÜBNER & CO., London.

Printed by Alfred Martien.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXIX.

No. I.

No. II.

No. III.

No. IV.

THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1867.

No. I.

ART. I.—*The Early Scottish Church; The Ecclesiastical History of Scotland from the First to the Twelfth century.* By the Rev. THOMAS MCLAUCHLAN, M. A., F. S. A. S. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1865.

Iona. By the Rev. W. LINDSAY ALEXANDER, D. D., F. S. S. A. Edinburgh.

LATE researches throw increased light upon the distinction between Celtic and Latin Christianity. They were separated by a boundary of facts, more enduring than the stone wall completed by Severus between the Solway and the Tyne, and warding off from Scotland both prelacy and papacy for more than a thousand years. There is reason to think that before the close of the second Christian century there were "Scots believing in Christ," and that for the gospel they were not indebted to missionaries from Rome. These Scots dwelt in Ireland as well as in Scotland, and there are historic intimations that they received their first Christian teachers from lands where the Greek language prevailed. It was perhaps three hundred years after Christianity dawned upon Scotland, when Ninian was commissioned by Rome as the *primus Episcopus*, "the first bishop to the Picts," and Palladius as "the first

bishop to the Scots," these Scots being partly in Ireland. Whatever was meant by the title, "the first bishop," it goes far to verify the statement of the chronicler Fordun, a Romish monk of the fourteenth century, who says of Palladius, "Before whose coming the Scots had as teachers of the faith and administrators of the sacraments presbyters only and monks, following the order of the primitive church." It might be shown that these presbyters held rank with the bishops of the primitive church, and received not their ordination from the Roman primate. They did not need over them a bishop of an unscriptural rank, and scarcely deplored the failure of Palladius to establish a see in Scotland. They were doubtless missionaries and pastors apostolic, so far as they followed the order of the apostles.

But what of the "monks?" Of what order? A monk in Fordun's time was a vastly different man from a monk in the fourth century, even if we take him from Mediterranean regions. Monasticism was bad enough in its first and best estate, but it grew worse and worse as Rome became papal and endorsed the eremite system. That the so-called Scottish monks, as late as the twelfth century, differed greatly from the peculiarly Romish orders, is a fact quite perplexing to those who would place early Scotland within the pale of Latin Christianity. It does not account for their differences to assume that Martin of Tours imparted his Gallic ideas to the presbyter St. Patrick, who transmitted them to Columba, and that Columba disseminated them from Iona throughout all Scotland; or that the said Martin, who first gave organic form to monasticism in Western Europe, did in some other way transplant it from Gaul into the land of the Gael. There was no little antagonism between the Gallic monks and the Roman primate, but this proves nothing in regard to the monastic system of the Culdees. There is nothing found in the early monasteries of Gaul analogous to the peculiarities which distinguished the Culdee system. Martin of Tours died shortly before the mission of Palladius; "before whose coming," says Fordun, there were "monks" among the Scots, and these Scots had "long been believers in Christ," having these "monks" as one class of teachers. It may be shown that they were not

monks at all, in the sense employed by Roman Catholic writers, from the venerable Bede down to Fordun, and even to Montalambert. They were ministers of God's word, "administrators of the sacraments," missionaries among the Picts, the Scots, and the Strathclyde Britons, co-workers with the presbyter-bishops; and if in defence from persecution, or in self-denial and self-support, they lodged in cells, this fact did not make them monks. In all probability they and the presbyters were of the same class. In the course of centuries the imagination of a genuine monk put a difference between them. They were the *Cuildich*,* the cell-men, the Culdees. They did not deserve the epithet of "monks," and yet something like a monastery was peculiar to their system of means for promoting the gospel and maintaining the church. Using the term in a qualified sense, Mr. MeLauchlan says: "The very monachism of Celtic Britain had features of its own, and these continued to distinguish it, in some measure, till the close of its existence." (Page 163.)

Our design is to present certain facts relative to the early institutions, often called Monasteries, which were peculiar to the Culdees after the influence of Columba was so powerfully impressed upon Scotland. It is not meant that he introduced the eremite principle into that country. It was there, in a simple form, before his day. "In speaking of the ancient Scottish Church, called by some the Culdee Church, we are not to suppose that this was merely the church whose founders crossed from Ireland, and planted it in Scotland, as a branch of the Church of Ireland. It was in fact the early Church of the British isles planted before the days of Ninian or Palladius, and retaining its distinctive features among the Scots for a longer time than among the other Celtic races of the country. Hence the fact that Culdees were not confined to Scotland and Ireland, but were found among the Britons, their organization

* That the word "Culdee" is but a modification of the Gaelic *Cuildich*, can scarcely be questioned. Like the term "Huguenot," it has been the subject of various surmises. The term was doubtless in existence before the Latin translation, "Cultores Dei," or "Keledeus." Of "Ceile De," and "Gille De," the Gael knows nothing, but "Cuiltich" is still in use among the Highlanders. On Iona there is a spot still called, "*Cobhan nan Cuildeach*," the Culdee's recess. The plural form is *Cuildich*, the men of the recess.

being, to a large extent, the organization of the early church of Britain and Ireland. Columba introduced the system among the northern Picts, but it was no new thing in the country; for in so far as Christianity existed in what is now called Scotland, it was moulded after the same form from the beginning. Ninian and Palladius might have exercised a certain influence on behalf of Rome, but there is every reason to believe that neither of those men had successors in their ecclesiastical offices and commission. Still, before the time of Columba, an influence had crept into the church, which was largely affecting its character and development, and which in the sixth century had unquestionably produced striking changes. This was the influence of asceticism, or the eremitical principle. . . . If we were to indicate what gave much of its peculiar character to the early Scottish church, we would say it was this principle. . . . The asceticism of the early Scottish church did, by no means, attain to the height of mediæval monkery, but it reached to a development sufficient to give a very peculiar character to the religion of the period." (*McLauchlan*, pp. 421, 422.)

To prove that the church of the Culdees was independent of Rome and of Anglo-Saxon prelacy, it is sufficient to look at the early Scottish monasteries, and show wherein they essentially differed from those which were connected with the papacy. And here we need not inquire for the earliest monastic institutes of the Scottish type. It was claimed for Abernethy, that it was a Culdee institute an hundred years before Columba's mission to the Picts. If so, it, and others like it, afterwards took the Columbite form. The same appears to have been true of the establishments founded by Ninian, Servanus, and Kentigern; they certainly were not the model for the Culdee institutes founded after the middle of the sixth century. We shall find that model on little Iona, which Dr. Samuel Johnson described as "that illustrious island, which was once the luminary of the Caledonian regions, whence savage clans and roving barbarians derived the benefits of knowledge and the blessings of religion." Wherein did the institute of Iona, and others of its order, differ from the monasteries which became the strength of Romanism? In furnish-

ing an historical answer to this question, we may reach certain important facts concerning the early Scottish church.

1. Their model was furnished by a missionary, who has never been represented as deriving his authority from Rome, nor classed with the founders of Romish monasteries. Colum Mac Phelim, or Columba, was born about the year 520, in the county of Donegal, Ireland. He was a descendant of the kings of Ulster, and closely allied to the royal family of Dalriadia, in Scotland. Rejecting the legends of his biographers, we may take it as true that he received a Christian baptism and education, and was ordained a presbyter. Prelatic writers of a later age found his ordination to the office of only a presbyter, too stubborn a fact for their disposal; they could not make him a bishop, in their sense of the term, but imagining that the office of bishop existed at the time, they invented the legend that Etchen "the bishop, by mistake, conferred priest's orders on Columba, when he intended to confer episcopal orders." Strange that the mistake was not corrected! Stranger still, to our minds, if there was any one to correct it! Another mode of solving the difficulty is the assertion that Columba objected to being raised to a higher office than that of priest, although he was going forth upon the first mission to Scotland, the greatest attempted in his day. He must, then, have been a very different man from the Columba, who is represented as visiting Rome, and receiving commission from the Pope. No prelatic authority has been claimed for him. Even Father Brenan declares him to have been "but a simple priest," who "possessed for many years an ecclesiastical jurisdiction even over the bishops of these countries," (Scotland.) We shall find him simply *primus inter pares*. "Columba received the orders that were conferred at the time," says McLauchlan, "receiving from Etchen the orders which he possessed himself." This was the highest ordination then known, in a land where the presbyter, St. Patrick, had "founded three hundred and sixty-five churches, and for them ordained three hundred and sixty-five bishops." The young Columba, fired with missionary zeal, is said to have founded several "monasteries" in Ireland; they must have been simple Christian communities, with the school, the church, and hospital for the poor. Willing to go abroad

for Christ, he left Ireland, for the purpose, says Bede, "of preaching the word of God." Taking with him twelve brother missionaries, he crossed the North Channel in a *currach*, or boat of wicker-work, covered with hides, and landed at Iona about the year 565. The little island, long held by the Druids, was given him, and his first thought was quite other than a monastery. It was a mission. He travelled extensively among the northern Picts, preaching the gospel, with the aid of an interpreter. Iona was chosen as the base of operations, not simply because of its seclusion, but for its safety from the attacks of barbarians, and for its nearness to Ireland, with which the missionaries held some ecclesiastical connection. There the *cuil*, or cell, was established, giving to it the name of Icolmkill, the Isle of Columba's cell. The spot was known for centuries as Cairn Cuildich, or the Cairn of the Culdees. In all this the authority of the bishop of Rome does not appear; no sanction came, none was needed from that quarter. Mr. Todd,* a prelatist, furnishes satisfactory evidence that the bishop of Rome did not appoint, elect, consecrate, nor confirm the bishops of Ireland, from the fifth to the twelfth century; nor did he sanction the missions of the Irish church, of which that of Columba was the first to another country. A stronger case may be made for the Scottish church, which was closely allied to the Irish until the ninth century, so that the names are often used interchangeably. The case is still stronger, when we take the word bishop as equivalent to presbyter. That the Pope had aught to do with Columba's mission is a mere assumption, without even the shadow of an historic fact for its basis. Even the prelatists admit that he was not a diocesan bishop. Who has ever ranked the presbyter Columba with such founders of monasteries as Benedict, Martin of Tours, Francis, and Dominic? There was strictly no Columbite order of monks.

2. The design and spirit were different. As a fair sample of western monasticism we may take that of Benedict, who became famous for his rigorous discipline at the beginning of the sixth

* The Church of St. Patrick; an Historical Inquiry into the Independence of the Ancient Church of Ireland. By Rev. W. G. Todd.

century. "Three virtues constituted the sum of the Benedictine discipline, silence with solitude and seclusion, humility, obedience, which, in the language of its laws, extended to impossibilities. All is thus concentrated on self. It was the man, isolated from his kind, who was to rise to a lonely perfection. All the social, all patriotic virtues were excluded. . . . The three occupations of life were the worship of God, reading, and manual labour. . . . So were doomed to live the monks of St. Benedict; so all monks, whose number is incalculable, for the long centuries during which Latin Christianity ruled the western world. The two sexes were not merely to be strangers, but natural, irreconcilable enemies." (Milman, *Lat. Chris.* ii. 30, 31.) The design was selfish, the spirit slavish. But at Iona there was, at first, almost nothing of this self-severity. "The institution at Iona may, be said, in one sense, to have been a monastery, although there was no vow taken by the inmates either of celibacy, poverty, or obedience. There was no rule constituting the brethren into a regular order, and any such attributed to Columba has been shown to be the work of a later age, and to be of no historical value. The principle which lay at the foundation of this institution was not that which gave its origin to monasticism generally, viz., the personal improvement of the monks themselves. . . . Here the main object was the benefit of others." (*McLauchlan*, p. 164.) The design was not to collect together monks, but to qualify and send forth missionaries. It was a great mission institute, not altogether unlike one of our mission stations in a heathen land, and still more like the mission institutes of the Moravian Brethren. Columba and his brethren founded a college, rather than a convent.

3. The institute at Iona is also to be regarded as a church. In it, no doubt, was incorporated the more ancient plan of the *cuil*,* *kille*, *kil*, or *cell*, as found among the earlier Christian Scots. The *cuil* furnishes, we think, the key to the whole Culdee system, giving to it name, character, and organic unity.

* Before Columba left Ireland he knew of Cuil rathan (now Coleraine,) Cuil feadha, &c. Perhaps the same term is retained in Scottish names, as Culross, Culloden, Culfargie. We find it in Loch nan Keal, or Ceall, "the Lake of the Churches." Kil-Patrick became Kirk-Patrick.

Its origin we cannot discover; perhaps it was, at first, a refuge from enemies, or a resort for prayer. It became the sacred place of the presence of God; almost the Holy of Holies, with its vail rent for the entrance of the Culdee worshipper. Its plan was carried with every missionary, and he chose the spot for his "cell," as the Hebrew did for the tabernacle. There was his sanctuary; there he wrestled with God in prayer; there the people might assemble with reverence to hear him preach. It was holy ground; the burning bush was there in the desert. The *cuil* develops into three forms; the oratory, the kirk, and the college. Our point now is that the "*kil*" grew into the *kirk*. That the kirk should be in a secluded place, needs not the supposition of a strictly monastic idea; the mission required a place of seclusion in order to obtain safety. After Iona became the model for other mission stations, the *cuil* did not generally grow into a college. If so, Culdee Scotland must have excelled all other lands in the number of its schools for the training of missionaries, for their record is to this day upon the very soil of the country. Turning to Nelson's guide-book we find almost one hundred "kils," pointed out as worthy of the tourist's visit, from Kilmany to St. Kilda. If most of these names be the memorials of some ancient Christian institution, as many undoubtedly are, it was the kirk rather than the college. We see the ancient Culdee kirk in scores of names, as Kirkcudbright (Kirk-Cuthbert) and Kirk-Cormac. If these were all actual monasteries, then Scotland was indeed a land of monks. If these were mission stations and kirks, then the Culdee church stereotyped its record upon the face of the country. We think this distinction between the kirk and the college important in marking the independence of the church of the Culdees. Both were in existence. The *cuil* gave the name to each. The members of each were *Cuildich*, or Culdees. In neither case were they monks of the Romish type, but missionaries in whom it were vain to look for perfection.

We find what seems to be an illustration of this view of the *cuil* and its development, in the case of Malrue, (*Maol rubha*, 'servus patientiæ'.) His royal lineage did not prevent him from imitating his relative Columba, leaving Ireland at the age

of twenty-nine, and fixing himself at Applecross among the northern Picts. There his cell became the nucleus of a flourishing kirk. Intent upon secluded prayer, he crossed over to the little island of Croulin, and there located a new cell. He drew others to the sacred place. A college arose, which became to him and his followers what Iona was to Columba. Thence his influcnce extended over the neighbouring region. For fifty-one years he laboured, in his wide and enlarging parish, a veritable bishop of pristine rank. He is said to have been slain by pirates at the age of eighty, leaving his name upon many a church and village, and upon the fairest of the Scottish lakes, the Loch Maree; on its little isle he had one of his cells for prayer, and there a chapel rose at a later day. Through all Scotland went the fame of Malrue of Applecross.

4. There were, doubtless, cells about which neither kirks nor colleges grew up; but they were not, at first, the abodes of hermits, nor the nuclei of monasteries. Men did not dwell in them for life. They resorted to them in order to prepare for the preaching of the gospel. "The religion of these men was less obtrusive than we often find it. It sought for concealment rather than display; and exhibited itself primarily, not in forcing itself, with little sense of modesty, upon the notice of men, but in urging its subjects to closer and more continuous intercourse with God. These men believed, as did Luther, that prayer was the best preparation for preaching, and hence much of their time was devoted to that exercise. The buildings, whose ruins still existing are memorials of the period, are clearly oratories, and nothing else; oratories, first used for prayer by these early Christians, and afterwards used more generally for the same purpose, in a later and more superstitious age. They carried to a dangerous extreme the idea, that to obtain opportunity for prayer, it was necessary for a time to seclude themselves entirely from the fellowship of others. In this they helped to lay the foundation of much future injury to the church; yet they never dissociated their retirement from the activities of their missionary life, but sought the one to qualify them the more fully for the other. We cannot conceive a more interesting object, in that rude age, than one of these holy men retiring to some lonely island of the sea, and there, in solitude, with

none of the comforts, and a small share of the necessaries of life, spending his time in holding communion with God, and pleading earnestly for his blessing on the great work in which he was engaged; and then, strengthened and stirred up to more earnest zeal, by his intercourse with Heaven, going forth among an ignorant and barbarous people, warning them to flee from the wrath to come, and calling upon them with earnest voice to believe and be baptized. The practice of taking possession of secluded islands continued to characterize the Culdee system, and was carried by the missionaries, sent forth from time to time, whithersoever they went. When Aidan at a later period was sent to preach the gospel to the northern Saxons, he fixed his residence in Lindisfarne, and thence went forth to preach the gospel to the surrounding population: Lindisfarne, or the Holy Isle, becoming to the north of England, what Iona was to the north of Scotland. In this there was a marked difference between the emissaries of Iona and those of Rome." Augustine seized upon wealthy Canterbury, and Paulinus settled in powerful York. "In nothing does the distinction between the church of Rome and the ancient Scottish church appear more clearly than in this." (*McLauchlan*, pp. 177—182.) An evidence of their wisdom will appear, when we consider how the Culdees took advantage of the principle of clanship in locating these institutions.

5. The development of certain "cells" into colleges was as important as that of others into kirks. The one class qualified ministers for the other. These especially have been called monasteries. That the monastic idea crept into them, in the progress of centuries, none will deny, but they did not become Romish until they ceased to be Culdee institutions. Romanism and Culdecism were incompatible. We may notice some of the peculiarities of the Culdee colleges. We use the term "college" as embracing the seminary of learning, the corporation of brethren, and the ruling body of presbyters. If there were presbyteries in existence, the college was the central point of the organization.

The regulations were very different from monastic rules. They were little else than would now be demanded in a college, where the inmates were required to support themselves. "Al-

though they observed a certain institute," says Jamieson, "yet, in the accounts given of them, we cannot overlook this remarkable distinction between them and those societies which are properly monastic, that they were not associated for the purpose of observing this rule. They might deem certain regulations necessary for the preservation of order, but their great design was, by communicating instruction, to train up others for the work of the ministry. Hence, it has been justly observed, that they may be more properly viewed as colleges, in which various branches of useful learning were taught, than as monasteries. These societies, therefore, were in fact the seminaries of the church, both in North Britain and in Ireland." (*Hist. Culdees*, p. 33.)

The labours required were not those of penance, but those of usefulness. Columba was averse to all modes of idleness in his disciples. "He encouraged them to attend to the useful arts, especially the culture of the fields and the garden. In that rude age, it says not a little for the skill and industry of Columba and his monks, that they had apples from their own trees, abundance of grain in their barns, and could indulge in the luxury of a Saxon baker; whilst the encouragement they held out to others to follow their example, by making presents to their neighbours of seed to sow their lands, entitles them to the gratitude of posterity." (W. Lindsay Alexander's *Iona*, p. 76.)

Donations of land, as a source of revenue, were not invited, although they were accepted in some instances at a later day, when the agents of Rome held forth endowments as temptations to the Culdee brotherhoods. "If the growth of the English monasteries was of necessity gradual, the culture around them but of slow development (agricultural labour does not seem to have become a rule of monastic discipline,) it was not from the want of plentiful endowments, or of ardent votaries. Grants of land and of movables were poured with lavish munificence on these foundations; sometimes tracts of land, far larger than they could cultivate, and which were thus condemned to sterility. The Scottish monks are honourably distinguished as repressing, rather than encouraging, this prodigality." (Milman, *Lat. Chris.* ii. p. 207.) The influence of

property and patronage was damaging to the best monasteries of Europe. "The indwellers of the Culdee college appear to have been anxious to make such arrangements as to prevent this secularizing influence. Hence the *Archinneach*, or Erenach, who managed the property of the monastery on behalf of the inmates. . . . The Erenach was a layman, probably a tenant under the head of the institute, and is understood, in some cases, to have held his office by hereditary succession. It may be true that the appointment of such an officer was not sufficient to counteract the secularizing influence of wealth and worldly power; but his existence showed a desire, on the part of these societies, to prevent the evil effects of such an influence if possible." (*McLauchlan*, p. 428.) The history of the evils arising from this source in Scotland would be very much the history of feudalism, and especially of the encroachments of Romanism upon Culdeeism. Rome endowed, that she might rule these institutions, whose independence she must destroy.

The head of the institution was the president or abbot, who came to be called *Vir Dei*,* *pater*, *sanctus pater*, *patronus noster*. For seven centuries this office remained quite unchanged. The abbot was elected by the brethren of the institute. He had jurisdiction over the inmates of his house, and also over the mission stations within his "parochia." He was under no prelate, nor pope. He was uniformly a presbyter. Bede calls him *non episcopus*, *sed presbyter*, *et monachus*—"not a bishop, but a presbyter and monk." We know what Bede's idea of an "*episcopus*" was, but it would not shock our minds to hear that a bishop and a presbyter were one. Adamnan applies both terms to Columban, the great missionary to Europe, as if he regarded them as equivalent, and that in 695. "The institution of Iona formed, in truth, a regular presby-

* This term is quoted by Dr. Ebrard, (Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie), in support of the view that the word Culdee is derived from *Ceile Dé*, which he renders "men of God." But the term "Vir Dei" is used only as applicable to the abbot or chief man of a monastery. It is not applied to the Culdees generally. Besides, the Gælic word *Ceile* does not mean man. It is applied to a spouse, or associate, conveying the idea of fellowship. No such term as "Ceile Dó" is known in the Gælic. Excepting this point, Mr. McLaughlan accords high praise to Dr. Ebrard's "remarkably able papers on the Culdee church."

tery, as it has long existed in Scotland, with this slight difference, that the presidency, or what we term the moderatorship was permanently enjoyed by the abbot, whom even Bede terms the 'Presbyter-Abbot.' . . . This peculiarity was well known to the venerable Bede, who terms it 'an unusual constitution, (*ordo inusitatus*),' as indeed it must have appeared to one who had been himself accustomed to the constitution of a diocesan and prelatic episcopacy." (Hetherington, *Hist. Ch. Scot.* p. 12.) Bede knew that he was describing no Romish abbot, and he whispers not a word about a prelatic superior. These abbots, in later centuries, allowed themselves to be called bishops, but it requires a marvellous power of invention to make them of the prelatic order, or give to one of them a diocese. Michelet says, "The Culdees recognized hardly more of the hierarchical state than the modern Scotch Presbyterians."

In connection with each institute there were at least twelve ordained ministers. These twelve formed the college of rulers in the Culdee church. There were no lay residents except students, nor "secular canons." "In the East, where the monastic system originated, the earlier monks were laymen. From this it followed that they had to look beyond themselves for the privileges to be derived from an ordained ministry. Among the Scots, the early monks, being in reality missionaries, were all in orders themselves, as presbyters associated together for the great purpose of converting the ignorant to the faith of Christ. Being thus ordained, they possessed all necessary ecclesiastical functions within themselves. Whence originated the so-called anomaly, in the early Scottish church, of the supreme power being in the hands of the abbot, or head of the Culdee college." (*McLauchlan*, p. 173.)

"That they sent forth ministers, as distinct from the planting of monasteries, is clear from their dealing, at a later period, with the Saxon populations in the north of England; and that they ordained those ministers, whom they sent forth, is quite as clear, those ministers holding their commissions from them, assuming the name and performing the functions of bishops. Thus far then they were Presbyterians, that they were presbyters themselves, and that as presbyters they exercised jurisdiction in the church, and conferred orders involving the episco-

pate, although these orders were afterwards rejected by the Roman Church." (*Ib.* 172.)

The rejection of Scottish ordination is a strong point of difference between the Culdees and the Romanists. Of such rejection the historical proofs are abundant; one from the canon law will suffice. It is clearly shown from one of the decrees of the Anglo-Saxon Church, in a council held at Cealhythe, A. D. 816, which runs thus: "It is interdicted to all persons of the Scottish nation to usurp the ministry in any diocese, nor may such be lawfully allowed to touch aught belonging to the sacred order, nor may aught be accepted from them, either in baptism, or in the celebration of the masses, nor may they give the eucharist to the people, because it is uncertain to us, by whom or whether by any one they are ordained. If, as the canons prescribe, no bishop or presbyter may intrude into another's province, how much more ought those to be excluded from sacred offices, who have among them no metropolitan order, nor honour it in others." We may thank the Ceal-hythe council for this strong proof of the independence of the Culdee church.

This proof that there was no "metropolitan order" in the Scottish church, in 816, is worthy of distinct remark. Its existence has since been imagined and asserted. After a new ecclesiastical system had been imposed upon Scotland, in the twelfth century, the prelatists sought to find an excuse for it in the old system of the Culdees. They invented the "primacy of the Scottish church," locating it first at Iona, as if it were the seat of an archbishop. Then they transferred it to Dunkeld, and thence to St. Andrews, just where they wanted it to serve as a foundation for the Romish primacy which they there established. If there was such a primacy among the Culdees it was collegiate; it was presbyterial. But who ever heard of a presbyterial primacy? We shall see from the case of Adamnan that the abbot was not even a prelate; much less was he a primate over other Culdee colleges, which stood upon a footing of equality in church government. Does a presbyterial primacy meet the requirements of the case? Does it satisfy the prelatists? "If so, the episcopal system has an amount of elasticity about it, which has not been hitherto generally under-

stood, and a presbyter, or group of presbyters, can exercise some of the most important episcopal and arch-episcopal functions. It may also be very naturally asked, Of what did Iona hold the primacy? The usual way of putting it is, that Iona held the primacy of the Scottish church. But it is very well known that the 'parochia' of the Columbite system consisted of affiliated monasteries, or colleges, and hence the jurisdiction of Iona must have extended to Ireland alone, for the only similar establishment said to have existed in Scotland from an early period [down to the year 600] was Abernethy; and there is not a shred of evidence to show that it was in any way subject to the jurisdiction of Iona. As for Dunkeld, the primacy is said to have been transferred there, when the church was built and the relics of Columba removed thither, [843, by king Kenneth]. But .... if the jurisdiction possessed by Iona was removed to Dunkeld, did Iona thenceforth become subject to Dunkeld? Of this there is no evidence whatsoever. Any supremacy that existed, so far as Iona was concerned [after 850] seems to have existed in the Irish institutions of Kells and Armagh. Iona was not subject to Dunkeld until the territorial diocese of Dunkeld was founded [1197]. .... It is often averred that Abernethy succeeded Iona in the primacy of Scotland. There is no evidence in support of this. St. Andrews existed for nearly a hundred years before Dunkeld, nor during that period was there any idea of primacy at all, although the institution seems to have been founded on the model of the Northumbrian monasteries, which were themselves originally of the Scottish type. When Dunkeld was founded, [823] there is nothing in the notice we have of the event to signify that there was any primacy intended." The supposed transfer of Columba's relics thither, "no doubt gave Dunkeld a place, in the eyes of Scotsmen, which it would not otherwise possess, and invested it with a new measure of consequence; but it was of short duration. .... The idea of primacy existing in these Columbite foundations is entirely an *ex post facto* one, and was intended to support claims of a modern growth. .... When Scotland obtained its primate, it was needful, if possible, to trace the roots of his authority into the old church, and men did so, although it finally landed their orders and jurisdiction

among a group of presbyters with their presbyter-chief at their head." (*McLauchlan*, pp. 371—373.)

The celibacy of the monks and the clergy was a prominent feature of the Roman Church, from the year 400, about which time the decree was issued enjoining it. But it did not obtain a place among the Culdees. There was no vow of celibacy even in their "monasteries." They married in Columba's time, and continued to marry until they ceased to exist. Their wives were not permitted to reside in the college, but a residence was granted them in the neighbourhood, where their husbands passed much of their time, while free from the duties of the school and the church. In the Culdee system there was no nunnery, an almost inseparable attendant of the Romish monastery. "Prior to the twelfth century there is no evidence to show that there was so much as one establishment of female recluses in Scotland proper. At an early period we read of an establishment of nuns at Coldingham, but we have no record of the existence of one north of the Firth of Forth. No evidence is stronger than this for the marriage of the Culdee clergy. Celibacy has never been long confined to one of the sexes; the celibate monk has ever been accompanied, in the history of the church, by the celibate nun, and in the ancient Scottish church we have no record of the existence of the latter. There were St. Bridgets and St. Kentigerns among the females of that church, but there is no evidence to show that these good women were nuns." (*McLauchlan*, p. 417.) The Culdees "were even frequently succeeded in their official station and duties by their own sons. From this [the absence of monastic celibacy] we can scarcely avoid drawing the conclusion, that those, who held a form of Christianity so primitive, so simple and so pure, must have branched off from the central regions and stem of the Christian church at a very early period indeed." (*Hetherington*, p. 12.)

From the families of these "presbyter-monks," were sons entering the college to be educated. From the mission stations and "kirks" others were sent. From more distant regions, England, and the continent, came young men of noble birth and royal princes, having heard of the famous schools. The education imparted was not of the monastic kind. The Latin classics

were studied. It is related that Æneas Sylvius, (afterwards Pope Pius II,) when in Scotland, intended to visit Iona, hoping to find in its celebrated library the lost books of Livy, but was prevented by the death of King James I. Greek and Hebrew were studied, as Dr. Ebrard proves. As the object was, in the earlier centuries, to qualify men for missionary and pastoral work, the Bible was the chief book. Columba was familiar with the word of God, ready to quote it on all occasions, as of supreme authority. "His own home-work and that of his disciples was transcribing the Scriptures . . . It is told by one of his biographers, that this was the last employment of his life, for he died while engaged in transcribing the 33d Psalm. These early missionaries were thoroughly Biblical . . . Bede informs us that they received those things only which are written in the writings of the Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles . . . . . Preaching the gospel and teaching the young was thus the great work to which the early [Scottish] church devoted itself, and for both these great works ample provision was made." (*McLauchlan*, pp. 175, 438.)

These collegiate institutions, in process of time, were not secluded enough for certain men of a more monastic disposition. Refusing or ceasing to become missionaries, they became monks. Instead of making the cell an oratory wherein to prepare for preaching the gospel, they made it a *diseart*, or an hermitage. Perhaps a few colleges were turned into convents. Thus arose a new order, more closely resembling ascetics. There was a difference between the *disertach* and the anchorite; the one still holding a connection with the college, and the other retiring into deeper solitude. But there is no proof that they were Romish monks. "It has been thought that the Culdees possessed an eremitical order, and there are facts toward the close of their history, which would seem to corroborate this. But there is nothing to point to its existence in the earlier period of the church." (*McLauchlan*, p. 434.) If it had no early existence, it certainly did not predominate in the colleges, and give them a monkish, rather than a missionary character. When the eloquent Cuthbert, after years of perilous travels and earnest preaching, sought for a "*diseart*" he could not find it in the "monastery" of Melrose, and he retired to the island of Farne,

about nine miles south of Lindisfarne in Northumbria. There he remained until the year 685, having his cell fenced in by an earthen wall that shut out from his view every object but the sky. We next find him for two years as an abbot, chiefly at Lindisfarne, but there he could not be a hermit. Activity characterized the "monastery" of the isle, and returning to his cell he died, leaving behind him a name that has been sainted by a church which he never served. Only by this device of canonization were the Culdees transformed into Roman Catholics.

6. The location of the earlier Culdee colleges was not so much in accordance with a monastic, as a missionary policy. To a large extent they were established in districts belonging to different families, clans, or tribes. From the mere fact of a secluded cell, one might argue that the founders were monks, but from the advantage taken of clanship we have evidence that they were missionaries. To illustrate this policy we mention the leading institutes, as nearly as possible in the order, and with the date of their foundation. Iona was established in the district of the clan Connell; Abernethy in Fife, at an ancient Pictish capital; Applecross in Ross; Loch Leven in Fife, and Melrose on the Tweed, between the years 565 and 625. It is claimed that Culdee schools were at Abernethy and Loch Leven at a much earlier date, but after Columba's time they were reorganized. St Andrews was founded in Fife, 736, by Culdee Britons; Dunkeld in Argyle about 820; still later we find Scone in Gowrie, Mortlach in Buchan, Birney in Moray, Monymusk in Mar, Dunblane in Stratherne, Dornoch in Caithness, and Brechin in Angus. It will be borne in mind that these were divided among three distinct peoples, the Picts, the Scots, and the Strathclyde Britons. Lindisfarne, founded 635, on what is now called Holy Island, was the model for others among the Saxons in north England. To this list might be added many other institutes of lesser eminence, but these are sufficient to show that the Culdees adopted the missionary policy of occupying the whole country. "The likelihood is that this principle [policy] was first admitted in order to secure all possible influence in Christianizing the people, the very principle which led Columba to visit and seek the conversion of the Pictish king. Family influence was in the highest degree powerful,

and to secure it on the side of Christianity, was but a policy, which the warmest zeal and the most consummate prudence dictated. The principle would also have been admitted for the sake of security. All these institutions had powerful family influence around them on every side; no man could assail them without calling down the vengeance of the clan, and all men would in consequence forbear; while they were capable of repaying in full the benefit they received, and became finally of so much importance, from their wealth and influence, that no family would willingly quit its hold of them. They thus became hereditary possessions in the hands of the great families of Scotland. . . . and even came to be so situated as that the lands of the monastery were in the hands of a layman, while the ecclesiastics of the community occupied the house and conducted the services." (*McLauchlan*, pp. 191, 192.) "Ecclesiastical property and office came finally to be hereditary, the worst feature about the ancient Culdee church, although the same feature characterizes the livings in some modern churches." (*Ib.* p. 329.)

7. The absence of certain peculiarly Romish doctrines and rites is a strong proof of the independence of the early Scottish church. The doctrine of a priesthood was not recognized; hence no auricular confession, no penance, no absolution. Prelacy did not exist; hence no rite of confirmation. In baptism there was no "consecrated chrism." In the Lord's Supper there was no "real presence," and both the bread and the wine were used by the people. Granting that there were errors in regard to the sacrament, yet there is no evidence of "transubstantiation," nor of the "mass." The merits of Christ were exalted, and hence "works of supererogation" were rejected. Christ was declared to be the only Mediator; therefore there were no prayers to the saints, no worship of angels and relics, no adoration of the "Virgin Mary." Until quite a late period in Culdee history there is no instance of the dedication of churches to her, although the name of native saints was often given to them, as Kilpatrick, Kirkcudbright, and St. Serf, (Servanus.) "Nor do we find in the biography of Columba, (by Adamnan,) any reference to the doctrine of purgatory. Where the faith of Christ was so entire, and the love of

Christ so ardent, there was no room for such a doctrine as this. The all-sufficiency of the atonement made by the Divine Saviour, and of the grace of the Divine Spirit, afford the one unanswerable argument against the doctrine of purification by any other means. The completeness in which these doctrines were held by the Iona missionaries, necessarily excluded their belief in the doctrine of a purgatory. From the same cause we find no regard to other more recent doctrines and practices. Thus there is no reference in the account given of Columba's death, (A. D. 597,) to his having received extreme unction." (*McLauchlan*, pp. 183, 184.) These were important matters. It cannot therefore be justly said that there was nothing but the most trifling and unessential differences between the Culdees and their Anglo-Saxon neighbours, whose Christianity had become Latinized.

8. The Culdees observed certain practices, enjoined by Rome upon her adherents, but they observed them in a manner so different, that it proves their independence. Early in the seventh century the tonsure became a theme of sharp dispute in Great Britain. The Roman tonsure was the coronal; the Scottish was the crescent. This small matter was so magnified by Rome, that it bade fair to shake the world. The Easter question grew into a serious affair. Rome followed the day of the week, commemorating the death of Christ always on Friday, and hence Easter always came upon Sunday. The Scotch followed the day of the month, (the 14th of Nisan,) and therefore Easter was observed upon whatever day of the week it fell. They were called the Quartodecimans. There were other elements in the reckoning, so that there was often the difference of a whole month, in the day of keeping Easter. While one party was fasting the other was often feasting. So vast was the importance attached to these matters that, at the close of the seventh century, Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, decreed, "They which have been ordained by the bishops of the Scots or Britons who are not united to the Catholic Church, in their Easter and tonsure, let them be confirmed again by a Catholic bishop by the imposition of hands." This canon was applied to Ceadda when he came to act as the presbyter-bishop of York. Having been ordained by Scottish hands, he was

rejected by Theodore, and Wilfrid, who had received prelatic ordination, was placed in the charge. This was but a skirmish; the battle was to come off upon Scottish soil.

9. The Culdee institutions had become glorious; but they did not glorify Rome. The Culdee church had disseminated through Scotland the truths of the gospel, had filled the country with places of worship, and had elevated the nation to a position of no small renown. Her strength lay in the great central institutes, called monasteries. From these her light shined afar. The Orkneys were reckoned a part of Christendom; even in Iceland there were Culdee missionaries in the tenth century. Into Switzerland had gone Columban and his brethren, rearing institutions of the Scottish type, and having differences with Rome, especially in regard to their ordination. It is surprising to find little Iona throwing her light into Europe, and sending forth such bands of missionaries into the old lands of the Saxon and the Gaul. In this she was greater than Rome. The papal power must have grown jealous of her influence, and anxious to secure her energy, her means, and her glory. The Culdee church must be reduced to submission under the pontiff; by gentle measures, if possible; by severer methods, if necessary.

10. The efforts made by the Culdees to resist the intrusions of Rome, would form a history of no small limits. Bede lamented their perversity and blindness in the matters of Easter and the tonsure. For years they repelled the advances of the prelatic party. The pressure increased, especially upon the Scottish institutes in the north of England. In 665 the crisis came. Colman, the presbyter-abbot of Lindisfarne, argued the case at the synod of Whitby. Strong in his attachment to the Culdee church, he claimed that he derived his system from his Scottish forefathers, and from the apostle John. Wilfrid appealed to the decrees of Rome, and prevailed. Put down, but not convinced, Colman and his Culdee brethren retired from their charges at Lindisfarne and in Northumbria, and returned to Scotland and Ireland, where they hoped that the ancient customs would never be displaced. Neander makes this a turning-point in Anglican history, saying that this decision at Whitby "could not fail to be attended with the most important

effects on the shaping of ecclesiastical relations over all England: for, had the Scottish tendency prevailed, England would have obtained a more free church constitution, and a reaction against the Romish hierarchical system would have ever continued to go forth from this quarter." In twenty-one years Theodore of Canterbury almost entirely banished the usages of the Culdee church from England.

Lindisfarne had been gained; the next attempt was made upon Iona, whose abbot was Adamnan, the biographer of Columba. This man visited Northumberland, listened to the Saxon priest Ceolfrid, and yielded the points relative to Easter and the tonsure. But the arguments that convinced him were not drawn from the authority and decrees of the Pope; they were based upon the traditions concerning Hebrew customs and the example of Peter as an apostle. On his return to Iona he endeavoured to bring his brethren over to his new views, but they rejected them. Crossing to Ireland he met with more success. Bede relates that he "brought almost all of them, that were not under the dominion of Hii (Iona,) to the catholic unity." The Scottish church maintained its own practices until after the death of Adamnan in 704. What sort of a bishop was he, thus to be withstood by his own clergy? They believed in no jurisdiction over them, as opposed to the will of the brethren. "If this be not presbytery, it is wonderfully like it. It may not indicate the details of modern presbytery as existing among these early Christians, but it certainly indicates a constitution implying in it the independence of individual ministers, and the supreme authority of the collected mind of the brethren. . . . These men were not to be overborne by authority, even that of the Apostolic See." (*McLauchlan*, p. 245.)

In making a fresh attempt, Ceolfrid sent a letter to Naitan, king of the Picts. In 710 he wrote it, carefully avoiding all reference to the papal decrees and supremacy. Naitan was convinced. The ministers over whom he held an influence adopted the coronal tonsure and the Roman Easter. But others would not yield. The "family of Iona" persisted in their views. For seven years these stubborn Scots maintained their independence, and right of private judgment. Royal power was employed; they were finally driven, as incorrigibles,

out of the Pictish kingdom. The Saxon monk Egbert used the same arts among the Scots, and large numbers of them yielded. It must be noted that the victory, thus far, was mainly in regard to Easter and the tonsure. The chief interest in this whole controversy lies in the fact, that "the Scottish brethren never once acknowledged that the authority of the Romish See was entitled to their deference and obedience. They acknowledged the authority of Holy Scripture, and of apostolic example, but they never acknowledged any other. Nor was it in deference to Papal authority, that they finally succumbed. What they refused to the letters of Popes, they yielded to the reasoning and persuasions of a Saxon monk. . . The ancient Scottish church was not papal in its constitution. It loved unity, and by its desire for unity was led to conform to a practice which it had long resisted, but the unity it sought was not the unity of Rome. The Scot and the Pict had no reason to love civil Rome; they withstood, for many a year, with no little determination, the claims of ecclesiastical Rome. Even when finally yielding in the matter of Easter and the tonsure, it was to reason, and not to Rome, that they professed to defer." (*McLauchlan*, p. 249.) The Strathclyde Britons did not submit until the year 768, and then by the agency of a monk.

After these concessions, the Culdee church seemed to say to papal Rome and England, "thus far shall ye come and no farther." Iona regained her position; her expelled "family" returned, and we have a tolerably complete history of the establishment for several centuries. The Danish pirates repeatedly desecrated the island, fire consumed the buildings, but the devoted brethren lingered among the scathed ruins. Some were murdered; others turned away, weeping, from the hallowed abode of their ancestors, and sought refuge in Dunkeld and similar institutions. But at the beginning of the thirteenth century there were Culdees at Iona. The other leading institutes have touching chapters of history, although many a chronicle may have been destroyed by the prelatic invaders. The politics of the country changed; the Scots predominated over the Picts, and, with the Strathclyde Britons, they became one nation. Church unity contributed largely to national unity, and the consolidation of the clans. That the piety and ortho-

doxy of the Culdees declined through the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, none will deny. But their sturdy resistance to the great evils associated with the prelacy of those centuries excites our admiration. It is remarkable that Romanism did not finally prevail through the influence of foreign prelates, but through the power of the Scoto-Saxon kings. Submission to the papal chair came by means of subjection to the throne of Malcolm Canmore and his sons.

11. A reform was needed. There is force in the peculiarity of the reform insisted upon by the Roman party, which was waiting on the borders to make a seizure of the Culdee institutions. It shows that the old Scottish establishments had not entirely lost their character nor their independence. "The anxiety of writers of the Roman school to represent the ancient [Scottish] church as so corrupt, shows that its organization could not be in accordance with their views. But it is questionable whether the corruption was such as these men represent it." (*McLauchlan*, p. 335.)

In 1058 Malcolm Canmore ascended the Scottish throne. If it be a fact that he was educated in England, it may be true that his Anglo-Saxon training led him to adopt the papal customs and doctrines. It is quite certain that he was resolved to introduce prelacy into his realm. It was probably about the year 1077, that he founded the bishopric of Mortlach, the first of the kind in Scotland. It was however a mere foundation on paper. Thus he began a policy, which aimed at the establishment of a complete hierarchy in the kingdom, at the expense of the ruin of the Culdee church. This was a specimen of the approaching reform. But he was not to be the reformer. The English princess Margaret, daughter of William the Conqueror, was to set in motion the papal machinery. She might have entered a convent, had she not been an exile in Scotland, and had not Malcolm insisted upon making her his queen. His kindness to her widowed and banished mother and children, and his devotion to herself, prompted her to repay the obligation by advancing the church that she ardently loved. To this object she gave her powerful mind and fervent heart. In her opinion the Scottish church was perversely in error, and she directed her zeal to its reformation.

The evils to be remedied were such as these; the marriages among the clergy; the absence of doctrines and customs important to the papal system; the observance of the "mass" in a way opposed to the whole practice of the Catholic Church; the wrong mode of reckoning the time for the Lenten fast; the failure to take the Lord's Supper on Easter Sunday; the want of strictness, (according to her prelatic biographer, Turgot,) in observing the Sabbath; the custom of not dedicating churches to the Trinity; the fact that "the ancient church was too much the church of the people, and too little that of the monarch, in an age when feudal ideas of sovereignty were beginning to prevail;"* the want of ecclesiastical councils, under the management of royal and papal legates; and especially the lack of dioceses, archbishoprics, and a fully empowered primacy.

Margaret was wise, politic, and condescending. It required no little skill and patience to effect the intended changes. The land was covered with places of worship, the remains of which still exist, extending to the most remote of the Hebrides. The cell, the kirk, and the college were still in the hands of the Culdees, and controlled by the presbytery. Her personal character won her a great influence. She was notable for her piety, as every visitor to her chapel in Stirling Castle will now be told. She fasted with rigour; she retired to caves for prayer, as if she were a genuine Culdee; she lavished alms upon the poor; she encouraged pilgrimages to Iona and St. Andrews, and furnished the means for the journey; she rebuilt the chapel of Columba; she assumed that it was her prayers to the great Saint of Iona, that obtained for her the gift of children, and thus overcoming national prejudices she sought to give to the revolution the appearance of a reform.

While thus winning the people, she was working for prelacy, which the Anglo-Saxons must introduce into Scotland. The striking fact is, that Lanfranc, the English primate, was her counsellor, notwithstanding the sad state of her family and of her Norman race in England. She could forgive all in England that she might gain all in Scotland. The Culdee presbyters were brought into conference. At one of the councils she

* McLauchlan, p. 330.

stood alone, and contended for three days with the Scottish clergy, arguing from Scripture and tradition. The king acted as her interpreter to the Gælic ministers. She insisted that the unity of the Catholic faith should be preserved, but was silent upon the authority of the Pope. No true Culdee would have listened, with a tendency to conviction, if she had intimated the right of Rome to rule over the church of his fathers, and of "the holy Columba." By degrees she carried the lesser points, and opened the way for the greater. Her policy was to clear the way for changes which her sons might effect. We may judge of the general purity of the Culdee church, in the eleventh century, by the kind of reform that was attempted.

12. It is a remarkable fact, that where Culdeeism was weakest, Romanism was introduced with the least difficulty. The so-called monasteries were in the way of papal progress. Where there was no prominent or active institute in a clan, or district, the people more readily accepted the new prelatic bishop. There being no central college, there was no well organized presbytery, and where there was no presbytery diocesan episcopacy easily gained a footing. This rule was modified by several conditions, such as the low state of piety and the feebleness of the missionary spirit; the readiness with which a Culdee abbot or presbyter would be tempted by the offer of promotion and reward; the enthusiasm of the clan for the king, and the ease of converting the family which held the lands of the college. The prospect of an aristocracy in the state would induce many chieftains to promote the introduction of higher orders into the church. In other lands, the larger the number of monasteries, the easier were papal customs and dominions introduced; but in Scotland the reverse was generally the rule. Immediately after Margaret's death, (1093,) her sons attempted to set up the entire system of prelacy. "Feudal lords and Romish bishops became now the chief denizens of the Scottish court." Dioceses were founded. A prelatic bishop was appointed over Caithness and Sutherland. He met with little resistance, for there was no leading Culdee institute in operation, the ancient one having declined. In Ross we find Macbeth, probably a perverted Celtic minister, as

the first diocesan, an instance of the fact that some few of the abbots and presbyters were won over to the new order of things. The whole college of presbyters was, in a very few instances, induced to make the change, as at Brechin, where was an old Culdee establishment. At this place, "David, notwithstanding his desire for the new state of things, constituted the Culdees, who were usually twelve in number, the Dean and Chapter of the diocese; an arrangement which would not have been made, if the older clergy had been so corrupt as a certain class of writers has represented them," or unless the Romanists were even more corrupt. "In this case the new state of things was grafted upon the old. Indeed this was David's usual policy." (*McLauchlan*, p. 370.) Large grants of property began to be made by the kings to the ancient monasteries, as in the case of Loch Leven.

And yet this grafting process did not succeed so well as might be imagined. There must be an entire uprooting of the old, and a planting of the new. Presbytery must fall, before prelacy could rise. The college must be supplanted by the cathedral. "With the exception of one or two of the earlier and less prominent bishops of somewhat doubtful identity, we do not find one native Scot accepting, or received into, the newly constituted offices. Bishops and monks are almost all importations from abroad; some from England, others from France. The whole Romish system was to be introduced into Scotland, and the men, who had to organize it, had to be introduced along with it." (*McLauchlan*, p. 418.) It is very clear, then, that Culdeeism did not slowly grow into Romanism; the one was by the other supplanted. Where the ancient institute was strongest, there the new system was most vigorously resisted, until a royal order expelled the inmates, as in the case of David I. expelling the Culdees from Dunkeld, (1197.)

13. Rome could not incorporate the Culdee system into her own government. She could adopt the continental Monachism, Pelagianism, and the later Jesuitism, but she could never take under her broad pretentious wing the system of the Waldenses, the Culdees, the Hussites, and the Jansenists. The antagonism in doctrine and practice was too great for compromise. The Scottish monasteries must be destroyed; colleges of presby-

ters must be dissolved. To accomplish this, two modes were adopted.

One was the erection of dioceses; the other was the importation of various orders of foreign monks, to build new monasteries, or occupy the old. The two movements went forward together, under the royal direction. The suddenness of the revolution proves that it was brought about by force, rather than by persuasion. What could the poor presbyter-monks do against the king and his army of prelates and papal monks? "Every diocese in Scotland was founded between 1100 and 1153, except that of Argyle, which was separated from that of Dunkeld in the beginning of the thirteenth century, the whole of the powerful hierarchy of Scotland having been set up by the sons of Margaret," and that in fifty-three years! "This was a remarkable change, and as sudden as it was remarkable. Nor did it stand alone; other changes, equally significant, were taking place alongside of it. The ancient Culdee monasteries were fast disappearing, and great establishments, in accordance with the Romish model, were taking their place. Monks were introduced into every part of Scotland, covering and feeding on the land. The providing of dioceses was but a small portion of what Alexander and David did for the church." Abbeys were founded at Scone, Inchcolm, St. Andrews, and at Edinburgh was built Holyrood. Others rapidly followed. We find monasteries, of almost every order known in Europe, speedily introduced, until the land was full of them. As specimens we may name twenty-eight convents of the Augustines, (the first order that entered north of the Firth of Forth,) six Red Friars, six Premonstratenses, three Benedictines, six Tyronenses, four Cluniacenses, thirteen Cistercians, fifteen Dominicans, seventeen Franciscans, and nine Carmelites, with nunneries in growing proportions. Before such an array the Culdees were not able to stand. These had more destructive power than the king, with his twelve dioceses and two archbishoprics.

To extinguish the Culdee church "all those means, by which a religious body may be annihilated, were systematically resorted to. By corrupting those who could be tempted by the bribe of ecclesiastical rank and wealth; by expelling from their

monasteries those who obstinately adhered to the belief and practice of their fathers; by vexatious and iniquitous lawsuits; by dazzling the eyes of the people with a more splendid ritual than that followed by the simple presbyters of the Columba order; by calumniating their character and affecting a superior standard of purity of morals—in short by all the means by which an adroit, determined, and unscrupulous party may enfeeble the influence and paralyze the resolutions of a sect it has resolved to destroy, did the adherents of the Romish Church labour to sweep from the land all vestiges of the Culdees. It was not, however, till the thirteenth century that they entirely succeeded, and even then they only suppressed the colleges of the Culdees and dispersed their members. The latter still continued to labour as individuals, and in many remote parts of the country kept alive the flame of a pure Christianity, long after the whole land seemed to have sunk under papal darkness." (Alexander's *Iona*, p. 134.)

And this has been called the progress of Latin Christianity! "Instead of the humble, unpretending Culdee establishment, arose a powerful hierarchy, the members of which came to hold the highest offices in church and state. This change is that often referred to as the 'progress of civilization,' as if civilization consisted in instituting high offices in the church, accompanying them with rich endowments, and filling them with foreigners, while the native population, who had long bravely defended their country, and filled the offices in church and state well, were put aside, and their liberties withheld and appropriated to the crown. Yet this has been called the progress of civilization; and outwardly it bore that aspect, for there was an apparent grandeur in the church as David left it, and a magnificence around the throne, which had never existed in the case of either before; but in a few centuries this grandeur became such an intolerable burden, that the nation refused to bear it any longer. With this averment that the changes in the church and state, in the beginning of the twelfth century, were changes in the direction of civilization, is almost always associated the statement, that the ancient Celtic church really was corrupted and depraved, and that in consequence there was a loud cry for reformation.

"If there were corruptions in the Culdee church, Queen Margaret and her sons sought to remedy them by importing from abroad corruptions of a grosser kind, which had grown up in a warmer climate, and under the influence of more powerful stimuli. The corruptions of Rome were a most insufficient remedy for the corruptions of Scotland. That the Culdee church had been gradually adapting itself to the necessities of a national Christianity, is sufficiently obvious. Ministers were found beyond the walls of the old mission institutes; churches were growing up in addition to the old oratories; and many of the working clergy were men of mark and of fame. Their lay abbots and their clanship were a source of weakness, while the marriage of the clergy, in an age when an ignorant and superstitious asceticism was growing into wonderful repute, served above all things to pave the way for a system more rigid, and apparently more spiritual. With all its sources of weakness, the Culdee church, however, was in the view of the nation superior to that which followed; and if evidence of this is sought for, it will be found in the fact that the revolution, which supplanted it, was the work of the king, not of the nation; that while the foreign portion of the population aided him, he received little support from the native Scots, or their ministers, and that these continued, in after times, to cherish the highest esteem for the memory of those men of piety and power, who had distinguished their ancient national church.

"Nor has this spirit died away. David might have supplanted the ancient church; he could not eradicate, from the minds of the people, the principles it had implanted. It requires but little acquaintance with Scottish history to observe that these never were eradicated; that during the reign of the Roman church in the kingdom they continued to exist, exhibiting themselves occasionally in such outbreaks as the letter of king Robert Bruce and his nobles to Pope John, or the uprising of the Lollards of Kyle, and finally culminating in the events of the Scottish Reformation. Those principles had regard, above all things, to the independence of the ancient Scottish kingdom and church. They exist still fresh and vigorous as ever in the Scottish mind; nor is it easy to say for how much of what now distinguishes Scotland ecclesiastically, she is indebted to the

ancient Culdee church. One thing is plain, that notwithstanding the claims of the Church of Rome, and its hierarchical organization to antiquity in Scotland, she can only claim four hundred of the eighteen hundred years that have elapsed since the planting of Christianity in the kingdom, viz., the period between 1150, when David established her, and 1550, when his establishment was overturned by the resuscitation of the old Scottish principles at the Reformation." (*McLauchlan*, pp. 420, 421, 440.)

ART. II.—1. *University Reform. An Address to the Alumni of Harvard at their Triennial Festival, July 19th*, 1866. Printed in the *Atlantic Monthly* for September, 1866.

2. *Review of Dr. Hedge's Address to the Alumni of Harvard:* being Article V. of the *New Englander* for October, 1866.

THE former of these articles is by Dr. Hedge, as we understand, Dr. Frederic H. Hedge, Professor in Harvard Divinity School, the American editor of the famous "Essays and Reviews." It was delivered at the last annual commencement of Harvard College. Its immediate occasion was the new organization of the Board of Overseers of that institution. This body concurrently with the corporation governs the college. What are the precise and distinctive prerogatives of each of these bodies we are not advised, nor is it important here to indicate. It appears, however, that great evils have arisen from the divided and often clashing jurisdiction of two Boards of Control, which all experience shows is far better concentrated in one, so insuring needful unity of action along with indubitable responsibility. The change in the membership of the Board of Overseers which gave rise to the special features of Dr. Hedge's address, amounts to a complete revolution. Hitherto they have been appointed by the State government. Hereafter, the legislature has directed that they shall be appointed by the Alumni who have been graduated for five years, giving their

votes according to certain prescribed forms, on commencement day, for candidates to fill such vacancies as shall from time to time occur. In a few years this will work a revolution in the membership of the Board. It was quite natural that Dr. Hedge, addressing the Alumni on the occasion of their investiture with this new power over the college, and consequent responsibility for its management, should improve the opportunity to call their attention to such reforms in its organization, government, and curriculum of study, as he deemed of most urgent necessity. This he has not failed to do. It is this part of his address—rather brilliant and sensational than profound or thorough—which makes it significant, and accounts for the attention it has awakened. The radical and sweeping innovations here boldly proposed by a professor in the oldest college of the country, on its annual festivity, to its future guardians, are too revolutionary in their bearing not only on that institution, but upon all our colleges, and the whole system of liberal education, to pass unchallenged.

The generally sound and judicious strictures on this address in the *New Englander*, which we have also noted at the head of this article, are from the pen of Dr. Woolsey, President of Yale College. They are a just exposure of some of the superficial yet plausible reasonings of Dr. Hedge, and a seasonable protest from high authority against these and like projects for disorganizing our great institutions for liberal education, destroying their discipline, and debasing their culture and training. Dr. Hedge's address is neither more nor less than a renewal, in an unexpected quarter, of the attempts periodically made to depreciate the utility and necessity of the study of the ancient classics, and the mathematics in our colleges; to urge the abolition of all compulsory courses of study, and enforced propriety of conduct, and, that the student be invested with the largest liberty in these respects; in short, to make him "master of the situation," so that he has only to consult his own pleasure as to what and how much he shall study, and generally as to his whole conduct and behaviour; the only restrictions being, that he must undergo a certain examination in order to obtain a degree, and that he is liable to removal from

the institution, if his influence prove incurably pernicious or his presence intolerable.

While it is wholly aside of our purpose to discuss the new organization of the Board of Overseers which has called forth the startling and revolutionary proposals of Dr. Hedge, we cannot refrain from turning the attention of our readers for a moment to the fact, that this address itself affords the first practical exemplification of its tendency and working. We find an appeal boldly made to the graduates to revolutionize the entire administration of the college as to government, discipline, studies; and to introduce a system, which, all versed in such matters know, would reduce our colleges to anarchy, and fill them, not with students, but with an ungovernable rabble of wild and idle youths. But it may be asked, what body of men may be more safely trusted with the disposal of such crude and empirical schemes than the mature graduates of our colleges? We answer, none whatever, if their deliberate and collective judgment can be fairly obtained, after due discussion. But how difficult to obtain this, on ordinary occasions, in any vote for overseers which may be given on commencement day? Are not the chances, that very few of the graduates will really cast their votes; that, in most cases, those who reside at a distance will know little of the relative fitness of different candidates for the post; that a few persons living in circumstances favourable to concert of action will really control the election; and that a little energetic and adroit management would enable those who have pet empirical reforms to promote, or personal and party interests to serve, to elect their candidates and carry their points, against the mature judgment of the great majority of graduates? While, therefore, we deem the interests of our colleges safe in the custody of their graduates, we object to this new system as being quite unlikely to secure that custody. We think it is obtained more completely and effectually through that single self-perpetuating Board of Trust and Control, to which the guardianship of our American colleges is generally confided, and which is usually composed of a majority of trusted and honoured graduates, with a wholesome infusion of other elements to give breadth to its plans, and shed corrective light on traditional errors and faults.

The changes advocated by Dr. Hedge are three, on each of which we propose to offer some comments. 1. The discontinuance of the present course of study of the Latin and Greek classics and of Mathematics in the collegiate curriculum. 2. Leaving to each student the choice of branches of study to be pursued by him unbiassed even by the stimulus of college honours. 3. The abolition of all laws, rules, rewards and penalties for regulating the actions, and securing the correct deportment and behaviour of the students.

1. In regard to the study of the ancient classics and the mathematics, Dr. Hedge says: (We give him the benefit of an extended statement in his own words:)

"The question has been newly agitated in these days, whether knowledge of Greek and Latin is a necessary part of polite education, and whether it should constitute one of the requirements of the academic course. It has seemed to me that those who take the affirmative in this discussion give undue weight to the literary argument, and not enough to the glossological. The literary argument fails to establish the supreme importance of a knowledge of these languages as a part of polite education.

"It is in vain to deny that those literatures have lost something of the relative value they once possessed, and which made it a literary necessity to study Greek and Latin for their sakes. The literary necessity is in a measure superseded by translations, which, though they may fail to communicate the aroma and the verbal felicities of the original, reproduce its form and substance. It is furthermore superseded by the rise of new literatures, and by introduction to those of other and elder lands.

"But, above all, the literary importance of Greek and Latin for the British and American scholar is greatly qualified by the richness and superiority of the English literature which has come into being since the Græcomania of the time of the Tudors, when court ladies of a morning, by way of amusement, read Plato's Dialogues in the original. If literary edification is the object intended in the study of those languages, that end is more easily and more effectually accomplished by a thorough acquaintance with English literature, than by the very imperfect knowledge which college exercises give of the classics" . . . .

"The literary argument for enforced study of Greek and Latin in our day has not much weight. What I call the glossological argument has more. Every well-educated person should have a thorough understanding of his own language, and no one can thoroughly understand the English without some knowledge of languages which touch it so nearly as the Latin and the Greek. Some knowledge of those languages should constitute, I think, a condition of matriculation. But the further prosecution of them should not be obligatory on the student once matriculated, though every encouragement be given, and every facility afforded to those whose genius leans in that direction. The college should make ample provision for the study of ancient languages, and also for the study of the mathematics, but should not enforce those studies on minds that have no vocation for such pursuits. There is now and then a born philologer, one who studies language for its own sake,—studies it perhaps in the spirit of 'the scholar who regretted that he had not concentrated his life on the dative case.' There are also exceptional natures that delight in mathematics, minds whose young affections run to angles and logarithms, and with whom the computation of values is itself the chief value in life. The college should accommodate either bias, to the top of its bent, but should not enforce either with compulsory twist. It should not insist on making every alumnus a linguist or a mathematician. If mastery of dead languages is not an indispensable part of polite education, mathematical learning is still less so. Excessive acquirements in that department have not even the excuse of intellectual discipline. More important than mathematics to the general scholar is the knowledge of history, in which American scholars are so commonly deficient. More important is the knowledge of modern languages and of English literature. More important the knowledge of nature and art."

Against all this we protest as narrow and superficial, and all the more earnestly inasmuch as it is a voice *from*, (though we trust the issue will prove not *of*,) our oldest University, in which these studies have hitherto been supposed to be in high honour—a voice echoing that demand for empirical reform in high education which is wont to come from very different quarters, and, as

it seems to us, would sacrifice liberal culture to the behests of a blind and suicidal utilitarianism. For there is in the sphere of intellect as well as conscience, and of intellectual not less than moral training, a false and self-destructive utilitarianism wherein he that seeks his life shall lose it, and he that loses it, for an adequate object, shall find it. But leaving generalities, we proceed to specific heads.

1. We do not deem it necessary to the full strength of the argument for the continuance of the classics in the regular collegiate course, to dispute what Dr. Hedge claims in relation to their comparative literary value. Certainly the literary treasures of modern Christendom vastly surpass all that can be gathered from heathen antiquity. And yet we strongly dissent from his statement that the substance of ancient literature can be filtrated to us through translations. He concedes that the "aroma" is lost in this metamorphosis. This must needs be so, and has an importance which he quite overlooks. For to an extent that is not true of modern languages, the thought and language in the Latin and Greek classics are so interlaced that they cannot be separated from each other without tearing the skin from the flesh. To reproduce Homer, Virgil, Demosthenes, or Cicero, without their language, is not merely, as in translations of most of our modern authors, like reproducing the same man in a changed costume. It is like reproducing his skeleton only. The bald historical facts recorded in ancient literature may be, of course, stated in English. But the beauty and force, the keen discrimination, delicate wit, exquisite felicity which have given the literatures of Greece and Rome their matchless charms, wherever high education and elegant letters have been appreciated, of necessity evaporate in every attempt to translate them into modern tongues. They are inseparably inwrought into the very etymological, grammatical, and rhetorical idioms of these languages. The attempt to reproduce them, and to exhibit the classic products of Greece and Rome, in our vernacular, is like the attempt to bring before us the Roman soldier with Minie-rifle and other modern accoutrements, or to represent ancient domestic and social life through the customs and phrases in

relation to such matters which Christianity, modern civilization, steam, and electricity have naturalized.

2. Dr. Hedge allows much more weight to the "glossological argument." He thinks this may justify requiring a certain amount of Latin and Greek as a condition of admission to college, but not the enforced study of them afterwards, certainly not for any long time in the regular collegiate course. Notwithstanding this concession, we think he greatly underrates the force of this argument. He views it chiefly as an aid to the due understanding of our own tongue, of which the Latin and Greek, especially the former, are such large constituent elements. This is so essential an accomplishment, that liberally educated men cannot afford to despise it. And surely the present classical course in our colleges does not outrun the amount necessary to a due mastery of our own tongue. This, however, is but a slender part of the "glossological argument." Dr. Hedge thinks the time given to the classics might be better given to the modern languages. Among the many sufficient answers to this, one is well stated by Dr. Woolsey, "A good discipline under the ancient languages, especially under the Latin, places the acquisition of the modern, and above all, of the Romanic languages within a young person's easy reach. Suppose five years to be mainly devoted to the study of language; we have little doubt that if three of them are given to Latin and Greek, the three principal modern tongues of Romanic Europe can be learned as well in two years as they could have been in the five, if no acquaintance with Latin had preceded. And the reason of this lies in the superior discipline afforded by these languages of ancient times, more than in the fact that the vocabulary and grammar of the modern daughters of the Latin are to a considerable extent drawn from it. It is on the difference of thinking and expression between the old world and ours, that the greater discipline, the greater trial and exercise of the faculties in learning a language depends. The modern world in Christian lands thinks and writes very much in one way; even the Germans have modern minds, although their language is harder to acquire than those of most other European nations. The difficulties to be overcome in Latin thus smooth

the way afterwards, and the succeeding task of learning a language of modern times is rendered far easier."

3. But the far deeper reason for the thorough and enforced study of the Latin and Greek languages is quite ignored by Dr. Hedge, except in a casual witticism. We refer, of course, to the discipline and training of the intellect. Intelligent educators recognize this as the chief, while the imparting of information is a subordinate, though by no means unimportant, end of liberal education. In professional study or other subsequent culture, the other end of communicating knowledge in some department or specialty predominates, although it is not exclusive. In the study of law, medicine, or theology, a paramount object is to obtain knowledge in these several departments. But a secondary and by no means unessential aim is to train the mind to a special aptitude and facility for investigation and practice in these several professions. Indeed, collegiate education is therefore liberal, (*liber*,) in contra-distinction to that of Polytechnic, Commercial, Military, or Common Schools, because it is *per se* freed from bondage to the requirements of any particular occupation, or the necessities of obtaining a livelihood. Released from such servitude, it is left free (*liber*) to pursue its own training, development, culture, and enlargement exclusively. And none the less so, although the purpose be ultimately to use this increased intellectual power for the more successful pursuit of vocations that shall yield a living. Still this education is liberal, *eminenter*, because for the time being it is emancipated from all bonds except to the mind's elevation and enlargement. Here, too, we have the key to the reason why, by common consent of the cultivated world, the professions of law, medicine, and divinity, are *par excellence* styled *liberal.* Beyond all other employments, except those of high teaching and the pursuit of literature or science as a profession, they involve, in addition to labours directly aiming at a subsistence, the culture of the intellect and increase of knowledge as intrinsically good; the improvement of the mind, in short, as an end in itself, and not as a mere machine for getting a living. Hence, where they are properly pursued, they promise a dignity and honour, which largely offsets the pecuniary advantages

of merely money-getting pursuits, or of what the Germans call the "Bread and Butter Sciences," which bear directly on material production, and the means of sustenance or wealth.

Such then being the nature and aim of liberal education, the value of different studies is to be estimated preëminently by their power to discipline and invigorate the intellect. Preeminently, we say, but not exclusively. For besides invigorating the mind, it should undoubtedly be the aim of a liberal education so to inform students in regard to the great outlines and elements of the sciences, physical and metaphysical, and of the liberal arts, that they may know how to prosecute at greater length whichever of them they may afterward choose; that they may know what every educated man ought to be ashamed to remain ignorant of; that they may be opened to that breadth of view which is a chief end and distinctive mark of all liberal culture; and finally, that food may be furnished to the mind in order to its vigour and growth, since it cannot exercise itself without objects on which to act, and can only grow by what it feeds on. Giving all due weight to these considerations, it remains true, first, that the great end of a liberal education is the due training and discipline of the mind; and secondly, that the study of the ancient languages, up to the point of a fair knowledge of them, is an instrument of this discipline for which no substitute has yet been found. The same, in our judgment, is also true of mathematics, in the average extent to which the study of them is enforced in the great colleges of our country, though we do not undertake to say that it is not urged beyond necessity in any of them.

4. Beyond the sphere of the intuitive faculties, and the retentive, or memory, what remain are the discursive powers of mind, the powers of thought, which culminate in reasoning. Now it is not the purely intuitive faculties of sense-perception by which we cognize the outer world, and of consciousness by which we cognize the ongoings within us, that are the special objects of cultivation in liberal education. These are rather memory, whereby we retain what we acquire by intuition, or otherwise; and thought, through the discursive faculties, by which the mind passes from (*discurrit*) the material so furnished to other results worked out of them. In this process abstrac-

tion, generalization, judgment, reasoning, constructive imagination are variously involved. These are the powers of thought, of intellectual discursion or discourse. Reasoning interpenetrates and supports them all. Or to reach the generic quality of them all, of which reasoning itself is a species, comparison—for, as Hamilton shows, they are all forms of comparison.

Now in regard to this reasoning by comparison, it is of two kinds—demonstrative, and moral or probable, according as it deals with necessary or contingent truth. The former is the ultimate standard, the perfect form, and normal type of all reasoning. Other reasoning becomes cogent and conclusive just in proportion as it approximates to this, or as we eliminate those elements whereby it comes short of this. Hence great educators, with rare exceptions, have incorporated a somewhat extended course of mathematics, as a fundamental part of liberal education, an indispensable mental gymnastic. How far, for these purposes, it is necessary to go into transcendental mathematics; how far it is needful to go beyond algebra and geometry, pure and applied, into the deeper intricacies of the calculus, in order to tone up the mind by adequate exercise in demonstrative reasoning, is thus far an open question. We care not to pronounce upon it. In deciding this, as well as the entire place of mathematics in liberal education, some other points must not be overlooked. They make great demands upon the powers of abstraction, attention, memory, especially logical memory. Probably nothing more tasks and invigorates the power of attention than difficult mathematical problems and demonstrations—and this too upon subjects the most abstract. And continuous persistent attention is but another name for mental application, or effective study, which is at once the measure and the synonyme of intellectual power. In this power, perhaps more than in any thing else, lies the secret of intellectual might, we were about to say, of genius itself, which is but a power of intense mental activity, in some given direction. Sir Isaac Newton is reputed to have said that if there was aught in which his mind surpassed that of ordinary men, it was this power of unremitting attention.

Another important power cultivated in the study of mathe-

matics is what we may call the tentative power, required in framing those hypotheses and inventing those experiments, which are so requisite in all investigations for the discovery of truth whether scientific or historical. This habit is constantly cultivated in forming conjectures, considering possibilities, devising processes for the solution of problems and the demonstration of theorems. Thus they become not only a calculus employed in the investigations of physical science, but a propaideutic for the tentative processes by which its discoveries are made. And, as dealing with formal and necessary matter, they are more especially a propaideutic for the study of other sciences of formal and necessary truth, such as logic and elementary metaphysics.

And yet pure mathematics yield only formal truth, which *as formal* is also necessary. But they do not of themselves give any content of actual being. They only prove truths of actual being hypothetically, *i. e.*, upon hypothesis of any facts thereof, otherwise evinced, furnishing the conditions to which they apply; hence, with logic, sometimes called hypothetical sciences. That is, they do not of themselves prove the first original fact of actual being. They may prove that $12 \times 12 = 144$, or that one side and the angles of a triangle being given, the other sides can certainly be deduced therefrom. But this does not prove any fact of actual being. If, however, it be otherwise proved that there are 12 garments, each worth 12 dollars, mathematics show their total value to be 144 dollars. Given from observation the horizontal distance from the base of a steeple to a certain point, and the angle formed by this line and another from the same point to the top of the steeple, and you can calculate its height. Without the data thus obtained from other sources, mathematics evince no truths of actual being. But it is mainly with facts of actual being that we have to do. On these we are called chiefly to exercise our reasoning faculties, and this in the methods of moral or probable reasoning. Hence it is of transcendent importance that the mind of the student receive the most complete drill in this kind, a drill which can only be given in any sufficient degree by the established curriculum of study in the Greek and Roman classics. This will appear more fully if we consider,

5. The special tasking of the reasoning powers which is involved in making out the meaning and the grammatical construction of the text of Latin and Greek authors. It is one continual process of finding premises and deriving conclusions from them. The various points as to gender, number, person, case, tense, the categorical, conditional, imperative force signified by the varied endings of words; the syntactical laws which must be harmonized with these endings; the necessity of conforming the meaning to the syntax and the syntax to the meaning, and both to known facts, and of ascertaining historical facts in order to find a key to each; the constant framing and testing of different hypotheses, as to the meaning and construction of sentences: the balancing of considerations often drawn from various aspects of the case; the filling out of elliptical passages; this followed up, as less difficult authors are mastered to those of greater complexity and obscurity, constantly and manifoldly tasks the attention, the discrimination, the invention, the application of logic, as no other exercises equally feasible at this stage of education can do. This discipline is invaluable. Nor can its loss be compensated.

It is no sufficient answer to this, to say that the same results may be achieved by studying the modern languages. Aside from obvious grammatical peculiarities which give the Latin and Greek a high vantage-ground in this respect, President Woolsey, in a passage already quoted, urges another fact with great force and conclusiveness, when he says, "it is on the difference of thinking and expression between the old world and ours, that the greater discipline, the greater trial and exercise of the faculties depends. The modern world in Christian lands thinks and acts very much in one way; even the Germans have modern minds, although their language is harder to acquire than those of most other European nations. The difficulties to be overcome in Latin thus smooth the way afterwards." Of this no one can doubt who has tried them.

It is indeed an evil *valde deflendus*, that this admirable discipline is now so greatly demoralized and thwarted, by the present nearly universal use of cheap translations in our colleges. Translations indeed might be used with great benefit, if the student would refuse to resort to them till he had exhausted

his own powers in solving difficulties and eliciting the meaning and construction. This, however, is too much to expect of the mass of immature and inconsiderate youth. Indolence has temptations which are immediate and urgent. The utility of the discipline resulting from faithful and thorough study is remote and not readily appreciated by the immature, when blinded by a seductive love of ease.

For this evil there is but one remedy. It is to be found in the skill and persistent fidelity of the teacher. He can find out methods of counteracting and thwarting the mischiefs of the reckless use of translations. He can work his pupils in such lines of questioning, that the illegitimate use of these helps, so far from saving labour to the student, shall only embarrass him in his recitations. No chairs in our colleges ought to be filled with more able and accomplished teachers. The cause under consideration necessitates, if not more scholarship and learning, more tact and fidelity in teaching, on the part of our classical professors, than formerly. The time has gone by when it will do to presume, as has so often been done, that almost any respectable college graduate will answer well enough to teach Latin or Greek. To teach them effectively, so as to neutralize this destructive agency, requires the highest measure of that knowledge, ability, fidelity, and tact which are the great requisites to all successful teaching. We ourselves passed through a college second to none in the land, in name and numbers, in which a single tutor taught all the Latin, Greek, and Mathematics, and, with slight exceptions, every thing else up to senior year. Of course there was very little real teaching or attempting to teach. He was little beyond a sort of sentinel or orderly, to see that his pupils attended and recited. Yet they made decided progress, *because they were obliged to work out their lessons by grammar and lexicon*, being in blissful ignorance of all translations but Smart's Horace, and their emulation quite sufficed to raise a recognized standard of excellence, irrespective of the tutor who never took the trouble to parse them. The day is past when that or any college could live on such a basis. The "ponies" would run them down.

6. Another great advantage of classical study lies in the

constant exercise in the necessary forms of thought, and in the elementary truths of logic and metaphysics which it affords. Language is the vehicle of thought; the articulate embodiment of human consciousness, and of the truths, ideas, the forms, processes, and results of thinking, which are grasped by or have place in that consciousness. Grammar is but the logic of language. It is constantly dealing with subject, predicate, copula, the quantity and quality of propositions, the categorical and hypothetical force of sentences; the relations of actions or events to time and space, of substance and accident, of cause and effect. The causative, attributive, disjunctive, conditional force of particles and inflexions, especially the multitudinous and subtle distinctions indicated by the different parts of the Greek verb, and the connective particles between sentences which form the hooks and eyes of thought—all this and much more the like, show what an admirable discipline for logic and metaphysics is found in high and thorough classical study. To the allegation that the study of modern or other languages will do this as well as Latin and Greek—we answer, first as before, that the difference between ancient and present modes of thought renders the ancient languages far more serviceable for this purpose, by enforcing attention to all the ideas and forms of thought implied in grammatical construction, in order to detect their meaning. Second, That the structure of these languages and their terminal paradigms is peculiarly fitted to fasten the student's mind on such points, and to work it into the apprehension of them.

7. In Christendom it is still the custom in all the departments of science, letters, and the liberal arts, to borrow the technical nomenclature from the Latin and Greek. This is not only true of the liberal professions, law, medicine, and theology, but it is true of the sciences, physical and metaphysical, and of the fine arts. An examination of the very names of these several departments generally, and of their subordinate divisions, however minutely carried out, will show the vast reach of this remark. This being so, a knowledge of the languages which furnish this terminology, must greatly aid the understanding of it; and this not only in one's own profession, department, or specialty, but in the whole range of

science and liberal study beyond his own particular vocation. This is one reason why the study of these languages has been deemed so essential a part of liberal education. By a sort of tacit and instinctive consent the new terms required by the advance of philosophy and science, pure and applied, are, with slight exceptions, in the cultivated nations, taken from the Greek and Latin. Thus they become the common property of the republic of letters through the nations, and down the ages; a great link in the *commune vinculum*, which infusing a common element into the language of the literary and scientific world, binds all its members together in closest brotherhood. To all this may be added the fact that the New Testament, the charter of our common Christianity, and the great spring of modern civilization, is given to us in Greek, while the early Christian literature, and the primitive discussions of Christian doctrine were written in Greek and Latin; and nearly all the great treatises on theology from Augustine until the post-reformation period, have come down to us in Latin. The great principles of civil law too, which the Romans first systematized, find their roots and elementary formulas in the original and later Latin treatises in which they were developed. In these aspects, therefore, the "glossological argument" for the study of the ancient classics, named by Dr. Hedge, is greatly amplified and strengthened. Indeed the very term "glossological" is quite an illustration of what has just been said.

8. There is another view of this subject, in part "glossological," that ought not to be overlooked. Among those studies of language that exert the highest educating power is to be ranked that which traces the original and derivative meanings of words. Some professors of rhetoric begin with *Trench on Words*, deeming such studies of the greatest value as a foundation of rhetorical training. But it is clear that the study of words in their original meaning and its subsequent modifications, is among the most powerful educators of the mind. These changes and variations in the meaning of words are but the articulations of similar processes of thought, and of the relations therein involved, even as the growth of language, alike in copiousness of words, and variety in

their meaning, is but an exponent of the growth of thought. The various meanings developed out of the radical primitive import of a word, are founded on analogy, or the relations of genus and species, or historical circumstances which, as related to the word, are most instructive, or other things the like. To study words through all these changes and ramifications of their meaning, is to thread some of the most subtle distinctions and refinings of human thought; the most important logical relations and analogies—in a word, the normal workings and unfoldings of the human intellect. Hence it is a grand educating power.

But it may and will be said, that all this can be accomplished by the study of words in our own language. To this we answer, first, that the most important part of the vocabulary of the English and other principal modern tongues is taken from the Latin and Greek, and therefore cannot be historically traced as to its origin and development except through those languages. Take any half-dozen of these words, say, conscription, project, traduce, baptism, sacrament, paradise, melancholy, and how clearly does this appear. Secondly, it is only in the necessities involved in finding the meaning of ancient writers, that the degree of attention to these various significations of words can be ordinarily secured in the case of young students, which will give them the full disciplinary benefit of this sort of philological study. What a prodigious knowledge and educational training are given in a thorough mastery of the different meanings, and their mutual relations, of the words *ratio* in Latin, and λογος in Greek; and this too as they come down into modern languages, single or compounded with other words!

Finally, this leads us to say a word of the relations of these studies to history, with which Dr. Hedge thinks most students might more profitably employ their time. Histories, by modern authors, of Greece and Rome, are instructive, and do much to reproduce their life before us. Yet there is no reproduction so real and life-like as in the representations, thoughts, reasonings, narratives, poems, and speeches of their own authors, in their own language. In fact Greece and Rome cannot be duly mirrored to us except through the languages

thereof. These are the most signal achievements of those nations, and the most characteristic outbreathings of their life. Moreover, in the study of these languages, large portions of their history, if not directly brought before the student in the authors he reads, must be found out by him and graven on his mind in order to any due understanding and exegesis, and so any proper translation of what he reads.

But above all, it is only by some knowledge of the ancient classics that the contrast between Christian and ante-Christian history can be understood. They show us the utmost that human nature could achieve in morals and religion without a Divine revelation and without Christianity, in a state of intellectual cultivation and polish, which have made their works, to a large extent, literary models to succeeding nations. So we are prepared to judge aright of Christian history; and to determine what in the condition and achievements of the Christian nations is due to Christianity. Here we cannot do better than quote Dr. Woolsey.

"Another thing worthy to be taken into account is, that the study of the ancient languages forms a connection in the mind of the students, between the ancient and the modern periods. The mathematical sciences have no connection with the world at all. The physical and natural, with the exception of geology, contain almost nothing of a historical character. We need for the highest purposes of life, for instance, that we may be in a condition to judge of the evidences of religion and to understand its nature the better, to come into contact with antiquity, to be able to estimate its spirit, its wants, its actual civilization, to know something of the world before Christ, and the world without Christ. Not only is the key to this furnished by ancient literature, but the study of the works of those ages creates a conception in our minds of the state and progress of mankind which is of use for our culture in the highest sense. Not only is the judgment exercised by the continual habit of estimating probabilities in the combinations of words and of sentences, but the world itself opens to our eyes and becomes more apprehensible; we can trace its plan better, and see a Providence working out its redemption."

Let us now attend to Dr. Hedge's argument for leaving

the studies and behaviour of the student wholly to his own option.

"I venture to suggest that the time has come when this whole system of coercion might, with safety and profit, be done away. Abolish, I would say, your whole system of marks, and college rank, and compulsory tasks. I anticipate an objection drawn from the real or supposed danger of abandoning to their own devices and optional employment boys of the average age of college students. In answer, I say, advance that average by fixing a limit of admissible age. Advance the qualifications for admission; make them equal to the studies of the Freshman year, and reduce the college career from four years to three; or else make the Freshman year a year of probation, and its closing examination the condition of full matriculation. Only give the young men, when once a sufficient foundation has been laid, and the rudiments acquired, the freedom of a true University,—freedom to select their own studies and their own teachers, from such material and such *personnel* as the place affords.

"The rudiments of knowledge may be instilled by compulsory tasks; but to form the scholar, to really educate the man, there should intervene between the years of compulsory study and the active duties of life a season of comparative leisure. By leisure I mean, not cessation of activity, but self-determined activity,—command of one's time for voluntary study.

"There are two things which unless a university can give, it fails of its legitimate end. One is opportunity, the other inspiration. But opportunity is marred, not made, and inspiration quenched, not kindled, by coercion. Few, I suspect, in recent years, have had the love of knowledge awakened by their college life at Harvard,—more often quenched by the rivalries and penalties with which learning here is associated. Give the student, first of all, opportunity; place before him the best apparatus of instruction; tempt him with the best of teachers and books; lead him to the fountains of intellectual life. His use of those fountains must depend on himself. There is a homely proverb touching the impossibility of compelling a horse to drink, which applies to human animals and intellectual draughts as well. The student has been defined by

a German pedagogue as an animal that cannot be forced, but must be persuaded. If, beside opportunity, the college can furnish also the inspiration which shall make opportunity precious and fruitful, its work is accomplished. The college that fulfils these two conditions—opportunity and inspiration—will be a success, will draw to itself the frequency of youth, the patronage of wealth, the consensus of all the good. Such a university, and no other, will be a power in the land.

"Nothing so fatal to inspiration as excessive legislation. It creates two parties, the governors and the governed, with efforts and interests mutually opposed; the governors seeking to establish an artificial order, the governed bent on maintaining their natural liberty. I need not ask you, Alumni, if these two parties exist at Cambridge. They have always existed within the memory of 'the oldest graduate.'

"Professors should not be responsible for the manners of students, beyond the legitimate operation of their personal influence. There should be no penalty but that of expulsion, and that only in the way of self-defence against positively noxious and dangerous members. Let the civil law take care of civil offences."

We cannot restrain our astonishment, to say no more, at language like this from the Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Harvard College. It is little better than an *ad captandum* appeal to the undisciplined feelings and ignorant inexperience of youth, against the control and guidance which are essential to their proper training and education. We favour, to the utmost, all possible advancement in the preparation for entering college. What can be done before entering, makes so much room to do more after entering. We should be glad to have Freshmen begin where they now end, and to gain a whole year in preparation for after-work. But such changes, as all know, are the work of time. Still, suppose this done. Take our American students as they are at the beginning of Sophomore, or even Junior, nay, Senior year; what qualifications have they to select and lay out the course of study most needful for them? What knowledge have they, or in nine cases out of ten, their parents, that fits them for such an office? And if they had this requisite, how could we rely upon volatile youth at

that age, voluntarily to take upon themselves the toil and self-denial required to carry it out? Is it not quite certain that in most cases, this election of studies would rather be of what is most pleasant, than of what is most needful? just as so much of their voluntary reading is apt, until they are duly trained, to turn more to light and amusing books than to the Novum Organum or the Paradise Lost, or the great essayists, poets, historians, and philosophers? They will take to those departments for which they have the greatest aptitude, in which their minds energize with greatest facility—not those in which they are most feeble and deficient, and which most need bracing, in order to that due balance and symmetry of mental development which is one great end of liberal, as preparatory to professional education. True, indeed, Dr. Hedge advises, that in regard to "born philologers," and "exceptional natures that delight in mathematics," "the college should accommodate either bias, to the top of its bent, but should not enforce either with compulsory twist."

We apprehend that this proceeds upon a radical misconception of the whole aim and end of a liberal education. One chief object of it is to substitute a broad for a narrow and one-sided culture: to prepare men to pursue their respective specialties at a later period, when they are mature enough to choose them intelligently, not only with greater power on account of their augmented intellectual vigour, but with some security against that extreme contraction of the mind upon single points, which would give a "life to the study of the dative case," or "find its chief value in the calculation of values." Even professional linguists and mathematicians see all the better through their respective departments, for having some outlook beyond them. He knows best his own home and its value who has taken some surveys beyond it. Doubtless he who works only at the point of a pin will gain amazing expertness therein, but it is in that which has "neither length nor breadth." Men who have no part of their nature developed beyond some single special bent or bias, become, in a sort, intellectual monsters, and unless education does something to correct the abnormity, they grow to be the pedants and bores of literary society, the terror of scholars and gentlemen.

As to this picking and choosing of studies, there is but a very narrow range that can properly be left to the discretion of the student during his college course, simply because he wants the knowledge and judgment requisite for a proper selection. Perhaps a small range of option may be wisely allowed toward the end of the college course, in which the student may elect studies bearing more, in preference to those bearing less, on his future course. In the main, however, his course must be determined for him, if his college career, in ordinary cases, is to be of much value to him. And not only so, his professional course must also be marked out by those wiser and more experienced than himself. This is involved in the very idea of professional schools. They not only afford competent teachers, but fix the course of study, so that the student's efforts may be rendered most effective in preparing him for his work. Here too, though far less than in college, a certain measure, if not of "coercion," yet of enforced courses of study and propriety of conduct comes in. All this, of course, admits of such side reading or study, outside of the regular curriculum, whether in the college or professional school, or in the interval between them, or after leaving the latter, as his opportunities and inclinations may lead him to pursue.

Aside from this insuperable objection to placing the course of study at the option of the student, President Woolsey suggests another at present scarcely less so. It would require a number of professors far beyond the present scholarship of the country, and an amount of endowments vastly beyond the present reach of even our older colleges. Of *competent* professors even within the present average curriculum, there is no surplus. Such an indefinite extension of the possible courses for the student, as would suit the fancies of all sorts of them, or make any approximation to the standard of a proper university, would require hosts of professors in different departments not now attainable, even if the funds were at hand to sustain them.

In reality, however, the best preparation for special courses of study is a liberal education in the true meaning of the term. It has been supposed that our schools of applied science could dispense with a liberal education in their pupils. And

so they can. But some of the ablest professors in those schools have borne their testimony that, as a class, those of their pupils who had enjoyed a regular classical and collegiate education were vastly more susceptible than others to their teachings. This will surely be the testimony of the teachers of law, medicine, and theology. And none the less so, although, in rare instances, men, by the sheer force of eminent natural gifts, attain the highest eminence in these several professions without such advantages. All this we believe to be corroborated by the experience of those institutions that have allowed, to such as desire it, a partial and self-selected course of study, whether with or without the privilege of a regular degree. As a whole, we think it will be conceded that the results with this class of students do not tell much in favour of attempts at high education through courses of study determined by the choice of the student.

Before proceeding to the consideration of the last reform proposed by Dr. Hedge, the abolition of all college laws regulating the conduct, we will call attention to one great principle, apparently overlooked by him, which underlies this whole subject, both of prescribed and enforced courses of study and rules of conduct, one withal which, in our judgment, decides the controversy regarding them, in its main issue, if not in its details. It is a familiar fact, that the first studies in most departments, are in various degrees, uninviting, mechanical, arduous, imposing all the pains of toil with little if any of the pleasures of insight. The rudiments of the sciences therefore, the first front presented by them to the student are apt to be, like those of the alphabet and rudimentary grammar in language, unwelcome and forbidding. It is only after the elementary principles have been mastered by dry and severe study, that the pleasures of insight supervene, and the pangs of intellectual travail at length bring to the birth the "rapturous eureka." The pleasure, the "inspiration" of study in any department, therefore, whatever the ability of the professor, or the inspiring power of his teachings, depend largely on a preliminary toilsome and painful effort, which the young student is sorely tempted to avoid, and generally will avoid if possible, unless some powerful extrinsic motive is supplied to him. He

is therefore in no condition to be safely left to his own choice as to what he shall study, or the manner and degree of diligence with which he shall study. How repulsive, for example, do the first exercise in the syllogism, and in metaphysics, often appear to those, who, after having been induced by sufficient motives, and under vigorous teaching, to toil upon them up to the point of facile insight, sport themselves in threading the tricks of "illicit process," arguing in a circle, *fallacia accidentis*, or in impaling adversaries on the horns of a dilemma? or at length luxuriate in questions of realism, idealism, and materialism, of cause and substance, of monism and pantheism, which have tasked Plato and Aristotle, Kant and Hamilton.

Abolish, says Dr. Hedge, "your whole system of marks, and college rank, and compulsory tasks." What is wanted is, first, opportunity, then inspiration. "But opportunity is marred, not made, and inspiration quenched, not kindled by coercion." This is well enough in the abstract, but in its present application it is shallow and one-sided, to say no more. We deem it enough, after what has already been said, to oppose to it the reasoning and authority of one of the mightiest minds and successful educators of this or any age. Says Sir William Hamilton in closing his introductory lecture on Metaphysics:

"The primary duty of a teacher of philosophy is to take care that the student does actually perform for himself the necessary process. In the first place, he must discover, by examination, whether his instructions have been effective,—whether they have enabled the pupil to go through the intellectual operation; and, if not, it behooves him to supply what is wanting,—to clear up what has been misunderstood. In this view, examinations are of high importance to a professor; for without such a medium between the teacher and the taught, he can never adequately accommodate the character of his instruction to the capacity of his pupils.

"But, in the second place, besides placing his pupil in a condition to perform the necessary process, the instructor ought to do what in him lies to determine the pupil's will to the performance. But how is this to be effected? Only by rendering

the effort more pleasurable than its omission. But every effort is at first difficult,—consequently irksome. The ultimate benefit it promises is dim and remote, while the pupil is often of an age at which present pleasure is more persuasive than future good. The pain of the exertion must, therefore, be overcome by associating with it a still higher pleasure. This can only be effected by enlisting some passion in the cause of improvement. We must awaken emulation, and allow its gratification only through a course of vigorous exertion. Some rigorists, I am aware, would prescribe, on moral and religious grounds, the employment of the passions in education; but such a view is at once false and dangerous. The affections are the work of God; they are not radically evil; they are given us for useful purposes, and are, therefore, not superfluous. It is their abuse that is alone reprehensible. In truth, however, there is no alternative. In youth passion is preponderant. There is then a redundant amount of energy which must be expended; and this, if it find not an outlet through one affection, is sure to find it through another. The aim of education is thus to employ for good those impulses which would otherwise be turned to evil. The passions are never neutral; they are either the best allies, or the worst opponents, of improvement. 'Man's nature,' says Bacon, 'runs either to herbs or weeds; therefore let him seasonably water the one, and destroy the other.' Without the stimulus of emulation, what can education accomplish? The love of abstract knowledge, and the habit of application, are still unformed, and if emulation intervene not, the course by which these are acquired is, from a strenuous and cheerful energy, reduced to an inanimate and dreary effort; and this, too, at an age when pleasure is all-powerful, and impulse predominant over reason. The result is manifest." Again, in note A of the Appendix to the American edition of his Metaphysics, he uses the following emphatic language—"Nothing, therefore, could betray a greater ignorance of human nature, or a greater negligence in employing the most efficient means within its grasp, than for any seminary of education to leave unapplied these great promotive principles of activity, and to take for granted that its pupils would act precisely as they ought, though left with every

inducement strong against, and without any sufficient motive in favour of exertion."

This disposes of a large part of the argument against compulsory regulations, not only as respects studies, but conduct. We are quite ready to let the civil law take effect against its violators, and do what it may in preventing disorderly outbreaks among students. This, however, might do its utmost, and leave the whole life and manners of our colleges in a state so anarchical as to counter-work, if not utterly frustrate, the best efforts of the best professors and best students. Indecorum and disorder in public exercises, academical and religious, are destructive and ruinous to the full extent of their prevalence. They must be prevented by adequate regulations. Some order and decency of deportment must be insisted on at all times and places—especially the avoidance of whatever interferes with study during the hours of study, and with due attention to recitations and lectures while they are going on. Surely our academic groves must not be allowed to degenerate into menageries. To forego all rules and restraints in such matters is really to put the college, its teachers and meritorious students, at the mercy, or rather under the despotism, of the indolent, heedless, mischievous, and vicious members. This would be a deadly blow to education, and a great injustice to all parties. We would go all lengths with the reformers in reducing the number of rules and regulations to the fewest possible, consistent with the paramount end of order, which is the condition of all other good in a college. But this we would not forego at the bidding of any theorizers or reformers.

But the cry is for liberty as the condition of powerful, delighted, successful intellectual activity. There can be no inspiration without liberty. So be it—only let it not be supposed that liberty and law within due limits are incompatible. They are rather mutual complements and supports, in the family, the state, the church, the school, the college, in all sound intellectual and moral training and growth. Even liberty supposes a "law of liberty." Lawlessness is the negation of all genuine freedom—nowhere more than in a college, where the unrestrained licentiousness of the bad is a fatal tyranny over the good: nowhere more than in intellectual

growth, in which the tastes of the young, if unregulated, will run to wild self-indulgence, instead of that wholesome discipline which developes a strong, symmetrical, efficient intellect, that, from first mastering itself, is prepared to master whatever it is called to deal with.

In regard to college, as all other governments, we greatly crave for it the divine art of governing enough without governing too much, and of so governing the student that he shall seem to himself to act of his own choice or spontaneity, rather than under the pressure of an extrinsic authority; that the power without and that within shall be consentaneous, without conscious clashing, like the union of the centrifugal and centripetal forces in harmonious action. So order, and decorum, and diligence are secured, let there be the smallest burden possible of minute rules and irritating exactions.

But, we are told, professors should not be responsible for the morals of students beyond the legitimate sphere of their personal influence. This, like most of the specious utterances from this quarter, is a half-truth, all the more dangerous for want of its complementary counterpart. Professors are bound of course to exert whatever personal influence they can in favour of morality and religion among the students. But still further, the guardians of a college in their collective and authoritative capacity are bound to prohibit, and as far as possible repress, practices which are not only injurious to the offender, but contaminating to his associates, and demoralizing to the college: such as gambling, profaneness, drinking of intoxicating liquors, licentiousness, &c. Within certain limits, during this susceptible period of life, while the student, yet a youth, is withdrawn from parental inspection and domestic influence, the college faculty is *in loco parentis*, and certainly owe it to those who confide sons to their care to do what they can to check vice, exorcise contaminating influences, and put forth a positive and active Christian influence. We will not undertake to say, having no present means of knowledge, what may be the case of Harvard, with its large numbers of opulent youth, its nearness to a great city, and its "broad" religion. But we do say, in regard to the better class of Christian colleges within our acquaintance, that, with all their defects, they furnish the

most safe and hopeful places of resort for youth. The proofs of this, presented in a former article, we cannot now stop to repeat.*

Dr. Hedge even would sanction expulsion of dangerous students. This, of course, will apply to infamous crimes and vices which are both pestilent and incorrigible. Suppose, however, that the student has not reached this pass, but nevertheless shows an idleness, heedlessness, a drift towards vice and disorder which tend this way, threaten such a consummation, and withal are alike injurious to himself and his fellow-students; are no reprimands, penalties, or rewards, to be plied to prevent his sinking to ruin and incurring the brand of EXPULSION? This is the extreme penalty of college laws. It can inflict no civil or corporeal pains or punishments. All milder punishments, while, if ineffectual, they prepare the way to it, yet are designed to save from the need of it, and often with the happiest effect. They are of the nature of warnings, lowering of rank, suspension, informing parents—in short, reformatory and corrective, not destructive. Shall these be abolished? Believe it who will.

In closing this discussion we scarcely need remark, that we shall zealously espouse all real reforms and improvements in the organization and administration of our great institutions of liberal education. We think there is room for progress in all of which we have any knowledge, and that such as stubbornly set themselves against healthy advancement must inevitably be retrograde. Nothing of life can long be stationary, without suffering stagnation. But reformation is not destruction—the issue to which this new project of college reconstruction seems to invite us.

Before dropping our pen, we take occasion to say that the greatest requisite to advancement in our colleges is the increase of facilities and incentives to a more thorough preparation for entering them; and this for the present not so much in the extent of ground gone over, as the style and thoroughness of fitting; the honest *bona fide* mastery, by means of grammar and dictionary, of the books now required to be read for admis-

* See Article on *Religion and Colleges*, January, 1859.

sion to college. There is no lack of schemes for new colleges. He who should elevate those we now have, by founding and endowing a first class preparatory school, not far from each or any one of them, having the excellencies without the faults of the schools of England, would embrace an opportunity which is rarely offered, for doing an inestimable service to the church and country, to this generation and to posterity.

ART. III.—*The Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.* New York. 1866.

WE observe several references in this Report to the want of missionaries. The same want is felt by most missionary institutions. We have seen with regret, in the public press, that the oldest of our missionary Boards reports a diminished number of missionaries, and but one new labourer sent out last year to the foreign field. Clearly more men should be sent out, and in seeking these men the first duty of all is that of prayer to the Lord of the harvest, that he would send them forth. No missionaries of any worth will be obtained except in answer to the prayers of the church, yet this axiom does not preclude the use of suitable means of obtaining them, nor the consideration of those second causes which affect their number, qualifications, and usefulness.

The idea of giving the gospel to the heathen is from Heaven, inspired in the hearts of men by Divine grace. In its development, like most things that endure, this idea takes the form of growth; it is not like a house built, or a machine made, but a seed planted, which springs up and grows. As a growth, its progress will be varied and subject to modifying causes; so a plant is affected by soil, climate, and culture. The growth of the idea of missions differs in each denomination of Christians, but all Protestant churches agree in their view of the object of the missionary enterprise. Their differing means of promoting this object depend on their doctrinal belief, and their opinions

concerning church government and order, perhaps also on their national customs, yet this diversity is not such as to discredit the divine origin of their work, nor to take aught from the idea of growth, each after its kind. Passing all but the Presbyterian type of this idea, we recognize this as developed in beautiful accord with the general church system bearing this venerable name; and in this system no feature is more distinctive than that which relates to the training of the gospel ministry, nor any thing more important than what concerns the efficiency of this ministry in actual service. In both we make most of the Divine element, be it that of the Holy Spirit in his distinctive work, or that of inspired truth as set forth in Holy Scripture, or that of providential ordering which directs all things. But coupled with reverence for God in the whole provision of the ministry, we also recognize the duty of the church, within certain limits, to see that her ministers are well prepared for their work, and well employed in it. The church acts on this view in her educational and presbyterial systems, and in her supervision of her ministers. In all that relates to this subject at home, matters are, in a good degree, settled in the judgment of the church. As to her work abroad, which is of but recent date, and which is performed under such widely varying conditions, it is not surprising that somewhat differing opinions should obtain. Without attempting to describe these varying judgments, or to discuss many of them, we give a few pages to the subject of the training and the distribution of missionaries.

Rightly or wrongly, most of the Protestant churches rely on volunteers for missionaries, and this fact must be kept in view as preliminary to the consideration of their proper training, if not also of their best distribution. Even in the few instances in which training schools for missionaries have been instituted, the young men thus educated are only such as have offered themselves for the work. Certain advantages are no doubt secured on this volunteer system, with some drawbacks also, and with the loss of important qualifications that would be obtained on the plan of having missionaries directly called by the church to engage in this service. The day will come when this plan can be adopted; in the mean time, we take the case as it stands, and leave in abeyance the whole question of a call to

missionary life. On any theory of this call, excepting one, some degree of training for future labour would be considered useful. If missionaries ought to be those only who need no other qualification than the consciousness of an inward call of the Holy Spirit to serve Christ among the heathen, the training of the schools and the experience of years may be dispensed with. We find no warrant for this theory in the Scriptures, and little countenance to it in practice; it is only too easy for some men to mistake their own impulses, and to misjudge the circumstances of their lives, so as to fancy that they should go out as missionaries. As an example, one out of several, we knew a man who was over forty years of age, having a wife and six children, with no education beyond the simplest rudiments, without clear religious views, but possessing energy in more than ordinary degree, who left his home in the interior and came with his family to one of our seaport cities, under the sincere conviction that it was his duty to go, without delay, as a missionary to China. His application to be sent out having been declined by more than one missionary society, he then engaged in some kind of work to earn a support for himself and family, and died after a few years,—his completed course showing that he was not called to be a foreign missionary by the unerring Spirit. While such mistakes may be made, we so highly reverence the sovereign and gracious work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men, that we should expect to see happy results from the missionary labours of many thus taught, even though they might not be learned in the studies of the college or the theological school; yet these good men might expect, unless in extraordinary instances, to have their usefulness increased by proper training.

At the opposite extreme, we find those who make every thing of training, and little of what we understand by the call of the Spirit. Missionaries are to be made as lawyers or doctors are made, they are to be educated for the work. The often-lauded school at Rome for the education of missionaries, gives us a striking example of this idea. Young men are brought from Asia, Africa, America, and the Islands of the Seas, to this school to be trained, and then they are sent back to their own country as Romish priests. Possessing the

vernacular language as their mother tongue, and taught in the wisdom of the Romans, they are sometimes held up for our imitation. We often hear the question, why do not our Missionary Boards bring some of the converts in India or China to this country, to be educated, and then to be sent back as missionaries? The question is a fair one, and the school at Rome is in some respects its answer. Were it our object to train up a class of ritualists, missionaries whose main duties would be the performance of ceremonies, men whose knowledge of the Scriptures and whose experience of Divine grace counted for little, agents whose service was to be regulated by their allegiance to the vicar of Rome rather than to our blessed Lord, then might we institute a school of this kind; but for such training as our missionaries need, there is a more excellent way,—as we shall see further on.

Another phase of missionary education is represented by the excellent Protestant schools at Basle and Islington, in which young men are in preparation for the foreign field through the whole course of study, usually extending over several years,—at Basle occupying six years. In these schools, a good degree of practical education is given; they have sent forth many valuable missionaries, some of whom have been men of superior scholarship. They may be expedient in countries where young men of limited pecuniary means cannot readily gain access to the colleges and universities; but in our country no difficulty of this kind stands in the way, and we should greatly deprecate the training of missionaries as a class separate from most ministers of the church. They would come to be regarded as of a less honoured type, and would lose the sympathy of many Christian people, while ministers at home would cease to feel the incentives to the duty of sustaining the work of missions, which grow out of their common education with their brethren in the foreign field. The result would be a diminished number of missionaries, and very likely the sending out of inferior men.

The true idea is that missionaries should be educated like other ministers, so far as college and seminary studies are concerned. Their support during their course of study should be provided in the same way, either by themselves and their

friends, or by the aid of our Educational Boards. In all respects they ought to be men of the same character, attainments, and social position with their clerical brethren at home, equally qualified for their work, enjoying the esteem of their classmates who are pastors of the churches, and having the confidence and sympathy of the churches themselves. Their missionary work, in all its varied duties, will then be fulfilled with ability corresponding to the average efficiency of ministers at home; and a kind consideration will be given by the church to the claims of superannuated or infirm missionaries, their widows, and children, such as could be expected only for those who stood on the same footing with similar cases in this country.

Our educational system sends forth men of varied gifts, some of them likely to be far more useful than others; we covet for missionary service men eminent in grace and also in gifts; in no instance should men of qualifications below the average be sent, while there is need of talents of the highest order. The idea that any good man will answer for the heathen can hardly be too severely reprobated. To lay the foundation of the church in Africa or Siam requires master workmen. To become scholars of eminence in the languages of China or India is no task for men of feeble parts, and no man should be sent forth, or should continue in the missionary field, who cannot in a few years become well acquainted with the vernacular language. To deal wisely with questions that spring up calls for mature general scholarship, insight into the motives of action, perception of the consequences, near and remote, of measures presented for one's approval; while to sway the minds of men needs in every nation very much the same high order of mental and moral power. It is Divine grace, however, which chiefly qualifies men for usefulness, and we covet most in missionaries earnest love and faith, manifested in humble, patient, unceasing labours for Christ and his kingdom. And for acquiring these qualifications of usefulness, our church arrangements as now existing furnish admirable provision.

A Chair of instruction in missions in our theological schools, has been advocated. More than thirty years ago something of this kind was under the consideration of the General Assem-

bly. The Free Church of Scotland has lately adopted this measure. Something, perhaps much, may be conceded as of value in an arrangement of studies in the Theological Seminary, which would furnish lectures, information, and counsel concerning missions,—having reference to the wonderful openings for the spread of the gospel in our day, and also to the diversified nature of modern evangelistic efforts. It were easy however, to expect too much from a professorship of this kind. No one man could give lessons, for instance, in all the languages spoken in our missions; nor could he always impart the counsel which young men need as to particular fields of labour, departments of work, adaptation of health to climate, and similar practical matters, some of which vary every year in their relation to different countries; we refer to such cases as often call for the best consideration of our secretaries of foreign missions. If the missionary professor were expected, moreover, to spend a part of his time among the churches, seeking to foster an interest in his great theme, he would find it difficult in our widely extended country to engage in this service without neglecting the duties of the class-room and the preparation required for these duties. We should think the German idea of Professor Extraordinary preferable in some respects, as opening the way for the services of returned missionaries in lectures on their respective fields of labour. It might be invidious to select men fitted to render the best service, but if men like Lowrie, Culbertson, and Fullerton—not to speak of any but missionaries who have finished their course, could be employed to give several lectures, each on his own field of labour, its people, their language, religion, the work of missions among them,—spending a few weeks at each one of our Theological Seminaries, the result might be happy. There may be objections even to a modified arrangement of this kind, and at any rate its practical details would require careful consideration and adjustment; perhaps it would be found to be impracticable. The working of the Scotch plan will be watched with interest. In a small old settled country like Scotland, among a homogeneous people, in churches all completely moulded by the Westminster type of theology, a missionary professor of eminent talents and surpassing eloquence, such a man as the

venerable missionary at whose instance this Chair has been founded, could exert a happy influence on behalf of the cause of missions in all parts of the land, as well as among all the sons of the prophets. It is well that the experiment is to be made under such favourable conditions. If it is found to work well there, the churches of other countries may inquire into its adaptation to their circumstances. In the mean time the missionary training of our candidates for the ministry is in good hands, and rests on correct ideas. The support of the work of missions is one of the duties of all Christians. The teaching of the pulpit, expounding the word of God, is the best human agency for leading Christian people to perform this duty. To aid this teaching, our Theological Seminaries are founded. Some of their students go abroad, others remain at home, both serving the Lord; and both need instruction while attending the seminary in regard to the missionary aspect of their vocation. Each professor gives instruction concerning it in his own department. All the leading divisions of our course of theological study have direct bearings on the work of Christian missions, in its home support and its development abroad. It is a work inseparably connected with right views of Scripture Exegesis, Theological Doctrine, Church History, Government in the Church, Homiletics, &c.; and the practical spirit of missions is closely related to the life of piety in the soul, which is fostered by the devotional services and the pastoral influence of professors, so greatly prized in our theological institutions. We may rest therefore in the conclusion, that the ordinary training of our ministers is the best training of our missionaries. Even the special provision of evangelistic instruction, if it were deemed expedient to make it, would inure almost equally to the benefit of all our ministers; indeed its bearing on the ministry at home might be one of its main recommendations. It cannot be questioned that one of the greatest wants of the ministry in our time is piety of the order needed by our foreign missionaries,—of the type so nobly exemplified by all ministers of the gospel in the first ages of the Christian church. If a missionary professorship would aid in supplying this want, it might well be founded without delay.

Thus far we have considered the training of missionaries of

our own country; the training of native missionaries in all unevangelized countries is not less essential to the prevalence of the Christian faith. The idea that missionaries must be sent forth from Christian countries in sufficient number to preach the gospel to every creature, we apprehend, is supported neither by Apostolic precedent nor by enlightened reason; without the restoration of the gift of tongues we see not how it would be practicable. In the native churches of every people will be found men that can be set apart to the work of the ministry; and these men will possess superior advantages over foreign evangelists, in their knowledge of the language, ideas, associations, usages, and way of life of their countrymen, in their living in their own climate and at small pecuniary expense, in short, in their being at home among their own people. Native ministers are now pastors of churches or evangelists in China, Burmah, India, West and South Africa, Western Asia, the islands of the seas,—men eminent in piety and in useful labours for the spread of the gospel. In all unevangelized nations the great want is that of such men, in number equal to the work of teaching every creature, and in qualifications so far advanced as to make them capable of rightly dividing the word of God. Our missionary policy and plans should be directed to the training of these men, or else our hopes will inevitably end in disappointment,—their training, not their support. Their support is indeed a matter of pressing moment. It may have in most cases to be provided at first from abroad, but it should be so ministered as to be readily turned over to the native Christian community at the earliest practicable moment; and in the meantime the native ministers should not be encouraged to adopt the expensive ways of European and American social life. This unfits them for intercourse with their own people, and increases the burden of the churches in the support of the ministry. Our remarks must be restricted, however, to the training of these native ministers.

The Roman church, as we have seen, brings candidates for the priesthood from their native country to Rome for higher instruction. Besides the objections already suggested to this measure, these young men are likely to be injured by acquiring the habits of foreigners; and this difficulty would be increased

among Protestant native candidates on our views of domestic life in the ministry, according to which married men—not too early married—are as a rule to be preferred. It would be a calamity if our Hindu or Chinese brethren, brought to our Theological Seminaries to be trained for the ministry, should return to their own country denationalized, having learned to look with contempt on the dress, the table, and other practical matters included in the idea of every-day life among their own people. They would be likely to receive injury from excessive attentions paid to them at first, or not less from want of judicious and kindly sympathy. It is, however, simply impracticable to adopt a measure of this kind on a large scale, both for its heavy expense and its severance of family ties; and were it practicable, we should still question whether the education of these young men should be conducted at all in the English or any other foreign language. No more useful native missionaries are to be found than Karen and Chinese brethren, who are acquainted only with their mother tongue. They should be able, at least many of them, to use freely the original languages of the Holy Scriptures; but while a knowledge of English, French, or German, may in some cases be desirable, it is difficult to be acquired, and when gained it is attended with many temptations to abandon the ministry for secular employment, as more remunerating. The peculiar circumstances of each country and people, however, should be well considered in their bearing on this topic; there may be instances in which this knowledge of a foreign language would be very useful.

The instruction of native ministers calls for no remark in this place, excepting that it should be scriptural, practical, and so far complete us to fit them for usefulness among their own people. The outline of our theological course of study will no doubt be kept in view by the instructors of our native missionaries, to be filled up as far as circumstances permit, which in many cases would be only in a very moderate degree. It is important that suitable text-books should be prepared early for the use of these native candidates. So far as the place and the instructors are concerned, each of two methods has certain advantages. The native candidate for the ministry may receive

instruction from his spiritual father at the station where he lives, and thus his theological training will bear some proportion to the qualifications of his teacher, the time at his command, and other circumstances; there is danger lest it be irregular and fragmentary, but it may possess a good degree of adaptation to practical usefulness. This method might be made in some cases thoroughly effective, and in no case should it be left out of use whatever other plan may be adopted. It is, as we suppose, virtually the method pursued by the Great Teacher in the training of the Apostles. In small missions, and perhaps in the early stages of every mission, it is the only method that can be adopted. On the other general plan, all the candidates in a certain district are brought together and form a theological class, under the instruction of a missionary appointed for the purpose. A theological training somewhat systematic and complete, useful acquaintance with one's fellow-labourers, valuable incentives to a life of piety and of devoted labours for Christ, broader views of their work and their relations to the church, serve to recommend this method of teaching our native ministers. Modifications of these plans need not here be considered. The well ordered system of Presbytery as a form of church government is comprehensive and flexible enough to provide for a satisfactory treatment of this vital subject; and every church court on missionary ground should give particular consideration to its claims. Whatever views are held, let some plan be intelligently adopted and firmly carried into effect, in complete distinction from the desultory, fragmentary, pointless efforts which yield so little fruit.

Closely connected with the training of missionaries is their distribution, as in an army the proper disposal of troops in the field follows their drilling in the camp, and is equally essential to victory. The distribution of our foreign missionary force has respect to the countries to be evangelized, and the stations to be occupied. The countries are marked out clearly for the American church. While the field is the world, it is not to all parts of this vast field that the Christians of all countries should equally send forth evangelists, but to such only as the hand of Providence may direct in the case of each denomination. No one will question the duty of our American churches

to send the gospel to the Indian tribes, to the Chinese emigrants in our Pacific states, to the Jews who are our fellow-citizens, as well as to all classes of unevangelized people in our country. Going into the regions beyond our boundaries, when our missionaries were sent out, thirty or forty years ago, Western Asia, India, Burmah, and Siam were accessible; and the evident success of our missions in these countries, as well as the spiritual wants of their inhabitants yet unsupplied, and the open doors still unentered, constitute a strong argument for the continued employment of American missionaries in these lands. Indeed, if our brethren were withdrawn from Burmah and Siam, and from Japan, lately entered, no labourers from Christian countries would be left. Even from India, which has special claims on the British churches, and where there are over five hundred European and American ordained missionaries, and about one-third as many native ordained ministers, we would withdraw no American labourer. The past history of our evangelistic work among the Hindus, and its present prospects, justify our missionary Boards in maintaining the existing staff of evangelists; and well may we ask, what are these among a heathen and Mohammedan population of nearly two hundred millions? If the number of our missionaries in this country may not be largely increased, let vacant places at least be supplied with new labourers, and let our plans be shaped in the best way for the training and employment of native missionaries. Into their hands, and into the charge of our English, Scotch, and Irish brethren, the work of evangelization in India may still be mainly entrusted.

In three of the other main fields of foreign missions, the churches of our country have been summoned to enter by the wonderful events of comparatively recent years, indeed, of days hardly yet ending—South America, Africa, and China. The first, Mexico included, as a part of our own continent, as opening gradually to our missionary agencies, as related to us by political and commercial ties of growing intimacy, and as burdened by the same religious bondage which many seek to impose on our countrymen, has certainly claims on our missionary zeal of peculiar and increasing force. Between Western Africa and China, our country in its geographical position stands as

the only Christian nation, and obviously sustains relations of peculiar interest to each. The remarkable orderings of Providence, which have connected Africa and her children with our country, and thus led to such wonderful and even terrible events in our history, have yet a rainbow aspect when viewed with reference to our giving the gospel to the African people. No other race has stronger claims on our missionary zeal. Turning to the East, the great hive of our race in Asia has suddenly come near to us, and has already swarmed into two or three of our states. Before these lines meet the eye of the reader the first steamer of a line of noble ships will be well on its way from our western seaport to the ports of China, carrying among her passengers some of our excellent missionaries. Who that has understanding of the times, and that looks thoughtfully towards the four hundred millions of Chinamen, can doubt that our churches are called to engage largely in the work of evangelizing this ancient, sensible, practical people. The one hundred and two European and American missionaries which the latest reports enumerate in China, aided by perhaps a score of native ministers, make but a small force, and one that is altogether inadequate to the work to be done. Let it be considered that the call for more men in this missionary field comes with a loud voice to our American churches. No others are more favourably situated for responding to it; indeed no others have equal access to this field of missions; no others have performed greater services preparatory to active labours, and no others have already enjoyed more signal proofs of the Divine blessing upon the work of their hands. Manifold should our missionaries be increased in the land of Sinim.

Passing to the stations to be occupied, we meet with three leading theories. One would make every foreign missionary an itinerant preacher, having some convenient place as his point of departure, or else literally living in tents all the year; and this idea is held with greater or less reference to native assistants. Most would employ these native helpers, and depend very much on their assistance, but we have known some who seemed to feel contented when they had preached a sermon in a heathen village, and were then ready to shake off the dust of their feet as a testimony against them, understanding in this

erroneous way one of the verses in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew. The usefulness of well-planned and well-sustained itinerant labours in some heathen countries cannot for a moment be called in question, but that they should be prosecuted in the case of most missionaries in connection with other and stationed work, will appear as we proceed. A second and more common plan is that of occupying as many stations as possible with foreign labourers, placing one or preferably two at each. These men engage in preaching services held by the wayside, and also in churches or chapels at stated times; they take the charge of schools, in many cases; they go out on missionary tours sometimes; they seek the assistance of native teachers and preachers; they are occupied with work for the press; obviously much good may be done in this way. Two or three drawbacks, however, are likely to attend it—the work grows on their hands beyond their ability to do it justice; their health gives way, and it is difficult to obtain relief or assistance, the missionaries at other stations being equally overworked; and it may be questioned whether on this plan the great element of native evangelizing agency will be developed in the fullest degree, inasmuch as the foreign labourer often cannot leave his station to watch over and encourage his native brethren at such outposts as they should occupy. A third plan contemplates the performance of the same kinds of work as the second, but differs from the latter in placing a goodly number of missionaries at a few well selected central cities or towns. In these the several departments of missionary work can be conducted with vigour, on some easily arranged system of division of labour. In the event of illness or bereavement among the missionaries, relief could be given or provision made for continuing the work, by the temporary re-arrangement of duties. Whatever labours were undertaken would be such as the missionaries approved in joint conference, under the sanction of the Home Committee, not however to the restriction of any one's liberty or energy of action in his own department, but yet guarding against the unwise attempting to do everything, which in some cases of isolated action ends only in disappointment; on the other hand, all the labours of the brethren, wisely proportioned, carried forward with mutual sympathy and coöpera-

tion, would exemplify the power of united action, on which so much of efficiency and success depends. But the main advantage of this plan is that it gives enlarged scope for the employment of native labourers in active missionary service. These may be placed at neighbouring towns and villages and often visited; without such frequent intercourse being maintained between them and their missionary friends, they are likely to fall off in their zeal, to give way to temptation, and to disappoint many cherished hopes of their usefulness. For the employment of an extensive and thorough system of native missionary agency, we apprehend that the action of the missionary Presbytery must contemplate supervision from central stations; this supervision indeed is its proper work, and in all cases it should be so ordered as to prove a source of strength and encouragement to the native brethren. The ministers among them, being themselves members of the Presbytery, would incur no risk of being unfairly dealt with, and could contribute much to the influence of their foreign co-presbyters.

Our missionary plans should all bear reference to the best employment of native agency; this indeed should be one of the main ends of their policy. To save lost souls is the great object of Christian missions, so far as man is concerned, and they are to be saved chiefly by the preaching of ministers of the gospel who are natives in each country. The temptation of most foreign missionaries, or at any rate their tendency, is that of doing too much of the work of evangelization themselves, and connected with this, their being slow to transfer responsible work to the hands of native assistants. In some missions of considerable maturity there are but few native ministers, and still fewer native pastors, while there is a large body of native assistants of other grades. It is likely that most of these assistants are not well qualified to become evangelists or pastors, but our plans should be so arranged as to impart the qualifications needed, in so far as these can be taught by men, and when Divine grace has been granted to these "helpers," to launch them forth on the great sea of native life. Let them be taught like our children to walk alone, not always leaning on the arm of their missionary friends, yet always under their kind and watchful eye. Let them be stationed in neighbouring

towns and cities, two or three in company. Let the growth and expansion of the mission take this form, that of spreading in all directions by the out-stationing of native labourers, rather than by occupying feebly numerous stations by foreign missionaries. Accordingly we should advise the grouping or stationing of missionaries, in fields which admit of this kind of centralized labour, at a few commanding centres of influence. In China, one well-manned central station in a province would, in ordinary cases, be sufficient for the work of each Missionary Board. In the case of missions already established on the second general plan, no immediate or radical change of policy would be expedient; nothing must be risked that we have gained by long years of noble and patient labour; yet the desired change could still be safely though gradually made,—by selecting certain stations as the main stations, to be strongly manned by both foreign and native labourers, and then by having the other stations, as their foreign labourers are removed by sickness or other causes, occupied by the best native labourers available, to be under the supervision of the missionaries at the nearest main station. These are somewhat matters of detail, we refer to them here only as connected with general views of the subject; and if this change were made, it should be rested on general reasons, not on personal, local, or economical considerations, and certainly not because the want of missionaries rendered a measure of this kind a matter of necessity. This want is deeply to be deplored, and it might become so serious as to be a good reason for reconstructing our missionary plans; but the subject as we here view it, is one having general and broad bearings. In some countries, and among tribes of small population, this line of action might be inexpedient, perhaps impracticable; but in the midst of people whose number is reckoned by scores and hundreds of millions, it would result in our having large, well-supported stations of foreign missionaries, surrounded by an ever increasing number of stations occupied by native labourers, into whose hands the work of evangelizing their own people would be transferred, more and more.

Our plans may be good,—they ought to be the best,—broad, well-balanced, far-reaching, in some degree worthy of the glorious end of the church as a missionary body,—yet we must

not put our trust in our good methods, nor in our excellent brethren, nor in the church itself, but only in the presence and grace of Him, who has said, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." We think, on the general views here presented, the work of Christian missions would have a steady growth, sending its roots deep into the ground, spreading widely its branches, and yielding fruit unto eternal life.

Art. IV.—*Gregory the Theologian.*

The province of Cappadocia, which was by no means noted for general intelligence, gave rise, in the fourth century, to three of the most eminent divines of the Greek church, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory the Theologian, or Gregory Nazianzen, who, in connection with Athanasius the Great, decided the victory of the orthodox doctrine of the Divinity of Christ and the Holy Trinity against Arianism and Semi-Arianism. Among these Basil was most distinguished and influential as a bishop and pastor, Gregory of Nyssa as a thinker, and Gregory Nazianzen as an orator. They were united by the tie of sanctified friendship, and coöperated hand and heart for the success of the Nicene faith. Basil died before its final triumph, but the two Gregories attended, and the one for a time presided over, the second œcumenical council, held at Constantinople 381, which reaffirmed, enlarged, and fixed the Nicene Creed, which is traced by some writers, though incorrectly, to the authorship of Gregory of Nyssa.

The life of Gregory Nazianzen, with its alternations of high station, monastic seclusion, love of severe studies, enthusiasm for poetry, nature, and friendship, possesses a romantic charm. He was "by inclination and fortune tossed between the silence of a contemplative life and the tumult of church administration, unsatisfied with either, neither a thinker nor a poet, but, according to his youthful desire, an orator, who, though often bombastic and dry, laboured as powerfully for the victory of orthodoxy as for true practical Christianity." So

Hase admirably characterizes him in his Compend of Church History. Gibbon speaks of him with considerable interest in the twenty-second chapter of his great work, and makes the characteristic remark: "The title of Saint has been added to his name; but the tenderness of his heart, and the elegance of his genius, reflect a more pleasing lustre on the memory of Gregory Nazianzen." The praise of "the tenderness of his heart" suggests to the sceptical historian another fling at ancient Christianity, by adding the note: "I can only be understood to mean, that such was his natural temper when it was not hardened, or inflamed, by religious zeal. From his retirement, he exhorts Nectarius to prosecute the heretics of Constantinople."

Gregory Nazianzen was born about 330, a year before the emperor Julian, either at Nazianzus, a market-town in the southwestern part of Cappadocia, where his father was bishop, or in the neighbouring village of Arianzus. Respecting the time and place of his birth, views are divided. According to Suidas, Gregory was over ninety years old, and therefore, since he died in 389 or 390, must have been born about the year 300. This statement was accepted by Pagi and other Roman divines, to remove the scandal of his canonized father's having begotten children after he became bishop; but it is irreconcilable with the fact that Gregory, according to his own testimony, (*Carmen de vita sua*, v. 112 and 238, and *Orat.* v. c. 23,) studied in Athens at the same time with Julian the Apostate, therefore in 355, and left Athens at the age of thirty years. Comp. Tillemont, tom. ix. p. 693—697; Schröeckh, *Church Hist.* xiii. p. 276, and the admirable monograph of Ullman on Gregory Nazianzen, 548, sqq.

In the formation of his religious character his mother Nonna, one of the noblest Christian women of antiquity, worthy to be placed at the side of Monica, the mother of Augustine, exerted a deep and wholesome influence. By her prayers and her holy life she brought about the conversion of her husband from the sect of the Hypsistarians, who, without positive faith, worshipped simply a supreme being; and she consecrated her son, as Hannah consecrated Samuel, even before his birth, to the service of God. "She was," as Gregory describes her, "a

wife according to the mind of Solomon; in all things subject to her husband according to the laws of marriage, not ashamed to be his teacher and his leader in true religion. She solved the difficult problem of uniting a higher culture, especially in knowledge of divine things and strict exercise of devotion, with the practical care of her household. If she was active in her house, she seemed to know nothing of the exercises of religion; if she occupied herself with God and his worship, she seemed to be a stranger to every earthly occupation; she was whole in everything. Experiences had instilled into her unbounded confidence in the effects of believing prayer; therefore she was most diligent in supplications, and by prayer overcame even the deepest feelings of grief over her own and others' sufferings. She had by this means attained such control over her spirit, that in every sorrow she encountered, she never uttered a plaintive tone, before she had thanked God." He especially celebrates also her extraordinary liberality and self-denying love for the poor and the sick. But it seems to be not in perfect harmony with this, that he relates of her: "Towards heathen women she was so intolerant, that she never offered her mouth or hand to them in salutation.* She ate no salt with those who came from the unhallowed altars of idols. Pagan temples she did not look at, much less would she have stepped upon their ground; and she was as far from visiting the theatre." Of course her piety moved entirely in the spirit of that time, bore the stamp of ascetic legalism rather than of evangelical freedom, and adhered rigidly to certain outward forms. Significant also is her great reverence for sacred things. "She did not venture to turn her back upon the holy table, or to spit upon the floor of the church." Her death was worthy of a holy life. At a great age, in the church which her husband had built almost entirely with his own means, she died, holding fast with one hand to the altar, and raising the other imploringly to heaven, with the words: "Be gracious to me, O Christ, my King!" Amidst universal sorrow, especially among the widows and orphans whose comfort and help she had been,

* Against the express injunction of love for enemies, Matt. v. 44, sqq. The command of John in his second Epistle, v. 10, 11, which might be quoted in justification of Nonna, refers not to pagans, but to antichristian heretics.

she was laid to rest by the side of her husband near the graves of the martyrs. Her affectionate son says in one of the poems in which he extols her piety and her blessed end: "Bewail, O mortals, the mortal race; but when one dies, like Nonna, *praying*, then weep I not."*

Gregory was early instructed in the Holy Scriptures and in the rudiments of science. He soon conceived a special predilection for the study of oratory, and through the influence of his mother, strengthened by a dream,† he determined on the celibate life, that he might devote himself without distraction to the kingdom of God. Like the other church fathers of this period, he also gave this condition the preference, and extolled it in orations and poems, though without denying the usefulness and Divine appointment of marriage. His father, and his friend Gregory of Nyssa, were among the few bishops of the Nicene age who lived in wedlock. Soon afterwards marriage was prohibited to bishops altogether, while the lower clergy in the Greek church were allowed and are expected to marry to this day.

From his native town he went for his further education to Cæsarea in Cappadocia, where he probably already made a preliminary acquaintance with Basil; then to Cæsarea in Palestine, where there were at that time celebrated schools of eloquence; thence to Alexandria, where his revered Athanasius wore the supreme dignity of the church; and finally to Athens, which still maintained its ancient renown as the seat of Grecian science and art. Upon the voyage thither he survived a fearful storm, which threw him into the greatest mental anguish, especially because, though educated a Christian, he, according to a not unusual custom of that time, had not yet received holy baptism, which was to him the condition of salvation. His deliverance he ascribed partly to the intercession of his parents,

* Carm. 116, p. 107.

† There appeared to him two veiled virgins, of unearthly beauty, who called themselves *Purity* and *Chastity*, companions of Jesus Christ, and friends of those who renounced all earthly connections for the sake of leading a perfectly divine life. After exhorting the youth to join himself to them in spirit, they rose again to heaven.—Carmen iv. ver. 205—285.

who had intimation of his peril by presentiments and dreams, and he took it as a second consecration to the spiritual office.

In Athens he formed or strengthened the bond of that beautiful Christian friendship with Basil, which, with a brief interruption, lasted till death. They were, as Gregory says, only one soul animating two bodies. He became acquainted also with the prince Julian, who was at that time studying there, but felt wholly repelled by him, and said of him, with prophetic foresight, "What evil is the Roman empire here educating for itself!" He was afterwards a bitter antagonist of Julian, and wrote two invective discourses against him after his death, which are inspired, however, more by the fire of passion, than by pure enthusiasm for Christianity, and which were intended to expose him to universal ignominy as a horrible monument of enmity to Christianity, and of the retributive judgment of God.*

Friends wished Gregory to settle in Athens as a teacher of eloquence, but he left there in his thirtieth year, and returned through Constantinople, where he took with him his brother Cæsarius,† a distinguished physician, to his native city and his parents' house. At this time his baptism took place. With his whole soul he now threw himself into a strict ascetic life. He renounced innocent enjoyments, even to music, because they flatter the senses. "His food was bread and salt, his drink water, his bed the bare ground, his garment of coarse rough cloth. Labour filled the day; praying, singing, and holy contemplation, a great part of the night. His earlier life, which was anything but loose, only not so very strict, seemed to him reprehensible; his former laughing now cost him many tears.

* These Invectivæ, or λόγοι στηλιτευτικοί, are, according to the old order, the 3d and 4th, according to the new, the 4th and 5th, of Gregory's Orations, tom. i. p. 78—176 of the Benedictine edition.

† To this Cæsarius, who was afterwards physician in ordinary to the Emperor in Constantinople, many, following Photius, ascribe the still extant collection of theological and philosophical questions, *Dialogi iv., sive Quæstiones theol. et philos.* 145; but without sufficient ground. Comp. Fabricii Bibl. Gr. viii., p. 435. He was a true Christian, but was not baptized till shortly before his death in 368. His mother Nonna followed the funeral procession in the white raiment of festive joy. He was afterwards, like his brother Gregory, his sister Gorgonia, and his mother, received into the number of the saints of the Catholic church.

Silence and quiet meditation were law and pleasure to him."* Nothing but love to his parents restrained him from entire seclusion, and induced him, contrary to talent and inclination, to assist his father in the management of his household and his property.

But he soon followed his powerful bent toward the contemplative life of solitude, and spent a short time with Basil in a quiet district of Pontus, in prayer, spiritual contemplations, and manual labours. "Who will transport me," he afterwards wrote to his friend concerning this visit,† "back to those former days, in which I revelled with thee in privations? For voluntary poverty is after all far more honourable than enforced enjoyment. Who will give me back those songs and vigils? who, those risings to God in prayer, that unearthly, incorporeal life, that fellowship and that spiritual harmony of brothers raised by thee to a God-like life? who, the ardent searching of the Holy Scriptures, and the light which, under the guidance of the Spirit, we found therein?" Then he mentions the lesser enjoyments of the beauties of surrounding nature.

The intimate friendship of Basil and Gregory, lasting from fresh, enthusiastic youth till death, resting on an identity of spiritual and moral aims, and sanctified by Christian piety, is a lovely and engaging chapter in the history of the fathers, and justifies a brief episode in a field not yet entered by any church historian.

With all the ascetic narrowness of the time, which fettered even these enlightened fathers, they still had minds susceptible to science and art and the beauties of nature. In the works of Basil and of the two Gregories occur pictures of nature such as we seek in vain in the heathen classics. The descriptions of natural scenery among the poets and philosophers of ancient Greece and Rome can be easily compressed within a few pages. Socrates, as we learn from Plato, was of the opinion that we can learn nothing from trees and fields, and hence he never took a walk; he was so bent upon self-knowledge as the true aim of all learning, that he regarded the whole study of nature as

* Ullmann's Monograph on Gregory Naz. p. 50. Comp. Gregory's Carm. v. 70, 75; Carm. liv., v. 153–175.

† Epist. ix. p. 774 of the old order, or Ep. vi. of the new (ed. Bened. ii. p. 6.)

useless, because it did not tend to make man either more intelligent or more virtuous. The deeper sense of the beauty of nature is awakened by the religion of revelation alone, which teaches us to see everywhere in creation the traces of the power, the wisdom, and the goodness of God.

The book of Ruth, the book of Job, many Psalms, particularly the 104th, are without parallel in Grecian or Roman literature. The renowned naturalist, Alexander von Humboldt, collected some of the most beautiful descriptions of nature from the fathers for his purposes.* They are an interesting proof of the transfiguring power of the spirit of Christianity even upon our views of nature.

A breath of sweet sadness runs through them, which is entirely foreign to classical antiquity. This is especially manifest in Gregory of Nyssa, the brother of Basil. "When I see," says he, for example, "every rocky ridge, every valley, every plain, covered with new-grown grass; and then the variegated beauty of the trees, and at my feet the lilies doubly enriched by nature with sweet odours and gorgeous colours; when I view in the distance the sea, to which the changing cloud leads out,—my soul is seized with sadness which is not without delight. And when in autumn fruits disappear, leaves fall, boughs stiffen, stripped of their beauteous dress,—we sink with the perpetual and regular vicissitude into the harmony of wonder-working nature. He who looks through this with the thoughtful eye of the soul, feels the littleness of man in the greatness of the universe."† Yet we find sunny pictures also, like the beautiful description of spring in an oration of Gregory Nazianzen on the martyr Mamas.‡

* In the second volume of his *Cosmos*, Stuttg. and Tübingen, 1847, p. 27, sqq., Humboldt justly observes, p. 26; "The tendency of Christian sentiment was, to prove from universal order and from the beauty of nature the greatness and goodness of the Creator. Such a tendency, to glorify the Deity from his works, occasioned a prepension to descriptions of nature." The earliest and largest picture of this kind he finds in the apologetic writer, Minucius Felix. Then he draws several examples from Basil, (for whom he confesses he had "long entertained a special predilection"), Epist. xiv. and Ep. ccxxiii. (tom. iii., ed. Garnier), from Gregory of Nyssa, and from Chrysostom.

† From several fragments of Gregory of Nyssa, combined and translated (into German) by Humboldt, l. c. p. 29, sqq.

‡ See Ullmann's Gregor von Nazianz, p. 210, sqq.

A second characteristic of these representations of nature, and for the church historian the most important, is the reference of earthly beauty to an eternal and heavenly principle, and that glorification of God in the works of creation, which transplanted itself from the Psalms and the book of Job into the Christian church. In his Homilies on the history of the creation Basil describes the mildness of the serene nights in Asia Minor, where the stars, "the eternal flowers of heaven, raised the spirit of man from the visible to the invisible." In the oration just mentioned, after describing the spring in the most lovely and life-like colours, Gregory Nazianzen proceeds: "Everything praises God and glorifies him with unutterable tones; for everything shall thanks be offered also to God by me, and thus shall the song of those creatures, whose song of praise I here utter, be also ours. . . . Indeed it is now [alluding to the Easter festival] the springtime of the world, the springtime of the spirit, springtime for souls, springtime for bodies, a visible spring, an invisible spring, in which we also shall then have part, if we here be rightly transformed, and enter as new men upon a new life." Thus the earth becomes a vestibule of heaven, the beauty of the body is consecrated an image of the beauty of the spirit.

The Greek fathers placed the beauty of nature above the works of art, having a certain prejudice against art on account of the heathen abuses of it. "If thou seest a splendid building, and the view of its colonnades would transport thee, look quickly at the vault of the heavens and the open fields, on which the flocks are feeding on the shore of the sea. Who does not despise every creation of art, when in the silence of the heart he early wonders at the rising sun, as it pours its golden (crocus-yellow) light over the horizon; when, resting at a spring in the deep grass or under the dark shade of thick trees, he feeds his eye upon the dim vanishing distance." So Chrysostom exclaims from his monastic solitude near Antioch, and Humboldt* adds the ingenious remark: "It was as if eloquence had found its element, its freedom, again at the fountain of nature in the then wooded mountain regions of Syria and Asia Minor."

* L. c. p. 30.

In the rough times of the first introduction of Christianity among the Celtic and Germanic tribes who had worshipped the dismal powers of nature in rude symbols, an opposition to intercourse with nature appeared, like that which we find in Tertullian to pagan art; and church assemblies of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, at Tours (1163) and at Paris (1209), forbade the monks the sinful reading of books on nature, till the renowned scholastic, Albert the Great, (1280), and the gifted Roger Bacon (1294) penetrated the mysteries of nature, and raised the study of it again to consideration and honour.

We now return to the life of Gregory.

On a visit to his parents' house, Gregory, against his will and even without his previous knowledge, was ordained presbyter by his father before the assembled congregation on a feast-day of the year 361. Such forced elections and ordinations, though very offensive to our taste, were at that time frequent, especially upon the urgent wish of the people, whose voice in many instances proved to be indeed the voice of God. Basil also, and Augustine, were ordained presbyters, Athanasius and Ambrose bishops, against their will. Gregory fled soon after, it is true, to his friend in Pontus, but out of regard to his aged parents and the pressing call of the church, he returned to Nazianzus towards Easter in 362, and delivered his first pulpit discourse, in which he justified himself in his conduct, and said: "It has its advantage to hold back a little from the call of God, as Moses, and after him Jeremiah, did on account of their age; but it has also its advantage to come forward readily, when God calls, like Aaron and Isaiah; provided both be done with a devout spirit, the one on account of inherent weakness, the other in reliance upon the strength of him who calls." His enemies accused him of haughty contempt of the priestly office; but he gave as the most important reason of his flight, that he did not consider himself worthy to preside over a flock, and to undertake the care of immortal souls, especially in such stormy times.

Basil, who, as metropolitan, to strengthen the Catholic interest against Arianism, set about the establishment of new bishoprics in the small towns of Cappadocia, intrusted to his young friend one such charge in Sasima, a poor market-town

at the junction of three highways, destitute of water, verdure, and society, frequented only by rude wagoners, and at the time an apple of discord between him and his opponent, the bishop Anthimus of Tyana. This was a very strange proof of friendship, indeed, which cannot be justified by the probable desire of exercising the humility and self-denial of Gregory.* No wonder that his ambition was deeply wounded; although to him a bishopric in itself was of no account; and that it produced a temporary alienation between him and Basil.† At the combined request of his friend and his aged father, he suffered himself indeed to be consecrated to the new office; but it is very doubtful whether he ever went to Sasima.‡ At all events we soon afterwards find him in his solitude, and then again, in 372, assistant of his father in Nazianzus. In a remarkable discourse, delivered in the presence of his father in 372, he represented to the congregation his peculiar fluctuation between an innate love of the contemplative life of seclusion and the call of the Spirit to public labour.

* Gibbon (ch. xxvii.) very unjustly attributes this action of Basil to hierarchical pride, and to an intention to insult Gregory. Basil treated his own brother not much better, for Nyssa was likewise an insignificant place.

† He gave to the pangs of injured friendship a most touching expression in the following lines from the poem on his own Life, (*De vita sua*, vss. 476 sqq., tom. ii. p. 699 of the Bened. ed., or tom. iii. 1062 in Migne's ed.):

Τοιαῦτ' Ἀθῆναι, καὶ πόνοι κοινοὶ λόγων,
Ὁμόστεγός τε καὶ συνέστιος βίος,
Νοῦς εἷς ἐν ἄμφοῖν, οὐ δύω, θαῦτ' Ἑλλάδος,
Καὶ δέξαι, κόσμον μὲν ὡς πόρρω βαλεῖν,
Αὐτοὺς δὲ κοινὸν τῷ Θεῷ ζῆσαι βίον,
Λόγους τε δοῦναι τῷ μόνῳ σοφῷ Λόγῳ.
Διεσκέδασται πάντα, ἔῤῥιπται χαμαί,
Αὖραι φέρουσι τὰς παλαιὰς ἐλπίδας.

Even Gibbon quotes this passage with admiration, though with characteristic omission of vs. 479—481, which refer to their harmony in religion, and he alludes to a parallel from Shakspeare, who had never read the poems of Gregory Nazianzen, but who gave to similar feelings a similar expression, in the Midsummer Night's Dream, where Helena expresses the same pathetic complaint to her friend Hermia:—

> Is all the counsel that we two have shared,
> The sister's vows, etc.

‡ Gibbon says: "He solemnly protests, that he never consummated his spiritual marriage with this disgusting bride."

"Come to my help," said he to his hearers,* "for I am almost torn asunder by my inward longing and by the Spirit. The longing urges me to flight, to solitude in the mountains, to quietude of soul and body, to withdrawal of the spirit from all sensuous things, and to retirement into myself, that I may commune undisturbed with God, and be wholly penetrated by the rays of his Spirit. . . . . But the other, the Spirit, would lead me into the midst of life, to serve the common weal, and by furthering others to further myself, to spread light, and to present to God a people for his possession, a holy people, a royal priesthood (Titus ii. 14; 1 Peter ii. 9), and his image again purified in many. For as a whole garden is more than a plant, and the whole heaven with all its beauties is more glorious than a star, and the whole body more excellent than one member, so also before God the whole well-instructed church is better than one well-ordered person, and a man must in general look not only on his own things, but also on the things of others. So Christ did, who, though he might have remained in his own dignity and divine glory, not only humbled himself to the form of a servant, but also, despising all shame, endured the death of the cross, that by his suffering he might blot out sin, and by his death destroy death."

Thus he stood a faithful helper by the side of his venerable and universally beloved father, who reached the age of almost an hundred years, and had exercised the priestly office for forty-five; and on the death of his father, in 374, he delivered a masterly funeral oration,† which Basil attended. "There is," said he in this discourse, turning to his still living mother, "only one life, to behold the (divine) life; there is only one death, sin; for this is the corruption of the soul. But all else, for the sake of which many exert themselves, is a dream which decoys us from the true; it is a treacherous phantom of the soul. When we think so, O my mother, then we shall not boast of life, nor dread death. For whatsoever evil we yet endure, if we press out of it to true life, if we, delivered from every change, from every vortex, from all satiety, from all

* Orat. xii. 4, tom. i. 249 sq. (in Migne's ed. tom. i. p. 847.)

† Orat. xviii. Ἐπιτάφιος εἰς τὸν πατέρα, παρόντος Βασιλείου, (ed. Bened. tom. i. p. 330, 362, in Migne's ed. i. 981, sqq.)

vassalage to evil, shall be with eternal, no longer changeable things, as small lights circling around the great."

A short time after he had been invested with the vacant bishopric, he retired again, in 375, to his beloved solitude, and this time he went to Seleucia in Isauria, to the vicinity of a church dedicated to St. Thecla.

There the painful intelligence reached him of the death of his beloved Basil, A. D. 379. On this occasion he wrote to Basil's brother, Gregory of Nyssa: "Thus also was it reserved for me still in this unhappy life to hear of the death of Basil and the departure of this holy soul, which is gone *out* from us, only to go *in* to the Lord, after having already prepared itself for this through its whole life." He was at that time bodily and mentally very much depressed. In a letter to the rhetorician Eudoxius he wrote: "You ask, how it fares with me. Very badly. I no longer have Basil, I no longer have Cæsarius, my spiritual brother, and my bodily brother. I can say with David, my father and my mother have forsaken me. My body is sickly, age is coming over my head, cares become more and more complicated, duties overwhelm me, friends are unfaithful, the church is without capable pastors, good declines, evil stalks naked. The ship is going in the night, a light nowhere, Christ asleep. What is to be done? Oh, there is to me but one escape from this evil case: death. But the hereafter would be terrible to me, if I had to judge of it by the present state."

But Providence had appointed him yet a great work and an exalted position in the capital of the Roman empire. In the year 379 he was called to the pastoral charge by the orthodox church in Constantinople, which, under the oppressive reign of Arianism was reduced to a feeble handful; and he was exhorted by several worthy bishops to accept the call. He made his appearance unexpectedly. With his insignificant form bowed by disease, his miserable dress, and his simple, secluded mode of life, he at first entirely disappointed the splendour-loving people of the capital, and was much mocked and persecuted.* But in spite of all he succeeded, by his

* Once the Arian populace even stormed his church by night, desecrated the altar, mixed the holy wine with blood, and Gregory but barely escaped the

powerful eloquence and faithful labour in building up the little church in faith and in Christian life, and helped the Nicene doctrine again to victory. In memory of this success his little domestic chapel was afterwards changed into a magnificent church, and named *Anastasia*, the Church of the Resurrection.

People of all classes crowded to his discourses, which were mainly devoted to the vindication of the Godhead of Christ and of the Trinity, and at the same time earnestly inculcated a holy walk befitting the true faith. Even the famous Jerome, at that time fifty years old, came from Syria to Constantinople to hear these discourses, and took private instruction of Gregory in the interpretation of Scripture. He gratefully calls him his preceptor and catechist.

The victory of the Nicene faith, which Gregory had thus inwardly promoted in the imperial city, was outwardly completed by the celebrated edict of the new emperor, Theodosius, in February, 380. When the emperor, on the 24th of December, of that year, entered Constantinople, he deposed the Arian bishop, Demophilus, with all his clergy, and transferred the cathedral church* to Gregory with the words, "This temple God, by our hand, intrusts to thee as a reward for thy pains." The people tumultuously demanded him for bishop, but he decidedly refused. And, in fact, he was not yet released from his bishopric of Nazianzum or Sasima (though upon the latter he had never formally entered); he could be released only by a Synod.

When Theodosius, for the formal settlement of the theological controversies, called the renowned œcumenical council in May, 381, Gregory was elected by this council itself bishop of Con-

common women and monks, who were armed with clubs and stones. The next day he was summoned before the court for the tumult, but so happily defended himself, that the occurrence heightened the triumph of his just cause. Probably from this circumstance he afterwards received the honorary title of *confessor*. See Ullmann, p. 176.

* Not the Church of St. Sophia, as Tillemont assumes, but the Church of the Apostles, as Ullmann, p. 223, supposes; for Gregory never names the former, but mentions the latter repeatedly, and that as the church in which he himself preached. Constantine built both, but made the Church of the Apostles the more magnificent, and chose it for his own burial place (Euseb. *Vita Const.* iv., 58–60). St. Sophia afterwards became, under Justinian, the most glorious monument of the later Greek architecture, and the cathedral of Constantinople.

stantinople, and, amidst great festivities, was inducted into the office. In virtue of this dignity he held, for a time, the presidency of the council.

When the Egyptian and Macedonian bishops arrived, they disputed the validity of his election, because, according to the fifteenth canon of the council of Nice, he could not be transferred from his bishopric of Sasima to another; though their real reason was, that the election had been made without them, and that Gregory would probably be distasteful to them, as a bold preacher of righteousness. This deeply wounded him. He was soon disgusted, too, with the operations of party passions in the council, and resigned with the following remarkable declaration:

"Whatever this assembly may hereafter determine concerning me, I would fain raise your mind beforehand to something far higher: I pray you now, be one, and join yourselves in love! Must we always be only derided as infallible, and be animated only by one thing, the spirit of strife? Give each other the hand fraternally. But I will be a second Jonah. I will give myself for the salvation of our ship (the church), though I am innocent of the storm. Let the lot fall upon me, and cast me into the sea. A hospitable fish of the deep will receive me. This shall be the beginning of your harmony. I reluctantly ascended the episcopal chair, and gladly I now come down. Even my weak body advises me this. One debt only have I to pay—death; this I owe to God. But oh! my Trinity, for thy sake only am I sad. Shalt thou have an able man, bold and zealous to vindicate thee? Farewell, and remember my labours and my pains."

In the celebrated valedictory which he delivered before the assembled bishops, he gives account of his administration; depicts the former humiliation and the present triumph of the Nicene faith in Constantinople, and his own part in this great change, for which he begs repose as his only reward; exhorts his hearers to harmony and love; and then takes leave of Constantinople and in particular of his beloved church, with this address:

"And now, farewell, my Anastasia, who bearest a so holy name; thou has exalted again our faith, which once was des-

pised; thou, our common field of victory, thou new Shiloh, where we first established again the ark of the covenant, after it had been carried about for forty years on our wandering in the wilderness."

Though this voluntary resignation of so high a post proceeded in part from sensitiveness and irritation, it is still an honorable testimony to the character of Gregory, in contrast with the many clergy of his time, who shrank from no intrigues and by-ways to get possession of such dignities. He left Constantinople in June, 381, and spent the remaining years of his life mostly in solitude on his paternal estate of Arianzus in the vicinity of Nazianzum, in religious exercises and literary pursuits. Yet he continued to operate through numerous epistles upon the affairs of the church, and took active interest in the welfare and sufferings of the men around him. The nearer death approached, the more he endeavoured to prepare himself for it by contemplation and rigid ascetic practice, that he "might be, and might more and more become, in truth, a pure mirror of God and of divine things; might already in hope enjoy the treasures of the future world; might walk with the angels; might already forsake the earth, while yet walking upon it; and might be transported into higher regions by the Spirit." In his poems he describes himself, living solitary in the clefts of the rocks among the beasts, going about without shoes, content with one rough garment, and sleeping upon the ground, covered with a sack. He died in 390 or 391; the particular circumstances of his death being now unknown. His bones were afterwards brought to Constantinople; and they are now shown at Rome and Venice.

Among the works of Gregory stand preëminent his *five Theological Orations* in defence of the Nicene doctrine against the Eunomians and Macedonians, which he delivered in Constantinople, and which won for him the honorary title of the *Theologian*, (in the narrower sense, *i. e.*, vindicator of the deity of the Logos.)* His other orations (forty-five in all) are devoted to the memory of distinguished martyrs, friends, and

* Hence called also λόγοι θεολογικοί, Orationes Theologicæ. They are Orat. xxvii —xxxi. in the Bened. ed., tom. i. p. 487—577, (in Migne, tom. ii. 9, sqq.), and in the Bibliotheca Patrum Graec. dogmatica of Thilo, vol. ii. pp. 366—537.

kindred, to the ecclesiastical festivals, and to public events or his own fortunes. Two of them are bitter attacks on Julian after his death.* They are not founded on a particular text, and have no strictly logical order and connection.

He is the greatest orator of the Greek church, with the exception perhaps of Chrysostom; but his oratory often degenerates into arts of persuasion, and is full of laboured ornamentation and rhetorical extravagances, which are in the spirit of his age, but in violation of healthful, natural taste.

As a poet he holds a subordinate place. He wrote poetry only in his later life, and wrote it not from native impulse, as the bird sings among the branches, but in the strain of moral reflection, upon his own life, or upon doctrinal and moral themes.

Many of his orations are poetical, many of his poems are prosaic. Not one of his odes or hymns passed into use in the church. Yet some of his smaller pieces, apothegms, epigrams, and epitaphs, are very beautiful, and betray noble affections, deep feeling, and a high order of talent and cultivation. His poems fill, together with the epistles, the whole second tome of the magnificent Benedictine edition, so delightful to handle, which was published at Paris, 1842, (edente et curante D. A. B. Caillou,) and vols. iii. and iv. of Migne's reprint. They are divided by the Benedictine edition into I. Poemata theologica, (dogmatica, moralia); II. Historica, (autobiographical, quæ opertant ipsum Gregorum, *περὶ ἑαυτοῦ*, De seipso; and *περὶ τῶν ἑτέρων*, quæ spectant alios); III. Epitaphia; IV. Epigrammata; and V. *Christus patiens*, a long tragedy, with Christ, the Holy Virgin, Joseph Theologus, Mary Magdalene, Nicodemus, Nuntius, and Pilate, as actors. This is the first attempt at a Christian drama.

We have, finally, two hundred and forty (or 244) Epistles from Gregory which are important to the history of the time, and in some cases very graceful and interesting.

* Invectivæ, Orat. iv. and v. in the Bened. ed. tom. i. 73—176, (in Migne's ed., tom. i. p. 531—722.) His horror of Julian misled him even to eulogize the Arian emperor Constantius, to whom his brother was physician.

ART. V.—*Voices from the East. Documents on the present state and working of the Oriental Church.* Translated from the original Russ, Slavonic, and French, with notes. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, M. A. London. 1859.

THE middle of the seventeenth century presents one of those great junctures in history, by which the progress of the church is divided into periods of different characteristics. By the year 1648, A. D., Protestant nations had successfully asserted their independence, defined their ecclesiastical position, and adopted their authoritative symbols. Rome, in reactionary conflict had declared herself through the canons and catechism of the Council of Trent, followed up by the profession of Pius IV., and further developed in the controversy now instituted with the Jansenists. Oriental catholics, though not constrained by any revolution in their history, produced also, about the same time, that confession whereby the doctrinal standing of their church was stated in opposition to encroachments from the west.

Attempts at union of the churches had failed on all hands. The gulf between the Greek and the Latin churches, after many efforts to bridge it over, remained as constituted in the eleventh century. In 1638, the honest labours of Cyril Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople, to promote a good understanding between the Greek and the Protestant, cost him his life. Six years earlier, Jesuit success in Abyssinia was brought to an end by a rising of the people, in which the order was expelled from the country, and the sultan, who had favoured it, was constrained to execute the popular will. The issue of the Thirty Years War had demonstrated that to hold Romanist and Protestant under one ecclesiastical jurisdiction was no longer practicable. More distinctly than ever had it been determined that the current of Church History was to flow in separate channels.

By the Peace of Westphalia, the strife in Germany between Protestants and Romanists was settled on the principle of an equal balance of power, the separate existence of Holland as a Protestant country was recognized, and the reformation in the

Scandinavian kingdoms assumed as authoritative, Sweden being one of the high contracting parties. Lutheran and Reformed were alike comprehended in that treaty. In the settlement of religious questions, the conditions were based upon the religious peace of Augsburg; and the possessions of all parties were decided by the state of affairs as it had stood on the first of January, 1624. "Where a free exercise of religion was publicly tolerated in that year, it was to be continued; and where that was not the case, liberty of domestic worship was to be permitted." The legal relations of the two Protestant parties were also to continue as they had existed in that year.

The treaty of Westphalia also determined fundamental political maxims for all Europe, to which even parties then apparently unconcerned in it, or reluctating against it, were in course of time constrained to conform. Against the old ambition of universal empire systematic opposition was organized, and permanent barriers arrayed. No longer was either pope or emperor to be supreme. Important principles, upon which the balance of all power in Europe was to be preserved, were then determined and accepted.

In countries where Romanism subsequently prevailed, the religious conditions of the peace were neglected or set at nought, and Jesuitical machination succeeded in imposing, by political measures, many unjust restrictions upon the Protestant church. In Bohemia it was exterminated; and in the Austrian hereditary estates remained under increasing oppression until the reign of Joseph II. In Silesia and Hungary, where the Protestants formed a large part of the population, they were plundered of their property, and under the severities to which they were subjected, seriously diminished in number. In France the Edict of Nantes was still law, but ill complied with on the part of the government, then in the hands of Cardinal Mazarine, as regent during the minority of Louis XIV.

The Jansenist controversy was beginning to enlist attention in France and the southern Netherlands; but the principal doctrines, brought thereby into discussion, were already sufficiently defined. Elsewhere Jesuits were the ruling spirits, and had succeeded in reaching the last extremity of the anti-reform reaction. The peace of Westphalia was a severe blow to their

hopes, and a strong check upon their measures; but was disregarded by them wherever they were able to set it aside.

In Holland and Geneva, the Reformed churches had reached the full day of prosperity. In England the Puritans had defeated the king, and were setting up a commonwealth in the interest of a progressive reformation.

The Assembly of Divines at Westminster had completed their work, and the last lingering delegates remained only to execute, in a few cases, what had been already enacted. Their Confession, Catechisms, Form of Government, and Directory for Public Worship, had been accepted in Scotland, in the Presbyterian church of Ireland, and in all but the Form of Government in New England, and thereby the definitive statement of Reformed doctrine settled for the orthodox English-speaking people, outside of the Anglican establishment. A similar service had been, at an earlier day, executed for the Reformed churches on the continent, and as a whole, by the Synod of Dort. Lutheran doctrine remained as determined by its two great founders, and as harmonized in the Form of Concord. And in the Greek church the Orthodox Confession had been approved by the Synods of Kieff and of Jassy in 1643.

Alike in the Greek, Roman, and Protestant connections, the middle of the seventeenth century formed a momentous crisis in the history of doctrine. The period of religious wars and of doctrinal organization, which had extended from the dawn of the Reformation, then came to an end. The union of church and state remained in force; but their relations were now different in different countries, by the introduction of new elements. And although oppression was often subsequently exercised by the stronger party, yet the right of each nation to follow the confession of its choice had been distinctly vindicated.

The position claimed by the Greek church is that of strict conformity to the ancient, maintained by unvarying hereditary practice, without change or alteration, or addition of any essential particular in either doctrine or practice, since the last true œcumenical council, when the bishops of both East and West met freely and on equal terms. The Greek presents itself as the unchanged orthodox catholic church of antiquity, the only

true church. And the two heretical churches of the East are no less conservative of the precise ground of their ancient theology.

Rome cannot deny that changes have taken place within her communion; but claims, notwithstanding, to be the only true church, as having an infallible guide to all truth, over and above the Scriptures, and a process of apostolical and spiritual development within herself, so that all the changes she may introduce are as binding as revelation.

Protestantism denies that Roman doctrine, together with all the innovations defended by it, refuses to accept the decisions of all œcumenical councils, and returns to the simplicity of Scripture. It respects the practice of apostolic and immediately post-apostolic times, the theological definitions of the first four general councils and the writings of the classical fathers; but tests all by conformity with Scripture alone.

All three, within their own respective bounds, contain minor divisions and dissenting sects. But the Protestant alone recognizes the fact, and accepts it as the legitimate condition of the church. The other two deny the right of dissent, war against it, and seek to extinguish it, and yet are constrained under various pleas and disguises, to legalize or submit to it.

In adhering to an absolute conservatism, the Eastern churches have produced little for the historian to record; the actively aggressive spirit of Rome presents more and more that is interesting; but it is under the intense activity and freedom of the Protestant churches that the richest historical treasures have been accumulated. The oriental have their relations most intimate with the ancient; the Romish with mediæval, and the Protestant with modern times. Since the council of Chalcedon in the middle of the fifth century, the oriental church has been divided into three great branches; namely the Greek, or Orthodox Catholic church, and the churches of Nestorian and Monophysite connection. The jurisdiction of these sections is not everywhere geographically distinct; but, in the main, the orthodox occupies the eastern countries of Europe, and the extreme west of Asia; the Monophysites, the next adjoining portions of Asia together with Egypt and Ethiopia, and the Nestorians are scattered in the

further east. In Syria and Mesopotamia they interramify with each other, having in many cases their churches side by side. And patriarchs of both orthodox and monophysite persuasion, in some places, exercise their jurisdiction over the same district, but in relation to separate pastoral charges. They are all and long have been in a state of great depression, diminished from what they once were and under bondage of alien powers.

The Nestorians are the ecclesiastical descendants of the one time great Syrian church, which holding its connection with Antioch, extended far into the centre and south of Asia. When Nestorius, one of the Syrian clergy, of the theological school of Antioch, was deposed from his place as Patriarch of Constantinople, on account of his views touching the relations of the divine and human in Christ, and for withholding a blasphemous honour from the virgin Mary, and subsequently banished to the desert under excommunication, a large portion of the Syrian church sympathized with him. But being thereby also laid under ban, they took refuge in the protection of Persia; and all the Syrian churches from the Tigris eastward were separated from the Catholic church.

Of the five and twenty metropolitan sees of which that communion anciently consisted, only fragments now remain. The most important of these is a population of about one hundred and fifty thousand, who live on the great plain of Oroomiah, in the northwest of Persia, and among the adjoining mountains of Koordistan. Some communities of them are also found in the southwest of India, on the Malabar coast and in Travancore, where they bear the name of Syrian or St. Thomas Christians.

When the Portuguese first arrived in India by way of the Cape of Good Hope, they found a Christian prince in the neighbourhood where they landed, and several communities of that profession; but who knew nothing of the Pope, nor of a great many observances and dogmas held as Christian in Rome. Missionaries were soon at work to constrain them into compliance with the religion of the invaders. An obstinate resistance was made by those Indian Christians. But vain was defence by argument, and in vain did they plead the antiquity

of their establishment, that the regular order and discipline of their church had existed for a period of thirteen hundred years, from the second century of the Christian era, and that they enjoyed a succession of bishops appointed by the Patriarch of Antioch. "We," said they, "are of the true faith, whatever you from the west may be. For we came from the place where the followers of Christ were first called Christians." The fires of the Inquisition and Portuguese arms were the final answer to every plea. The Syrian bishop, Mar Joseph, was seized and carried a prisoner to Lisbon, and a synod of his clergy forcibly convened at Diamper near Cochin, in which the Romish archbishop Menezes presided. "At that compulsory synod one hundred and fifty of the Syrian clergy appeared." They were charged with having married wives, with recognizing but two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's supper, with neither invoking the saints, nor worshipping images, nor believing in purgatory, and with having no other orders, or names of dignity in the church, than bishop, priest, and deacon. All which they were called upon to abjure, or be deposed from office. Their church books were also condemned to the flames, "in order," said the inquisitors, "that no pretended apostolical monuments may remain."

Thus constrained, the churches on the sea coast acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope, and accepted the changes of their liturgy made by Menezes; but retained the Syriac language in their worship. Subsequently they received the name of Syro-Roman Christians.

Further inland, where the force of Portuguese arms could not be so well applied, the churches under the protection of native princes successfully resisted Romish intrusion, and retained their ancient faith, although in a state of great depression, until the establishment of the English rule in India.

In 1806, the Rev. Claudius Buchanan visited them, and by the representations which he made of them, enlisted on their behalf the enterprise of English Christians. The cause was taken up by the Church Missionary Society, and a mission established at Travancore, under very favourable auspices. Without intending to interfere with existing forms and order, the mission aimed at the reformation of the Syrian churches,

by improving the education of the clergy, by teaching youth to read, and by putting the Scriptures into their hands, and promoting the publication of evangelical principles. For many years the work proceeded with encouraging success.

Between 1832 and 1836 that method was abandoned, and, by decision of the metropolitan bishop of the English church in India, the Syrian Christians were to be treated in the same way as the heathen, all connection with them as a church was to be declined, and all of them who desired to have ecclesiastical relations to the mission were to become members of the Church of England. Subsequent missionary success has accordingly gone to diminish the numbers and importance of the Syrian Christians of India.

Of those two bodies now mentioned, as descended from the once great and widely diffused church of the further east, one has submitted to a connection with Rome, and the other still adheres to their ancient forms and order. The population of the former was, a few years ago, estimated at nearly one hundred and fifty thousand, and the latter at about fifty thousand.

The other remnant of that ancient church still residing on the plains of ancient Media and Mesopotamia and among the mountains of Assyria, is also divided. Their patriarch in the best days of their history resided at Seleucia. When the Abbasside Caliphs established their throne at Bagdad, the Christian authority also centred there. Subsequently the patriarch removed his seat to Elkoosh, about thirty miles north of Mosul, and at the foot of the Koordish mountains. About the year 1590, a quarrel between two candidates for the office of patriarch led to division of the church. One, bearing the official title Mar Elias, retained his residence in Elkoosh, and the other, with the title Mar Shimon, planted his throne among the mountains, near the Koordish stronghold of Julamerk.

Romish missionaries came among them. And in 1681 A. D. a patriarch was appointed from Rome, with the title of "Mar Joseph, Patriarch of the Chaldean Christians," to preside over those who submitted to the Pope. Until about 1790, his seat was at Diarbekir. In that year another defection occurred. The patriarch of Elkoosh, Mar Elias, passed over to Roman-

ism, in which connection his successors have remained, while their city has become a popish seminary.

Mar Shimon was thus left their only patriarch who remained faithful to the ancient church. This people live partly among the mountains of Koordistan, and partly upon a large and beautiful plain, which lies immediately to the east, and between the mountains and the lake of Oroomiah, which name it also bears. The mountain district belongs to the extreme east of Turkey, and the plain to the extreme west of Persia, being a part of ancient Media, as the mountains were of ancient Assyria.

Little was known of that people by Protestant nations until about thirty-five years ago, when they were visited by Messrs. Smith and Dwight, in the course of a missionary exploring tour. Their report decided the American Board to establish a mission there immediately. It was undertaken by the Rev. Justin Perkins, who was followed in 1835 by Dr. Grant, and in the course of the next year operations were commenced on the plain of Oroomiah. Much favour was shown to the enterprise by the native clergy, who in general regarded it in the light of a desirable assistance in their labour, and some of them gladly accepted instruction from the missionaries. Especially do they mention with gratitude the aid and encouragement which they received from an eminently pious bishop, Mar Elias, of Geog Tapa, who continued to coöperate with them for nearly thirty years, even to the end of his days.

As in the similar and earlier enterprise in India, so here it was not the design of the missionaries to make any change in the Nestorian order, form of worship, or ancient creed, but simply to labour for a revival of true practical piety by the diffusion of scriptural knowledge and evangelical influences—to purify and awaken the old Christian church of that denomination. At first the patriarch, Mar Shimon, was friendly; but in the complication of disasters which befell the mountaineers of his charge, from incursions of the Koords, and of the Turkish forces, his temper changed, and in his later years he threw obstacles in the way of the reformation.

When Dr. Grant, in 1839, for the first time, carried missionary enterprise into the glens of the Zab, in the heart of the

Koordistan mountains, the Nestorians of that region were still independent, under the rule of their own local chiefs, and the patriarch, in whom was vested the highest authority of both church and state. Frequently harassed by the predatory incursions of their Koordish neighbours, they successfully defended themselves in their mountain fastnesses. In 1843, the Koords and Turks united, marched their forces into that portion of the Nestorian country, and laid it waste with great bloodshed, and circumstances of aggravated cruelty. In the end, both Koords and Nestorians were annexed to the subjects of Turkey. The patriarch, driven from his house, took refuge in Mosul; and thence, after the lapse of a few months, escaping to Oroomiah, put himself under the protection of Persia. While there, he proved a serious obstacle to the work of the missionaries. But with the restoration of peace in 1848, he returned to his residence among the mountains, and so little had his opposition effected, that in the course of 1851, missionary work was resumed in that quarter. Upon his death, the patriarchal office came into the hands of a youth, who, from his earliest years of observation, had been cognizant of the labours of the Americans, and of their deep interest in the welfare of his people. Although but imperfectly prepared for his high office, as it could not be otherwise from his immature age, he forthwith evinced his approval of the effort and a high sense of its value. But subsequently, owing, it was thought, to the influence of some of his kindred, he became less frank, and covertly discouraged the native helpers of the missionaries within the district where his power was greatest, although still maintaining the profession and appearance of friendship upon the whole.

In some places among the mountains, but more upon the plain of Oroomiah, the missionary work has made encouraging progress; and repeated revivals have added to the membership of the reformed congregations, to the number of native helpers, and the evangelical influence, in all of which some of the Nestorian clergy have cordially taken an active part.

Of the Monophysites there are still three grand divisions, the heads of which are Egypt, Syria, and Armenia. With the first are connected Nubia and Abyssinia, which acknowledge

the primacy of the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, who now makes his residence at Cairo. In addition to his own city, there were in 1687, eleven bishoprics in Egypt subject to the jurisdiction of that prelate. In 1844, they had increased to thirteen, including Nubia as one.

The diocese of Syria, as belonging to the same connection, is governed by the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, who resides in Diarbekir, at Amida, or at the monastery of St. Ananias, near Mardin, and whose rule also extends over his co-religionists in Mesopotamia, and the adjoining desert. His power is shared by the Maphrian of Mosul, who, formerly vicar of the patriarch over the churches beyond the Tigris, is still sometimes called primate of the East; but is now only nominally superior to a metropolitan.

The third division of the Monophysites consists of the Armenian churches. Chief of their ecclesiastical connection is a patriarch catholicus whose capital is Echmiadzin, in the northern part of Armenia, and now within the Russian dominions. Two other patriarchs of more limited jurisdiction reside respectively at Ciz in Cilicia, and at Aghtamar, in Lake Van. Other prelates also, dignified by the title of patriarch, in different places protect the interests of their people scattered throughout the catholic dioceses of Constantinople and Jerusalem; besides vicariates and archbishoprics in Persia and Russia.*

As among the Nestorians, so among the Monophysites, there are converts to the Latin church, and organizations under Romish authority, the fruit of modern Romish missions. Under the name of Maronite, there still survives in Syria a remnant of the ancient Monothelite party. Since the time of the Crusades they have been divided, the larger number having, in 1182, A. D., submitted to the dominion of Rome. They have, however, reserved some practices peculiar to themselves. They read their liturgy not in Latin, but in the ancient Syriac tongue, and retain their own ecclesiastical order. Their patriarch, who lives in the monastery of St. Mary at Karnobin, not far from Tripoli, takes, in common with the Greek catholic and Monophysite patriarchs, the title of Antioch. But the people over

* For further information touching this sect see *Princeton Review* for October, 1866.

whom his authority extends are to be found principally in Mount Lebanon, and cities of that neighbourhood. He is elected by his own communion, but receives the pallium and confirmation in office from the Pope.

A Maronite college, established at Rome, has been distinguished by the Assemani and others, to whom we are largely indebted for valuable information touching the eastern churches.

Another, but smaller number, have persistently rejected the connection with Rome and still adhere to their ancient ecclesiastical independence, and peculiar doctrine of the two natures with one will in Christ.

Of all parts of the eastern church jurisdiction, the most divided by the presence of conflicting parties are the Sees of Antioch and Jerusalem. No less than four prelates bear the title Patriarch of Antioch, namely, the Greek catholic, who resides at Damascus; the Roman Catholic, at Aleppo; the Monophysite in Diarbekir, and the Maronite near Tripoli.

In the orthodox or Greek catholic church, the ancient titles and distribution of primacy are retained. The patriarchate of Constantinople still enjoys the honour of precedency, aud the number of people belonging to it, though sadly diminished, is not inconsiderable. But those of Antioch, of Jerusalem, and of Alexandria, are hardly skeletons of their former substance. The bishop of Rome is held to be entitled to the rank of Patriarch of the West, as in ancient times; but his assumption of universal primacy is condemned as utterly unwarranted. And, moreover, he and western Christendom, in general, are regarded as guilty of heresy and schism, in corrupting the creed, and separating from the communion of the only orthodox catholic church. According to that view, the other four patriarchs are, with equal right, primates of the regions assigned them respectively by ancient councils. The higher honour admitted to Rome and Constantinople is referred to the rank of those cities as capitals of the Roman empire. Apostolic foundation is not accepted as a reason for any special distinction; because Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria are on the same footing in that respect; and in the true and higher sense, all the churches were founded by apostles. The equal independence of all the patriarchs is constantly maintained, and

the rank of œcumenical is not allowed to any except in that sense in which it is proper to all. Constantinople is higher in honour, not different in rank. And even the metropolitans of Cyprus, of Austria, and of Montenegro, and the archbishop of Mount Sinai, still retain their ancient independence, and take their places, in virtue of it, by the side of the patriarchs, in a synod of the whole. In the seventeenth century, the number of the patriarchates was, as determined by ancient councils, five, Russia having been admitted to the place left vacant by the schism of Rome.

Church government of the whole Greek catholic church is synodal, and the monarchical system of Rome is censured as unscriptural, the power of the keys having been committed not to Peter alone, but to all the apostles. And while the union of church and state is defended, they are each held to be sovereign within their own jurisdiction; the state being under duty to protect the church, while the church sustains the order and authority of the state. In Mohammedan countries these relations have long been in a state of great derangement. At the present time they are most consistently observed in Russia and independent Greece. Both are governed by synods, and in the latter there is no ecclesiastical superior to the bishops.

Each patriarch is elected by the church over which he is to preside; that is by the synod of the diocese; and approved by the chief magistrate of the state. In Mohammedan countries the latter condition is subject to great abuse, not unfrequently leading to simony, and on the part of the civil ruler to oppression, and sometimes to murder.

The principle of unity in the Greek church consists in recognition of the same doctrines and canons of ancient councils, the common synodal authority, and the same forms of worship and ceremonies. Since the defection of Rome no synod has been regarded as general, but only as authoritative for the jurisdiction of the prelates assembled in them. At the same time it is held that the Greek church alone is the truly catholic and orthodox.

In the middle of the seventeenth century Mohammedanism prevailed in all those countries, which had belonged to the

ancient jurisdiction of the oriental churches; and Christians, only a sprinkling where once they constituted the mass of the population, were barely tolerated under great oppression. In the north, a more recent conquest yielded the Greek church a freedom and a power which she enjoyed nowhere else. To that quarter—the great empire of Russia—the principal interest of her subsequent history belongs. Of the patriarchs, the Constantinopolitan is at the head of one hundred and thirty-five metropolitans, archbishops and bishops. The patriarch of Jerusalem presides over twelve. Those of Alexandria and of Antioch are held to be chiefs respectively of four and of sixteen, who all rank as metropolitans; but in reality there is at present no catholic bishop in Egypt except the patriarch.

The metropolitan of Montenegro, and the archbishop of Mount Sinai, are merely titular, having no subordinate bishops. The metropolitan of Cyprus presides over three suffragans, and of Austria over ten.

The population over which these authorities extend may be estimated at somewhat more than sixty-six millions, of which at least fifty millions belong to Russia; and of the remainder by far the larger part to the see of Constantinople.

The several languages retained in the liturgies and other offices of the oriental churches are such, in all cases, as are not now spoken by the people. Among the Greeks, and their immediate connection, it is the ancient Greek; among the Georgians, the old Georgian; in Russia, Moldavia, Wallachia, Servia, Bosnia, Montenegro, Slavonia proper, Dalmatia, and Bulgaria, although various dialects are spoken, it is the old Sclavonic which alone is used in the church service. Monophysites retain, in Egypt, the Coptic; in Ethiopia the old Ethiopic, while it is the Amharic which is spoken; in the patriarchate of Antioch, the old Syriac, although both there and in Egypt the common idiom is the Arabic, and in Armenia, the old and otherwise obsolete Armenian. The Nestorians alike of Turkey, Persia, and India, whatever the language they speak, use in their worship only the ancient Syriac of their religious books; and the Maronites still continue to read their prayers in that same language, which they no longer understand.

In this view we also observe the preponderance of the Slavic race among the Christians of the East. Even there the more recent European element prevails. Of the sixty-six millions, or thereby, connected with the orthodox church, at least fifty-eight millions accept the Sclavonic as the language of their devotions.

In every instance, it is the old language in which the Scriptures and liturgies were first established among the people which is held as sacred; the idea of sanctity attaching to it as it became obsolete and obscure to the common understanding. Such, in like manner, is Hebrew to the Jew, old Arabic to the Mohammedan, Sanscrit to the Hindu, the learned system of the Mandarins to the Chinese, and Latin to the Romanist. Protestants alone, and those who follow their example, employ the vernacular in the service of the sanctuary, preferring an intelligent worship to a blind veneration.

The little volume which has given occasion to these statements of ecclesiastical relationships, is one of those which the learned author of the "History of the Holy Eastern Church" throws out, from time to time, as incidental to the prosecution of his larger work. It consists of eight brief treatises, six of which are from the pen of Mouravieff, the illustrious church historian of Russia. Catholic orthodoxy, as compared with Roman catholicism, forms the topic of the first, which is also the longest and most valuable. It is followed by a paper, biographical and critical, on the great men of the Russian church; and that by an account of the recently formed mission to the heathen of the *Altaïs*. The Romish dogma of the immaculate conception, considered from an orthodox point of view, is the subject of the fourth. Two letters, one from Palestine, and one to a Roman neophyte, by Mouravieff; a copy of the prayers in honour of the passion of our Lord, and an account of the confessions of faith employed by the eastern church complete the list. Prefixed is a tabular view of the present catholic church of the east.

Much as the Christian world owes to Mr. Neale, for the light he has already thrown upon a region of church history, which previously to his labours was almost unknown to scholars of the west, it is with the deepest interest that we receive from his

hand every additional fragment, and with impatience that we wait for a new instalment of his great work in the history of the Patriarchates yet to be recorded.

We shall close this article in the words with which Mr. Neale takes leave of his reader, making free to accept them in their best meaning, according to our views, and as really comprehensive of all branches of the church of God.

"And now I pray God to accept this volume as a mite thrown into the treasure-house of preparation for union. The union of the three churches, that second, and even more glorious pentecost, we cannot hope to see; but in the meantime, amidst all the obloquy and disputes, and suspicions and hard words of this generation, it is a blessed and consoling dream which some day will most assuredly become a reality. But a real and true union must not be, like that of Lyons or Florence, the triumph of one party, and the surrender of the other; but an equal assembly, where the problem of orthodoxy on the one side, and catholicity on the other, may be happily and enduringly solved. May God hasten that most glorious day."

Art. VI.—*Malthusianism.**

The most general form of this theory is, that the constant relation between the natural increase of population and that of food, is such that the earth's productions necessarily tend to become less and less adequate to the support of its inhabitants. The moral consequences of this view, advocated as it is by a certain school of political economists, and exerting its influence at the present time among a large class of intelligent people, may serve to justify us in submitting it to a critical examination in the pages of a religious periodical. In doing this we shall attempt to show that the theory rests upon speculation and

* The greater part of the materials of this article may be found in Principles of Social Science, by H. C. Carey, 1858; and in A Manual of Political Economy, by E. Peshine Smith, 1860.

analogy, that the facts of social experience are opposed to it, and that its moral consequences are inconsistent with the teachings of the Holy Scriptures. We are persuaded that all this can be shown to the satisfaction of every candid mind.

Before entering upon this examination, however, it should be observed that there is a strong antecedent probability against the truth of this theory. In other words, there are rational grounds for a strong presumption that the Creator, in his infinite fulness of wisdom, power, and goodness, 'whom giving does not impoverish, nor withholding enrich,' has made ample provision for all the necessary wants of his human children; and this presumption is confirmed by the acknowledged fact that all these wants, except that of food, have been provided for with a bountiful liberality. The wants of man may be classified as physical, intellectual, and moral, or spiritual, the classification resting upon that element which predominates in each, because most of them partake to a greater or less extent of all these characteristics. The chief of the physical wants is that of food; of the intellectual, that of knowledge; and the moral or spiritual wants are summed up in that of communion with God. Besides these there is one other original want in man's nature, which is perhaps equally physical, intellectual, and moral, namely, that of communion with his kind—the want of society. Now, for the satisfaction of all these wants, unless that of food be an exception, it is acknowledged that adequate and abundant supplies have been provided. The human powers of procreation are acknowledged to be ample for the supply of all man's want of communion with his kind. In the facts and laws of nature, in the universe of truth, no one has ever anticipated any deficiency for our intellectual wants. In the revelations which God has made of himself in nature, in the human soul, and in his word, we have the source of the most abundant supplies for all our moral or spiritual wants. In fine, with respect to none of the physical wants, except that of food, is any deficiency ever supposed. All analogy therefore seems to warrant us in the expectation that the Creator has provided with equal liberality for this lowest yet most urgent necessity. It seems wholly irrational, and even monstrous, to suppose that an inordinate bounty in supplying man's want of communion

with his kind, should have led him to endow the procreative powers in such excess, that all the treasures of the earth, air, and waters, should be necessarily inadequate to the supply of food; and that an ever-increasing proportion of the human race must annually die of starvation. It seems as if it might be safely affirmed on *a priori* grounds, that a system of social science whose last word is that marriage has been virtually prohibited to the most numerous class of human beings, that charity to the poor is a violation of the laws of God, and cannot fail to increase the evil it is intended to relieve, must be false.

We now proceed to show that the Malthusian theory rests upon speculation and analogy.

The analogical argument which has exerted the greatest influence in propagating these doctrines, especially during the last quarter of a century, is drawn from the lower organisms, plants and animals. The "struggle for existence" which is constantly going on among them, is exhibited in Mr. Charles Darwin's Origin of Species, in elaborate detail. The substance of what he says, however, is contained in the following paragraph:

"A struggle for existence inevitably follows from the high rate at which all organic beings tend to increase. Every being which during its natural lifetime produces several eggs or seeds, must suffer destruction during some period of its life, or during some season or occasional year; otherwise on the principle of geometrical increase, its numbers would quickly become so inordinately great that no country could support the product. Hence, as more individuals are produced than can possibly survive, there must in every case be a struggle for existence, either one individual with another of the same species, or with the individuals of distinct species, or with the physical conditions of life. It is the doctrine of Malthus applied with manifold force, to the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms; for in this case there can be no artificial increase of food, and no prudential restraint upon marriage. Although some species may be now increasing more or less rapidly in numbers, all cannot do so, for the world would not hold them."*

Now this is unquestionably true of all the lower organisms,

* Origin of Species, p. 63.

and hence it is inferred that it must be true of the highest, man. But this does not follow. For the advocates of this theory themselves are not ignorant that the argument from analogy can never prove that anything is so; all that it can prove is that something may be so; and thus lead to the inquiry whether it is so or not. If there be in the human world a "struggle for existence" similar to that which reigns among plants and animals, and by which vast multitudes of the feebler organisms must ever be destroyed, it must be proved by other arguments besides this, and beyond any which analogy can furnish. For evidently there may be good reasons why this struggle should prevail in the lower and not in the higher organic worlds. One reason for the creation of vast numbers of the lower organisms, beyond the possibility that they should all live to die a natural death, is obvious, namely, that they are created, plants to supply food to animals and man, and animals for food to man and each other. Here, then, the analogy breaks down upon the very point which it is adduced to establish. For human beings are not created to become food either to one another, or to the animals; but, for aught that appears, to live out the full term of their natural life. The analogy, therefore, does not warrant us to expect anything like so high a rate of natural increase in men as we find in other creatures. Accordingly it is a well established law of the natural development of organic life, that its lower forms increase and multiply with immensely greater rapidity than the higher. A single fish-spawn, *e. g.*, contains literally millions of germs, whilst a human pair can produce only a very few offspring. A similar law in its relations to the supply of food for man and animals had been observed as early as the time of Herodotus, who says, in explanation of the causes which prevented the rapid multiplication of what he calls the "winged serpent" of Arabia: 'I, myself, have observed this law of animal life, that the wise providence of God has made those creatures which are good for food, very fruitful, as the hare; but those which are noxious incapable of rapid multiplication, as the lion.'* For these, and many similar reasons, it may be for ought that appears, notwithstanding this analogy, that the human powers of pro-

* Herodotus, book iii. chap. 107, 108, 109.

creation shall be found at last no more than adequate to supply the want of society, and to *replenish the earth and subdue it.*

But Mr. Malthus himself does not base his theory upon this analogy, although it has contributed of late more than all other arguments to its credibility and acceptance. He lays it down as a principle which hardly requires proof,[3] that population, when not restricted by external causes, must increase in a geometrical ratio, whilst the production of food can never increase faster than in an arithmetical ratio; viz. the former as 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, &c., and the latter as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, &c. This principle is assumed by Darwin, and by all the disciples of Malthus, as incontrovertible. We venture to deny it, and to challenge the proof. It rests upon purely speculative and hypothetical grounds. It has never been proved—the proof of it has never been formally attempted—it is incapable of proof. For, in the first place, no portion of the human race has ever been freed from external checks upon the propagation of the species, in order to make possible a determination of the law of its increase in such circumstances. A multitude of powerful restraints upon the natural increase of mankind, such as diseases and war, have always been in operation. These restraints have never been determined in their numbers or efficiency. In the present state of our knowledge they are incapable of being so determined. How then is it possible to establish the law of the natural increase of mankind in circumstances in which they have never been placed? In the second place, no scientific determination has ever been attempted of the law of increase in the production of food of which the earth is capable. The loose and general statements of Malthus himself upon this point, do not even suggest the possibility of a scientific solution of the problem; and what he does say, was in entire ignorance of all the resources of agricultural chemistry, and of the relation of the inexhaustible stores of the atmosphere to the nourishment of organic life. Nor have his disciples contributed anything, strange as it may appear, to supply his deficiencies upon this point. We affirm then that both branches of this fundamental principle of Malthusianism remain to this day unproved, and further, that they are both incapable of proof.

But if it be conceded that the procreative powers of mankind, being conceived of as adequate to populate the whole earth from a single pair, must needs, if unchecked, tend to overpopulation, it does not follow that the check required must come from the want of food. For aught that appears, other checks may continue to prove amply sufficient to keep down population within the limits of the earth's capacities to support it. It will be shown hereafter that this has hitherto been the case in every country of Europe, in which no excess of population has ever yet occurred, but all the want and starvation among the people have arisen from other causes. For aught that appears, these checks may continue to be sufficient to the end of time, and they may increase in numbers and efficiency as population advances. The all-wise Creator, who, by his immutable laws, stored away the coal thousands of years ago to meet the want which should arise from the destruction of the forests, and the rock-oil to be discovered when the whale should have begun to disappear, may have implanted in the human constitution itself, just those checks upon the increase of population, which may hereafter be required, and which shall be developed at the proper time, when all the waste lands of the globe shall be fully occupied and tilled to their utmost capacity of production. Some such pre-arrangement as this is just what we might expect from the Divine wisdom and power and goodness, and it would be in perfect analogy with the wonderful facility which the physical constitution of man has always exhibited in adapting itself to the ever-varying circumstances and conditions of his earthly life.

But the disciples of Malthus shut themselves up within much narrower limits than those which would be allowed them by this principle of the geometrical ratio of the increase of population, and the arithmetical ratio of that of food. In other words, they take much higher ground, by undertaking to show that increase in the production of food can never be so great as that allowed by the arithmetical ratio of Mr. Malthus, except perhaps for a very short time, and in extraordinary circumstances, and that all the resources of emigration, whilst the greatest abundance of unoccupied land remains, are totally inadequate to supply the want of food which arises from over-

population. These statements are founded upon what is called Ricardo's Theory of Rent, in which that author undertakes to explain the reason why land employed in agriculture will pay a rent to its owner. This theory, on account of the use which has been made of it in support of the Malthusian doctrine, requires now to be examined.

In 1815 Mr. Malthus himself published an Essay on the Nature and Progress of Rent. His ideas however upon this subject had been previously broached by other writers on Political Economy. Subsequently they were taken up by Mr. Ricardo, and formulated in a theory with detailed applications. This theory, which has come to be associated almost exclusively with Ricardo's name, presented in his own words, is as follows:

"On the first settlement of a country in which there is an abundance of rich and fertile land, a very small proportion of which is required to be cultivated for the support of the actual population, or indeed can be cultivated with the capital which the population can command, there will be no rent; for no one would pay for the use of land, when there was an abundant quantity not yet appropriated, and therefore at the disposal of whosoever might choose to cultivate it. On the common principles of supply and demand, no rent could be paid for such land. . . . When in the progress of society land of the second degree of fertility is taken into cultivation, rent immediately commences on that of the first quality, and the amount of that rent will depend on the difference in the quality of these two portions of land. When land of the third quality is taken into cultivation, rent immediately commences on the second, and it is regulated as before, by the difference in their productive powers. At the same time the rent of the first quality will rise, for that must always be above the rent of the second, by the difference between the produce which they yield with a given quantity of capital and labour. With every step of the progress of population, which shall oblige a country to have recourse to land of a worse quality to enable it to raise its supply of food, rent on all the more fertile land will rise."*

* On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation, by David Ricardo, Esq. London, 1817. Pp. 52—55.

Such is Ricardo's world-famous Theory of Rent which has been vaunted by great authorities as the most important contribution to political economy made since the time of Adam Smith! J. Stuart Mill, one of the latest, and probably the ablest writer on Political Economy that England has produced within this century, speaks of it in the following words: "This general law of agricultural industry is the most important principle in Political Economy. Were the law different, nearly all the phenomena of the production and distribution of wealth would be different." It is necessary to bear in mind these remarkable words. For if it can be shown that there is no such law as this, then the whole system of the English economists, themselves being judges, is overthrown.

The first and most obvious objection to this theory is that it is purely hypothetical and speculative, a pure *a priori* hypothesis, an assumption without the shadow of proof. Its authors and supporters rest it wholly upon the antecedent probability. They assert that men, being rational, would first choose and settle upon the richest lands, therefore they always have done, and will always do so. Not one of them seems ever to have thought of examining into the history of new settlements, to see in what order superior and inferior lands have actually been occupied. Here then is a great system of Political Economy vauntingly based upon a purely speculative notion.

The second objection is, that precisely the opposite of this theory may be made to appear quite as plausible, and, indeed, far more probable, on precisely similar *a priori* grounds. It may be worth while to look at them for a moment.

Let us observe then, that when men come to settle new countries, they are necessarily few in numbers, with little aid from the appliances of civilization. If the first occupancy is by a tribe of savages, which has often been the case, they support themselves by hunting and fishing, after that by pasturage, and either do not till the ground at all, or only in the feeblest manner. In such states of society population is necessarily very sparse. For it has been roughly computed that one-half acre of cultivated land will furnish as much food as eight hundred acres of forest and stream to a community of hunters and fishers. And when cultivation begins under any circum-

stances, farming implements are difficult to be obtained, and are of the rudest construction; whilst the sparseness of the population precludes the massing of numbers and coöperation in great agricultural enterprises. Consequently the first practical question which new settlers have to meet, is not where they can find the deepest and richest soils, but where it is possible for them, with their rude implements and paucity of numbers, to overcome the resistance of nature, and eke out a bare subsistence for themselves and their families.

Now the resistance of nature is commonly greatest where her strength is greatest. Entering a new country, the settlers find a wilderness. Dank and pestilential vapours fill the valleys, whose natural growths are the heaviest timber or impenetrable jungles, the cover of ferocious beasts and noxious reptiles. Here a vast work of clearing and drainage must be done before the soil can be rendered productive. But to this work the forces of the new settler are totally inadequate; and even if this were otherwise, he and his family would probably be cut off the first year by the malaria which floats along the sluggish streams. The next best soils extend for some distance up the sides of the valley and lower slopes of the hills. But here also the timber is too heavy to be cleared away by the new settler's imperfect tools and inadequate force of numbers. Hence, from the necessities of his condition, whatever might be his wishes, he is compelled to pass by these, and to commence the work of cultivation upon the light, thin soils of the upland slopes, where there is no malaria, no heavy timber, nor thick jungle, to be cleared, where no drainage is required, which can be immediately worked with his inadequate force and implements, and which will afford him the speediest though scanty returns—"returns, however, which are immeasurably in advance of all that could be obtained by his savage or nomad predecessors, who roamed over a thousand times greater space, and depastured the natural grasses with their flocks and herds."

"It is the first step which costs." When the new settler's first crop is gathered from his thin soil, he has notwithstanding a store which will last him till the next harvest, and which gives him some leisure to improve his tools. This improvement, and the natural increase of his live stock, render the next year's

labours somewhat more productive. And thus, year by year, he is enabled more thoroughly to till the ground, still further to improve his agricultural implements, to clear more and better land, and extend his plantation. As his children grow up around him, they take part in his labours, and increase his force. By their aid he is now enabled to clear away heavier timber, and thus to bring deeper and richer soil under cultivation. In this way, as population advances, from generation to generation, the progress of settlement and tillage is naturally from the lighter and poorer soils to those which are heavier and richer, down to the swamps and bottoms of the valleys. Thus the richest lands, where the strength and resistance of nature are greatest, where a gigantic work of clearing and draining is indispensable, must needs be the last which are reached, when population has become the most dense, and the appliances of civilization the most numerous and efficient.

Such, in brief, is the *a priori* argument which is opposed to Ricardo's theory. Certainly it is no less probable than that which it is adduced to refute; and a system of social science of an entirely opposite character, might be as legitimately built upon this foundation as the English system is built upon their theory. But whatever is worthy of the name of science can make no further use of such speculations than to raise from them the inquiry, whether the conclusions to which they point are true or not? And this question must be settled by an appeal to the facts of the case. Hitherto we have only one *a priori* theory set off against another. It is necessary now to inquire further, what has been the history of new settlements? Do the facts of the case show that they have first been made on the richer or poorer soils; and have increasing populations proceeded from the former to the latter, or from the latter to the former?

Mr. Henry C. Carey was the first writer who undertook to submit Ricardo's theory to the test of facts. In this part of his Principles of Social Science, he has given us a vast historical induction; in the course of which he traces the history of new settlements in the United States and their territories, in Mexico, the West Indies, South America, Canada, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Greece, and other countries. It is impossible

to do any sort of justice here to this splendid historical argument. It should be read and studied by every one in the author's own words. A few well-known facts, however, may be mentioned as examples.

In England those parts of the country which in the days of Richard *cœur de lion* were forests and swamps, are now under the highest and most productive cultivation. The morasses of South Lancastershire, which had nearly swallowed up the army of William the Conqueror, are now among the most productive lands of the kingdom. The Lincoln Fens, which Cromwell undertook to drain by the labour of his Dutch prisoners, and failed, together with the border countries between England and Scotland, which two centuries ago were the haunt and refuge of the bold moss trooper, are now drained by wind and steam hydraulics, and are proverbial from their fertility. Everywhere the lands most recently brought under cultivation are those which have required the heaviest outlay of capital, especially in the form of machinery, to reclaim them. A considerable portion of such lands were totally irreclaimable until the invention of the steam engine. Even in the prairies of the United States and Territories, where there is no jungle nor timber, it is found that the lighter soils are first occupied, and the deepest at a later period of settlement. Thus, in the Report of the American Pomological Society, 1849, it is stated that "many small tracts known as wet prairie fifteen years ago, and *rejected by the first settlers*, are now brought under cultivation. . . . . To constitute dry prairie it must be rolling. Between the waves of this great ocean . . . are the sloughs, *the terror of the early emigrant, and the most valued possession of his successor*. . . . . These sloughs are the drains of the dry prairie. . . . . The soil of the dry prairie is from twelve to eighteen inches deep in this region; the wet prairie in general much deeper; and the alluvion (of the river bottoms) as in all countries of irregular and often astonishing depth." In general, we find at the present time that the best lands are not cultivated except where population has become dense. Where it is sparse, tillage recedes from the river banks, and runs along the crests and ridges of the hills. The old roads wind from hill top to hill top; regardless of the increased distance

and of the toil of ascent and descent. They connected the scattered villages and sparse settlements. The modern railway on the other hand connects great cities. It plunges through forests and swamps, wholly or comparatively destitute of population, which, however, soon follows its course. The jungle and timber are cleared away; the swamps are drained; villages, towns, and cities spring up along its line; and now at last the best lands are brought under cultivation.

The result of this whole argument is, that Ricardo's theory of the occupation of land will not stand the test of the facts of history. Its precise contrary is true; viz., that the poorer lands have in general been first occupied; and that increasing populations have almost or quite uniformly advanced from the poorer to the richer soils.

This conclusion is confirmed, and the Malthusian doctrines still further refuted, by another class of facts of still greater significance. These are brought to bear immediately upon the question, whether increasing populations have actually produced a decreasing proportion of food for each mouth, as required by Ricardo's theory? And here we undertake to show from various considerations, but especially from statistical tables, that precisely the opposite of this is true.

Ricardo's theory, then, as applied by himself and others, gives us the following procedure and results. Suppose a colony of one hundred persons in families to settle in a new country, they choose first, of course, the best portion of the land. This yields them for the first crop, say, 1000 bushels of wheat, ten bushels for each person. In twenty-five years, say, the population will have doubled, requiring them to cultivate a double portion of the land. The latter part of this must be of inferior quality to the former. It produces, say, 900 bushels, giving for the whole crop 1900 bushels, which yields but $9\frac{1}{2}$ bushels for each person. In another twenty-five years the population doubles again, and now amounts to four hundred persons, requiring double the amount of land, the addition being of a still inferior quality. The whole crop now amounts to 3500; and this yields but $8\frac{3}{4}$ bushels for each person. Another twenty-five years, population doubled again, amounting now to 800, and the whole crop gives but $7\frac{8}{10}$ bushels to each person. Thus

we have a constantly decreasing proportion of food for each mouth as population advances. But all this is upon the supposition that each person of the 800 occupies as much land as each of the 100 did at first; so that the population has not increased in density at all. But now if the land be limited from any cause, so that each person of the increased number cannot obtain as much land as his ancestors each occupied, this decreasing proportion of food for each person is necessarily and greatly accelerated, and still further by the tendency (assumed by these writers) of cultivation to exhaust the natural fertility of the earth. Such are the inevitable and acknowledged consequences of the theory.

Now upon examination of the facts of the case, no such consequences appear in the history of increasing populations, but the contrary, namely, that increasing populations produce an ever-increasing amount of food for, and actually distribute it normally to each mouth, and that the densest population known in Europe is consequently and actually in the best economical condition. Here also Mr. Carey has a vast and splendid induction of facts; only a few of which can be mentioned as examples of the whole.

Upon this point we have the best statistical information of the progress of population and economic improvement in France. Let us take the interval between Louis XIV. in the year 1700, and Louis Philippe, 1840, one hundred and forty years. For this period, M. de Jonnès, the head of the statistical bureau of the government, has compiled statistical tables, which give us the following among a vast number of other most interesting facts. 1. The whole population of France nearly doubled, lacking but three millions of it, in one hundred and forty years. 2. The whole crop or product of food nearly quadrupled in the same time. Consequently a population twice as dense has produced four times as much food, and twice as much for each mouth. But it is of importance also to know how this increased product of food was actually distributed, and what was the condition of the labouring poor during this time. In 1700 then we find from these tables that the landlords and capitalists received for their share of the whole product, full two-thirds, or twice as much as the labourers, the

actual tillers of the soil, whilst in 1840 the labourers received three-fifths of the whole, or fifty per cent. more than the landlords and capitalists. This however does not indicate that the landlords received less in absolute amount; for so great was the increased production during this period that two-fifths of the whole in 1840 was far greater in absolute amount than two-thirds in 1700. For notwithstanding, or rather, because, the labourers were so much better paid, the absolute amount that remained to be distributed among the non-agricultural portion of the people had increased one hundred and twenty-seven per cent., whilst those among whom it was distributed had increased only one hundred per cent. Again, the whole cost of cultivating the soil of France increased during this period more than seven times; the proportion of this, which was paid in wages, was nearly doubled; the proportion for each individual nearly trebled; and the daily wages received by each individual of the agricultural families was nearly quadrupled. In the meantime the cost of wheat, taken as an index of the expense of living, had increased about thirty sous per bushel, or less than one-eighteenth of its value. And, again, the wages of an agricultural family per year in 1700 was one hundred and thirty-five francs, whilst the cost of wheat enough to give them bread was two hundred and fifty-four francs, leaving a deficit for them to make up with acorns, chestnuts, and such materials, one hundred and nineteen francs. In 1840 the wages of such a family was five hundred francs, whilst the cost of wheat enough to give them bread was two hundred and fifty-six francs, giving an excess of wages over the cost of bread, for clothing, and other necessaries, two hundred and forty-four francs. Thus it appears that under Louis XIV. the rural population of France wanted bread half the time. Intermediate statistics show that under Louis XV. they had bread two days out of three; under Louis XVI. three days out of four; and under the Empire and Louis Philippe, they had bread every day, and a constantly increasing surplus of wages for clothing and other necessaries. It is true indeed that during all this time they had food and clothing, such as they were, those of them that survived starvation. But their bread was made of inferior grains, chestnuts, acorns, fern, and worse materials; nor could

they obtain enough even of such wretched means of subsistence to prevent multitudes of them from perishing. One of the ministers of Louis XV., in 1739, says: "At the moment when I write, in the month of February, with appearances promising a harvest, if not abundant, at least passable, men die around us like flies, and are reduced by poverty to eat grass." The Duke of Orleans carried a loaf of fern bread into the king's council to show his majesty what his subjects lived upon. Few persons are aware of what wretched food the masses of the people of Europe lived upon in "those good old times."

In these tables, moreover, we have compared the more with the less populous portions of France, with precisely similar results. We cannot go over the details. They show a constantly increasing proportion of food produced for, and actually distributed to each mouth, as the population increased in density; and a decreasing proportion as it became more sparse. Thus, in the words of a French Economist: "If we compare together the ten most populous and the ten least populous departments, it appears from official statistics that in the former the yield for each person is more in quantity, and better in quality, to the extent of thirty per cent. in weight of grain, than in the latter; and there is a similar disproportion in all other products of the soil besides grain." In other words, there was produced in the portions of France where the population was more dense at least a third more food for each mouth, than in those where the population was more sparse.

With respect to the other states of the continent and to Great Britain, we have not such precise statistical results; but we have a body of general facts which necessarily involve similar conclusions; and some of these facts are more significant than any yet given.

Thus the following statements are taken from Adam Smith, although some of them are sufficiently known to all readers of general history. "Under the feudal governments the tillers of the soil were commonly bondsmen, or tenants at will. Both their persons and services were at the disposal of the feudal lord, who supplied all the little capital employed; to whom therefore all the produce belonged. But in the present state

of Europe the share of the landlord seldom exceeds a third, sometimes not a fourth part. Yet the rent of lands (that is the share of the whole produce received by the landlords) in all the improved parts of the country, has tripled and quadrupled in absolute amount since the ancient times; and this third or fourth part received by the landlords, is, it seems, three or four times greater than the whole formerly was. Rent, though in the progress of improvement it increases in absolute amount, diminishes in proportion to the whole produce of the land." Now then the other two-thirds or three-fourths of the whole produce, which does not go for rent, remains to be divided between the farmer and the labourer; and this must be four or five times greater than the whole amount was formerly, whilst the population of no country in Europe is three times as great as it was five hundred years ago.

From the statements of Mr. Malthus himself, forty years after Adam Smith, it would appear that the whole amount of the produce of the soil of England, and the proportion of it enjoyed by the labourers, had still further increased during that period of rapid improvement. "According to the returns lately made to the Board of Agriculture, he says, the average proportion which rent bears to the whole produce seems not to exceed one-fifth; whereas, formerly, the proportion amounted to one-fourth, one-third, or even two-fifths. Still, however, although the landlord has a less share of the whole produce, this less share, from the very great increase of the whole, which has arisen in the progress of improvement, yields a larger quantity." Now if one-fifth was at this time greater than two-fifths had been formerly, the whole produce was more than doubled; and of this whole, four-fifths went to the labourer and farmer. All this in the face of what his own theory required. How this difficulty is disposed of we shall see hereafter. It is not the least wonderful thing connected with this whole subject.

In like manner, Mr. Senior, one of the ablest of this school of Political Economists, in 1836, thus estimates the improvements which had taken place in England and the southern parts of Scotland in the preceding sixty years: "Population

doubled, wages of labour more than doubled, rent nearly trebled."

These are examples of a vast multitude of facts which have been adduced in disproof of Ricardo's theory that increasing populations produce a decreasing quantity of food for each mouth; and these are crowned by one acknowledged fact, which we claim is not only sufficient of itself to overthrow the theory, but also the whole system of Political Economy which is built upon it. Far the most populous country of Europe is Belgium; and it is an undisputed fact that the economic condition of the people in that country is the best in Europe. There is hardly any such thing as pauperism, or distress from the want of food. The country produces more than enough for all its inhabitants, and large quantities of food are constantly exported. This one undisputed fact amounts, as we claim, to a demonstration that there is no such thing as over-population in Europe; and that wherever there is pauperism, or distress from want of food, as in England and Ireland, it arises from other causes, namely, false and wrong social arrangements. For during the Irish famine itself, in which perhaps a million of human beings perished from starvation, the exportation of food in large quantities from that country, was constantly going on. It was not that Ireland did not produce food enough for its inhabitants, that they perished; it was because they had nothing to buy it with: and the reason of this was simply the want of a sufficiently diversified industry. Into the discussion of this point, however, we cannot enter in this article.

Here now the question arises, how do the Malthusian Economists deal with these facts? And the answer is that they frankly admit the most significant of them, and undertake to reconcile them to their theory. Some quotations to this effect from these writers have been already given. Thus Mr. Senior in 1836: "Since the beginning of the eighteenth century, the population of England has about doubled; the produce of the land has certainly tripled, probably quadrupled." Mr. McCulloch also says: "Let any one compare the state of this, or any other country of Europe, with what it was three hundred, or one hundred years ago, and he will be satisfied that prodigious advances have been made; that the means of subsistence have

increased much more rapidly than population; and that the labouring classes are now generally in possession of conveniences and luxuries that were formerly not enjoyed by the richest lords." This is not true of the present condition of the people; for it leaves out of view the enormous increase of pauperism in England during the last thirty years, under the influence of her wrong social arrangements, by which the natural distribution of the wealth created has been prevented, so that it has been more and more concentrated in the fewest possible hands. But it would be easy to multiply to any extent similar quotations.

These admissions, however, as was said, the Malthusians do not understand to invalidate the *a priori* theory to which they have been so long and so fully committed. They believe in the doctrine that one theory is worth a thousand facts; and if the facts cannot be made to square with the theory, so much the worse for the facts. Thus Stuart Mill, admitting that the facts *of modern times* are against the theory, goes on to say: "This, however, does not prove that the law of which we are speaking, does not exist; but only that there *is some antagonizing principle at work, making head against the law.* Such an agency there is in habitual antagonism to the law of diminishing returns from the land . . . . it is no other than *the progress of civilization*" (sic). But he comes to the conclusion that this law constantly operating, must in time produce its due effect, notwithstanding this "antagonizing principle." So, also, Mr. McCulloch: "From the operation of fixed and permanent causes, the increasing sterility of the soil is sure in the long run to overmatch the improvements that occur in machinery and cultivation."

These statements seem to us little less than prodigious. For here it is conceded that this boasted law does not hold good in an advancing civilization. Here it is admitted that for more than two centuries of the most rapid increase of population ever known, the progress of civilization has been more than a match for this law. What then becomes of it in the past if, in the human race, taken as a whole, civilization has always been advancing? and what becomes of it for the future, if civilization should continue to advance? Certainly the former of these suppositions

has never been disproved; as certainly the latter is incapable of being disproved. Here, then, this boasted law of "the increasing sterility of the soil," is conceded to be no law at all of the actual facts, but something which might, could, would, or should be a law, if it were not for the progress of civilization! A great system of political economy vauntingly based upon a purely speculative notion, which confessedly ignores the progress of civilization! Is this anything less than prodigious?

It must, however, be observed further, that upon this theory it is impossible to explain or to understand how civilization should ever have made any progress. For in the case already given of one hundred settlers on the best land of a new country, if we allow that eighty of them might be sufficient to work the soil, that would leave twenty of their number to make and improve tools, machinery, and other appliances, to attend to the education of the youth, and other such necessities of civilization. Now at every advance which they make to poorer soils, they must needs occupy a greater proportion of land, because it becomes poorer and poorer, in order to produce a sufficiency of food; and this necessitates that a constantly increasing proportion of their numbers should devote themselves to tillage, leaving a constantly decreasing proportion to apply themselves to the production of tools, &c., whilst the population constantly becomes more and more sparse. At first then they have eighty out of the hundred for other necessary purposes of civilization besides tillage; at the second stage they will have but fifteen to the hundred; at the third, ten; and soon none at all. Every human being must work in the fields to procure a bare subsistence; this soon fails, and the feebler begin to die of starvation. Thus at every successive stage of the relatively decreasing returns from the land, we find less and less force and time available for study, invention, and improvement in general, that is to say, for the progress of civilization. How then is it possible that civilization should ever have made any progress? According to this theory it must have been always and everywhere declining with ever-increasing human misery. But because it is impossible to deny that in some circumstances progress has been made, at least during the last two centuries in Europe, these writers are forced to treat the progress of

civilization as an accident, which is subject to no law, and admits of no explanation. And this, forsooth, they call "Social Science."

Here then we recall the words of perhaps the very ablest expounder of this system of notions and fallacies, J. Stuart Mill. "This law is the most important position in political economy. Were the law different, nearly all the phenomena of the production and distribution of wealth would be different." The law is different—there is no such law; it is purely imaginary. The precise contrary is the law of the facts of the case. New settlers begin with the lighter soils, that are the most easily worked. The proper culture of these tends to enrich and not to impoverish them. As population and force increase, and tools and other appliances are improved, the settlers advance to soils of superior strength and fertility, which are more difficult to be cleared and worked. Whence an increase of food for each individual; increased proportion of their numbers released from the work of tillage, and enabled to apply themselves to study, invention, and general improvement to all that belongs to an advancing civilization. This is the law of the facts of the case. Therefore "nearly all the phenomena of the production and distribution of wealth" are different from the exhibition made of them in English Political Economy. In fact this whole system is simply the blossom and fruit of English institutions, the worst economic arrangements to be found anywhere except on heathen ground. Malthusianism is nothing else but the attempt to justify theoretically these institutions and social arrangements, with all their consequences of pauperism and starvation.

There are two points which have not been noticed in the preceding review, and which can only be glanced at now.

The first of these is, that when these writers speak of "the law of the decreasing fertility of the soil," they do not simply mean that men occupy ever poorer and poorer lands as population increases, but in addition to this, that the constant tendency of agriculture, upon the whole, is to exhaust the soil of its natural fertility. They assume that land has a certain natural amount of productive power, and that this is constantly, upon the whole, in a process of exhaustion. They are

either ignorant of, or they have a sublime contempt for, all inquiries into the sources from which the earth derives its fertility, and all the results of agricultural chemistry. Now these inquiries and results have poured a flood of light upon this whole subject, showing us that the earth relies for her fertility chiefly upon the atmosphere, and that the atmospheric supplies are inexhaustible. Thus we know now that the growths of the earth on an average take from the soil not more than two-tenths of their substance; full eight-tenths are drawn directly from the atmosphere. Whence every crop, as it is consumed, deposits something less than eight-tenths of its weight in the soil, which was not there before. And it makes little difference how it is consumed, provided it be not burnt up; when all that was taken from the atmosphere escapes back into it again in a free state. But when it is consumed in any other manner, as there is still some tendency to this escape, the amount deposited in and retained by the soil is less than eight-tenths, perhaps five or six. In this way the soil of the western prairies has been formed, and made what it is, and is constantly rising, viz., by the annual decay, perhaps for thousands of years, of the natural grasses produced upon it. Hence it is the natural tendency of the increase and multiplication to any extent of organic beings, both plants and animals, and of their decay, to enrich the earth, taken as a whole, and not to impoverish it, as these writers suppose. Whenever a portion of the soil is thus impoverished, it is by the remorseless removal and consumption of its growths away from it, and making no proper returns. Otherwise the tendency of agriculture is rapidly to enrich the soil year by year. And thus this element of the Malthusian "law of the increasing sterility of the soil" is found to be no law at all of the actual facts; but the reverse is true.

The second point which has been omitted, respects the normal relation between the increase of population and that of wealth in civilized countries. The later English Economists lay it down as a principle that the increase of wealth in any country is measured by the rate per cent. interest which money commands. They do indeed qualify this statement by such general additions, as that the government must be liberal, and property well secured. But they apply it without qualifica-

tion to their own country, France, Germany, the United States, and Canada. There is not indeed, as usual, the least foundation for this notion; as Adam Smith would have taught them, if they had not utterly repudiated the authority of their great master. For he says that "the rate of interest is naturally low in rich countries, and high in poor countries; and it is always highest in the countries that are going fastest to ruin." But this is characterized by Mr. McCulloch as a most erroneous statement, and he adds, "we have no hesitation in laying down as a principle, which holds good in every case, and from which there is really no exception, that if the governments of any two countries be equally liberal, and property in each equally well secured, their comparative prosperity will depend upon their rate of profit," *i. e.*, upon the different rates per cent. interest which money commands in those countries. The truth is, however, that in all industrial countries, where money is borrowed for investment in productive enterprises, the rate at which wealth increases is far greater than that which money commands. We cannot stop to prove this, except to observe, that it was the application of this erroneous measurement to the increase of wealth in this country, which led the English people into those false estimates into which they fell, of our financial ability to meet the expenses of the late civil war.

But now let us assume this wholly inadequate standard of measurement for the increase of wealth and compare it with the increase of population. The highest rate of the increase of population known in any country, is that in which it doubles every twenty-five years. This is less than three per cent. per annum. But three per cent. is a very low rate of interest. It averages four or five in England, France, and Germany; it is seven in this country. Yet at three per cent. wealth doubles in less than twenty-three years. So that at this extreme high rate of the increase of population, and this extreme low rate of the increase of wealth, the latter would always keep in advance of the former. Where the rate of profit is five per cent. wealth would amount to nearly three and a half times the original sum in twenty-five years; while population could not be more than doubled. In another twenty-five years, population would be doubled again, but wealth would be more than ten times as

great; giving to each of the quadrupled population nearly three times the quantity of useful things that was enjoyed by each when the population was less by three-fourths. Now the increase of population in such old and well-peopled countries as England and Holland has hardly ever been greater than at the rate of one per cent. per annum; whilst the rate of profit has averaged from three to five. In such countries an increase of two per cent. in wealth would always keep it in advance of population. But the actual increase of wealth in such countries for the past two hundred years has been nearer ten or fifteen or twenty per cent. than four or five; and in the present state of the world, wealth of whatever kind can always be converted into food.

Here then we have another proof that the distress from want of food in England and other industrial countries has literally nothing to do with overpopulation; but is wholly due to other causes, chief among which is a totally inadequate system of the distribution of the wealth that is produced.

We come now, in conclusion, to consider some of the moral consequences of this theory, which have been reserved to the last on account of their superior weight with those who do not claim to be experts in social science.

The first of these is, that all attempts to relieve the distresses of the poor by poor-laws, charitable institutions, and charity in general, are contrary to the laws of nature, and cannot fail to increase and aggravate the evil which they are intended to mitigate. Mr. Malthus himself, being a clergyman of the Church of England, could not indeed tell us in so many words, that we must never give a shilling to a starving beggar; but he developes in detail the consequence from his doctrines above stated, and leaves us to apply it for ourselves. He tells us that every increase of food thus supplied to the poor, stimulates the increase of population; and every increase of population increases the evil of pauperism. The necessary effect of this doctrine in hardening the hearts of the rich against the poor, is obvious. It brings man's noblest sympathies into direct conflict with his social duties, which, of course, require him to do all he can for the mitigation of distress, consequently never to bestow charity. For every act of charity increases

the amount of human destitution and misery. This surely must be a detestable doctrine to all who have human hearts.

The second of these consequences is that, according to this theory, a very large proportion of mankind must be deprived of the blessings of marriage, and of the family. This consequence is frankly avowed by Mr. Malthus and his followers. They exhort the poor to abstain from marriage, as their only hope of escaping starvation. It is appalling to contemplate the practical results which must follow such a violation of the laws of nature. For if there is anything certain it is that the well-being of mankind can never be generally realized out of the marriage relation. What would men become but for the purifying influence of women in married life, and what without the educating, ennobling influence of the family! Impurity, more wide spread and desolating than any ever known, except on heathen ground, would be the result. Promiscuous intercourse, from which a large portion of mankind, as it would seem, have slowly emerged, would return with all its horrors. We do not hesitate to affirm that if the advice of these writers should be followed, that the work of two thousand years of Christian civilization would be undone. The world would be engulfed in perdition.

The third moral consequence of this theory is, that it tends to promote all those abominable means of frustrating the natural course of nature in the production of human offspring, and even infanticide itself, which have prevailed so extensively among the heathen, and which, from the influence of this theory, are now returning with a dreadful significance among us. Upon this point Dr. Nathan Allen of Lowell, Massachusetts, has given us some alarming statistics, drawn from the registration of births and deaths in that state.* From this we learn that there has been among the native New England people, for many years, a steady decline both in the number of children to each family, and in the number of births relatively to the number of deaths. Formerly the general average of children to a family was from eight to ten. In one small town there were at one time ten hundred and forty-three children in ninety families, between eleven and twelve to each family. The present generation averages not more than three children to a family. In

* See a communication to the *New York Observer*, October 4th, 1866.

1864 the deaths among the American population of the State exceeded the births by nine thousand. In Boston alone the deaths exceeded the births by fifteen hundred and two. Again, for any community to be in a prosperous condition with respect to the increase of its numbers, the annual birth-rate must be at least as one to thirty of the adult population; whilst that of the American population in Massachusetts is less than as one to sixty. In fact this glorious old Puritan stock is disappearing from New England under this process, at an appalling rate. Much of this is, no doubt, due to the fact that so many of the young people, especially the young men, emigrate to the new states of the West. But this fact can have no bearing upon the decrease of the number of children in each family. In the words of Dr. Allen: "What cause, or causes, could ever possibly bring about such disastrous results? . . . . The whole explanation may be summed up briefly under two heads: 1. *The physical degeneracy of women:* and 2, the settled determination among a large portion of them in married life *to have no children, or a very limited number.* . . . . No language, he adds, can adequately portray the terrible effects which have already resulted from these violations of law; and no imagination can fully comprehend the nature or extent of the disastrous consequences which are yet to follow in the same train." In addition to this, the extent to which infanticide is now prevailing among the labouring poor of England, is known to be so great that the statistics are kept as much as possible from the public. The intelligent London correspondent of the *New York Times* of December 27, the day on which this is written, says: "Wife-killing is one of the most common crimes in England, next to infanticide, which has become so much a custom as scarcely to be considered a crime."

Now all these abominable practices and their results, are in perfect accordance with this theory. For it teaches us that the one great thing to be avoided for the welfare of the human race, is the increase of population. If children are born, in natural numbers, the greater portion of them must perish from starvation. It is a mercy, therefore, to prevent them from coming into the world, or if they must come, to remove them as early as possible. If these views should once come to con-

trol the action of legislators, it is easy to predict that infanticide will cease to be a punishable crime, and will be regarded as a praiseworthy act, as it has always been among the most degraded of the heathen.

The last consequence of this theory is, that it subverts all faith in the Holy Scriptures. Its teachings are diametrically opposed to those of the word of God. God has given the express command to the human race to *be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth;* and this command is communicated in the form of a Divine blessing. These authors teach us that the natural increase of population is the greatest curse of humanity; and enjoin upon a large proportion of mankind to avoid marriage, and to frustrate their natural fertility. God has placed all men in families; these men would deprive a large proportion of mankind of the blessed influences of the family. God has enjoined charity to the poor; here we are taught that it is a curse, which can never fail to increase the evil it is intended to mitigate. God has forbidden murder; infanticide is the legitimate and inevitable practical consequence of this theory.

ART. VII.—*The Rejection of Christ by the Jewish Rulers and People.*

WE propose in this article, to inquire into the causes of the rejection of Christ by the Jewish rulers and people; to exhibit the principal occasions when this was publicly and decidedly done; and to present the evidence they possessed of the truth of his character, and of the validity of his claims.

From whatever point of observation this rejection is viewed, it stands out boldly as one of the most remarkable phenomena in the religious history of man. It presents the case of a nation, decided in their religious convictions, rigorous in their religious observances, members of the true church of God, and enjoying the full and clear light of his written word, struck, individual cases excepted, with total moral and spiritual blind-

ness. Facts and truths, supported by every kind of evidence that is adapted to produce conviction, were either explained away by senseless cavils, and by the most improbable suppositions, or were bluntly rejected. And this was done not once or twice, but many, many times, during a period of three years. Had these facts and truths been entirely new in their character, this rejection might have been in part accounted for by this circumstance: the human mind is slow to apprehend that which is totally different from its present knowledge, and its accustomed trains of thought. The use of language also, in a sense new to it, and especially the introduction of new words, which the presentation of such facts and truths renders necessary, cover them with doubt and mystery. A man, for example, who is intelligent on other subjects, but who is ignorant of the nomenclature of chemistry, might be present at a lecture where the most brilliant experiments were performed, and where the explanation of the lecturer was clear and satisfactory to those who understood his terms, and yet to him the whole might be an enigma. When Paul preached to the cultivated and fastidious Athenians, their philosophers said, "What will this babbler say? He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods; because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection."

No such explanation as this can be given of the blindness and prejudice of the Jews. They were looking for the appearance of Messiah at the time Jesus commenced his public ministry. The prophecy of Daniel, ix. 24—27, had definitely determined it. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city," said the angel to the sorrowing prophet. The key of the period measured by these prophetic weeks they had in Levit. xxv. 8. Each week represented seven years. Counting, therefore, from the date of the commission of Artaxerxes king of Babylon to Ezra to rebuild Jerusalem four hundred and ninety years, it brought them to their own period as the one of Messiah's coming.

That they did then expect him is perfectly clear, not only from the narratives of the Evangelists, but also from the testimony of Josephus, and of Tacitus and Suetonius. The Roman historians declare that the belief was general over the East,

derived from prophetic books, that at that very time one should arise in Judea, who should obtain universal dominion. And Josephus says it was this expectation which inspired the Jews in their effort to throw off the Roman yoke. (See Robinson's *Calmet*, art. Christ.) But more than this, they distinctly and universally recognized the fact, that his coming was to be the most glorious era in their history. They firmly believed that it would bring to them the richest blessings; that it would be the complete fulfilment of the promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

There were in their Scriptures minute prophecies relating to his birth and lineage. He was to be born of a virgin; his descent was to be through the royal line of David; and his birth-place was to be Bethlehem. If they had been capable of instituting a candid examination, they would have found that these prophecies were fulfilled in Jesus. If again, their stolid, unreasoning prejudice had not taken away all power of mental and spiritual vision, they would have discovered in the noble and dignified person and bearing of Jesus, in his sinless life, in the divine depth and wisdom of his teachings, and in the splendour of his witness-bearing miracles, the clearest and fullest evidence that he was their long expected, long and earnestly wished for Messiah. From whence then their unbelief? Why did they reject their glorious Messiah? Why did they crucify the Son of God, and put him to an open shame? Were the laws which govern mind in its reception of truth, in their case, suspended? Did a kind of monomania, an insanity confined to this one subject, seize upon this whole people? Did a demoniacal possession, (in that age so common in individual cases) formed by the joining together of a terrible judgment from heaven, and of an uprising of all the powers of hell, fall upon that unhappy generation? As we view their conduct from our stand-point in this age, it certainly looks like this. And yet there was "method in their madness;" there was evident intelligence and design in these works of the devil.

Our first business, in replying to the question, Why did the Jewish rulers and people reject Christ? will be to ascertain their civil and religious condition at the time this greatest and blackest of crimes was committed, because in this will be found

the roots of the tree which bore such baleful fruit. In doing this, however, we shall not attempt to trace the long train of causes by which they were brought into this condition; but simply endeavour to exhibit what it was when Christ commenced his public ministry.

They were then a subject people. Roman soldiers garrisoned their cities and towns, and Roman governors held the supreme power over them. At the same time, they were treated with comparative leniency. They were allowed the full and free exercise of their religious faith and worship; and apparently all, except the higher civil offices, were filled by their own people, chosen by themselves, and executing the laws prescribed by Moses.

The Sanhedrim, their highest court, still bore its mixed character of a civil and religious tribunal; and it had jurisdiction in all cases, it would seem, except that it could not execute the penalty of death. The people were allowed, as a general thing, to hold their property, and to pursue their accustomed occupations without Roman interference. For a number of years after their subjugation, they were not even taxed by the supreme government.

About the time of the birth of Christ, however, a decree was promulgated by the emperor, which brought them under this humiliating and onerous burden. That rapacious system of extorting money, which by the corruption it produced at Rome, and the discontent it caused in the provinces, had so large a share in hastening the downfall of that mighty empire, the Jews, in the time of Christ, felt in its full force. It was one of their chief grievances, and they manifested their disgust and opposition to it in every way they were able, without bringing down the iron hand of Rome upon them. So unpopular was the office of tax-gatherer that no respectable Jew would accept it. To do so, was to cut himself off from all social and religious intercourse with his nation. A publican was an outcast; a man despised and hated by all around him; and in no other way could the scorn and maledictions of the people be so effectually brought down upon a man, as to charge him with having defended the Roman taxation. A remarkable proof of this is found in the skilfully formed dilemma into which the Phari-

sees attempted to bring Christ, by proposing to him the question, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not? Shall we give, or shall we not give?" If he replied, No, it would be an act of insubordination to the Roman government; if Yes, it would bring him into disrepute with the people.

We have remarked that the Roman tax was one of the chief grievances of the Jews, but it was by no means the only one. That proud and high-spirited people looked down with feelings of contempt upon all other nations. And there were strong reasons for this. Their illustrious origin, and their religious character and institutions, as God's covenant people, separated them from all others, and placed them immeasurably above them. They alone had God's written word. It was clothed in their language, and addressed to them. They were, by birth and by covenant, the members of his church. It was impossible but that the Roman yoke should gall them to their heart's core. Their painfully tragic history shows that they never ceased to writhe under it, and to rebel against it, until finally, by their sullen discontent, and their open insurrections, they brought the full power of the empire upon them to their utter destruction.

About two years before Christ commenced his public ministry, Pontius Pilate, a Roman by birth, was raised to the Procuratorship of Idumea, Judea, and Samaria. He was a man of impetuous, cruel, and rapacious character. While he does not seem to have interfered, under ordinary circumstances, with the religious faith and customs of the Jews, he visited with terrible severity every infraction of the Roman authority. By his cruelty, his extortions, the tortures he inflicted on those who fell under his displeasure, and the number he put to death without trial, he rendered himself, and the government he represented, exceedingly odious to the Jews. Discontent was general among them, and they sighed for deliverance. This they confidently expected in the person and reign of Messiah. The prophecies pointed to the period then passing as the one for his appearance; and as their interpretation of those prophecies made him a Mighty Prince, who was to establish a temporal kingdom, excelling all others in power and splendour, and finally attaining universal dominion, the unhappy people, one and all, looked to

him as their deliverer from the Roman power. So strong and so general was this expectation, that several impostors had taken advantage of it to create insurrections. Gamaliel, in his remarkable speech before the Sanhedrim which arraigned the Apostles for preaching Christ in Jerusalem, a few weeks after his crucifixion, mentions two of this character: Acts v. 36, 37. In a word, the whole Jewish people, at the time our Lord appeared, were in a state of civil and political agitation and distress; eagerly looking for his coming, but alas, with such mistaken views of his character and work, that when he came they knew him not, they received him not. They blindly rejected him, and, with their own hands, put him to a cruel and ignominious death.

We now turn to the religious state of the Jews in the period under review. Taking a merely general and outside view of it, it would seem to have been fully up to their most favourable state at any time posterior to the reign of Solomon. The temple of God at Jerusalem was one of the most splendid edifices then standing. The materials of which it was constructed were of the finest and most costly description, and it was enriched by the most elaborate and splendid ornaments of gold and silver. The worship of God there, in accordance with the Mosaic ritual, was fully maintained and generously provided for. The orders of the Priesthood and of the Levites were filled by the descendants of Aaron and by the tribe of Levi. The great feasts prescribed by the Law were regularly observed and largely attended, not only by Jews resident in Palestine, but in foreign countries. Asia, Africa, and Europe were largely represented at the great national jubilees. Synagogues were erected in all the towns and cities. Each of these had a copy of the Old Testament, which was read and expounded to the assembled people. The Sabbath was rigorously observed, and a Jew who profaned it by any outward act was liable to be cut off from all religious fellowship and privileges.

In matters of faith they are divided into three sects. The Essenes, who were the mystics, the transcendentalists, and monks of the Jewish family, were the least numerous and influential.

The Sadducees who, though less in numbers than the Phari-

sees, possessed great authority and influence, because they were the allies of the Roman power. They were loose in their morals, and semi-infidel in their faith. Holding the doctrines of the Epicurean philosophy, they denied the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and the existence of angels. They were the rationalists and sceptics of the Jewish family.

The third sect was the Pharisees, by far the most numerous and influential with the people. They, in reality, represent the religious faith and practice of the Jews in the age of our Lord. It is therefore important to the object of this article, to give a somewhat extended view of them. The leading Pharisees were men, outwardly at least, of an eminently devoted and self-sacrificing religious character. In this respect they put to shame the vast majority of the Christian ministry of this or any other age, except that of the Apostles. Truly, they had a righteousness and a fiery zeal for God, but it was not the righteousness which is by faith, and it was not a zeal which is according to knowledge.

It was a righteousness and a zeal which had its roots and its growth in a wholly legal spirit—in the over-scrupulous and painful observance of the letter of the law. In frequent and rigorous fasts; in long and studied prayers, offered in the most public places, which had the form without the spirit; in ostentatious contributions to the support of religion, giving the tenth of all their incomes, down to the very herbs which grew in their gardens; in the outward manifestations of devotion, in their speech, in their countenances, and in their dress; in frequent ceremonial washings of their hands, and of pots, and cups, and plates, used at their meals; in an outward observance of the Sabbath so strict as to forbid the performance of acts of mercy and necessity; and in a haughty and insulting refusal to hold any intercourse whatever with the irreligious and immoral.

The legitimate effect of all this on fallen human nature, was to foster a spirit of intense pride and self-righteousness. It led them to value themselves on their superior religious knowledge, on the purity of their lives, and on their full and blameless obedience to the law. In its relation to men, it prompted

them to look with contempt upon all who did not come up to their standard. Their language was, "Stand thou aside, I am holier than thou." In its relation to God, it produced in them a settled conviction that they were, above all other men, his honoured and accepted servants; and that in virtue of their covenant relation as the children of Abraham, and their meritorious obedience, they were clearly, certainly entitled to everlasting life.

All this when, in truth, sin held undisputed sway over the inner man; when corruption festered and rioted in their hearts, and manifested itself in the motives and principles which prompted this very outward obedience, in which they so much gloried. They envied and hated other men, but it was under the guise of religious zeal; they were harsh and unmerciful in their treatment of offenders, but it was their desire to sustain the authority of God's law; they were avaricious and extortionate in their demands upon the weak and defenceless, they devoured widows' houses, but they cast the full tenth of their gains into the treasury of the Lord; they permitted the undutiful child to withhold support from his aged and helpless parents, but they commanded him to devote the amount thus saved to the support of religion; they permitted the unfaithful and licentious husband to put away his wife, on the most frivolous grounds, but they required him to give the forsaken woman a bill of divorcement according to the law of Moses. Thus the most monstrous crimes were perpetrated under the name of religion.

It was this deep and wide-spread corruption, not less than their insurrectionary and rebellious spirit, that led Josephus, himself a Jew and a priest, in his account of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the nation by the Romans, to write that sentence of bitter and scathing condemnation, "I believe, had the Romans made any longer delay in coming upon this wicked race, an earthquake would have swallowed up the city, or a flood would have drowned them, or the thunders which destroyed Sodom would have struck them. For this generation was more ungodly than all that had ever suffered such punishments." *Wars of the Jews*, book v. chap. 13, sec. 6.

The Pharisees filled, in the age of our Lord, the chief post

of instruction throughout Judea, and they were held in the highest veneration by the people, as the expounders of the law and the prophets. They received the whole of the Old Testament as the plenary inspired word of God, and they professed to bow implicitly to its authority; but they had also a large body of comments upon the sacred text, by their most learned and venerated Rabbis, called the Traditions of the Elders, which they treated with scarcely less reverence. They themselves obeyed these traditions, and required their followers to do this, with the most scrupulous care. They added thus to the already heavy burden of the ceremonial law, a crushing weight. They covered almost the whole of social life and intercourse with their rites and ceremonies, seeking, it would seem, to give the whole a religious character. Their object in these supererogatory precepts and obedience was to gain distinction among men for special devotedness, and to add to their merit in the sight of God.

All this grew out of their entire misapprehension of the nature and design of the ceremonial law revealed through Moses. Aside from its being the method prescribed by God for his worship, it had a twofold purpose. The first and chief design was to prefigure the atonement which Messiah in the fulness of time would make, and to enable God's people by the observance of its requirements in the exercise of faith to obtain the priceless blessings of that atonement. The second was to humble them, to keep the remembrance of their sinfulness ever present, ever fresh, and, by the rigor and oppressiveness of its demands, to lead them to look forward to Messiah's coming, with earnest longing, as the time of their spiritual deliverance. All this they lost sight of, and they came to regard it as a great system by which personal righteousness, and personal desert before God could be acquired. Hence they added to it still more onerous, still more rigid and painful observances. And they held and taught that a descendant of Abraham, who scrupulously, straitly performed all these ceremonial requirements, was assured of salvation. Under these teachings and this practice they became mere formalists; men of ice; men of iron; and they ceased entirely to regard the coming Messiah as a Redeemer, a great atoning sacrifice,

a deliverer from the corruption and curse of sin. They only looked and longed for him, as we shall more fully see, as a great earthly conqueror, who was to deliver them from the civil and political evils under which they groaned.

We have remarked that the leading men among the Pharisees were regarded by the body of the people as the true expounders of the prophecies. It was by their interpretation of the prophecies relating to Messiah, more than by any other single instrumentality, that they gave form and direction to the views of the masses in relation to him. The patent and striking fact that the prophets speak of Messiah in two seemingly opposite characters, now as a mighty prince setting up a glorious kingdom, bearing in its progress righteousness and peace, and salvation to men, and destined to universal and endless dominion; and again, as "persecuted, despised, and rejected," as "wounded and bruised," as "in prison," as cut off from the land of the living, as "making his grave with the wicked and the rich in his death," these opposite declarations they knew not how to reconcile. Some held that there were to be two Messiahs, the one a majestic and victorious king, the other a rejected, despised, and suffering man. Whether these views were openly and generally expressed in their exposition of the prophecies to the people in the synagogues, we have no means of determining. However this may have been, there is abundant evidence that the first of these Messiahs was the one they taught the people to expect at that time. Interpreting the language of the prophets in a literal and temporal sense, they led the multitude to look for Messiah in the character of a mighty earthly prince, who was to place himself at the head of the Jewish nation, overcome and disperse their enemies and oppressors, and make them the ruling nation of the world.

Like the man who is slowly dying from an ulcer, which has its roots in the very centre of his vital organs, and who expects his physician to remove it by covering up its putrid and livid mouth, so the Jewish rulers and people, entirely overlooking the fact that the seat of their malady, the source of their woes, lay deep within their hearts, and in numberless crimes against God, expected Messiah, their divine Physician, to heal them

by removing the sorrows and desolations of their civil and political condition.

Gathering now into one view what has been exhibited of their civil and religious condition, we have before us the causes of their rejection of Christ. Over and above the essential opposition of corrupt human nature to God and to righteousness, these unhappy people were totally blinded, and bound hand and foot by two great errors, wrought out and perfected by themselves, viz., their icy, dead formalism, and their false interpretations of the prophecies relating to Messiah, applied to their oppressed and wretched civil and political condition; the two interwoven and interlinked, and covering them like a coat of mail, forged by Satan himself in the fires of the bottomless pit. The one shutting their eyes to their own sins, to their deep and damning corruption and wickedness, and leading them to feel that they needed no Messiah, and desired no Messiah, to deliver them from these; and the other filling their minds and hearts with false and delusive desires and hopes, which wholly shut out from their view the true spiritual and remedial character of Messiah, and made him merely a temporal prince, an earthly king.

We proceed now to the second division of the subject, which is the manner in which the Jewish rulers and people rejected Christ, and the character and power of the evidence of his Messiahship, which was furnished to them in his person and life, and in his teachings and miracles. The consideration of these two things will, from their close relation, naturally come together.

Passing over the circumstances of our Lord's birth and early history, because, though these furnish a clear and weighty body of evidence to us, who have his full history, they were probably unknown, at that time, to the Jewish rulers and people, we come to the appearance and testimony of his herald, John the Baptist. His advent had also been distinctly predicted, and the time of it fixed. The prophet Malachi, the last of the illustrious line, in the closing words he was commissioned to utter, distinctly foretold the appearance of John as the messenger of Messiah: "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek

shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts." Mal. iii. 1. And again, in the very last two sentences, obviously designed, from this circumstance, to give the age in which Christ was to appear a prophetic mark about which there could be no doubt: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." Mal. iv. 5, 6. Equally clear and decisive was the prediction of John's coming and office by Isaiah, xl. 3—5, which the Baptist applied to himself when the leading men at Jerusalem sent a special embassy to him with the question, "Who art thou?" John i. 19—27.

The effect of John's ministry on the Jewish people of all conditions was, in the highest degree, remarkable. His person, dress, and manners, his stern character, his thrilling eloquence, and above all, his solemn and startling message, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," broke upon the ear of his slumbering countrymen like a voice of thunder from heaven. They were for the moment awakened. They came out to him from the cities, and towns, and hamlets of the land, into the wilderness that lies between Jerusalem and the river Jordan. Their hearts were touched. They saw, for the time, their sinfulness, and professed repentance. The leading men of the Pharisees alone stood aloof. True to their formalisms, jealous of their power and distinction in religious matters, they looked upon this great spiritual movement, among the dead masses of their followers, in a cold and cavilling spirit, waiting for the opportunity and means to arrest it.

John's testimony to Christ as Messiah, was in the very highest degree, clear, particular, and ample. To his disciples standing around him when Jesus was coming to him, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!" "The same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." "This is the Son of God." John i. 29—34. To the Jewish rulers he said, when they sent to him the embassy already referred to, "I baptize with water: but there standeth one among you whom ye know not: He it is, who coming after me,

is preferred before me, whose shoes latchet I am not worthy to unloose." To the Jewish people as a whole, when their interest and expectation in reference to him were raised to the highest point, "when all men mused in their hearts of John whether he were the Christ or not," he said, "I indeed baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Luke iii. 16.

It is a fact, worthy of special notice, that the ministry of John was an open and direct attack upon the formalism of the Jewish rulers and people, and, by an inference so pointed and forcible that it seems impossible they should have failed to make it, upon their false interpretation of the prophecies relating to the Messiah. He cut up root and branch their self-righteousness, and he blasted their false hopes of acceptance with God on account of their covenant relation, and their ceremonial obedience, by his bold and scathing denunciations, and by the distinctness and prominence which he gave to the great spiritual truth they had so utterly lost sight of, that religion is a work in the soul, a turning of the heart to God by repentance and faith in his Son. To the multitude who came forth to be baptized, he said, "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance, and begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, That God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the axe is laid unto the roots of the trees: every tree therefore which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire." Luke iii. 7—9.

It is to be borne in mind that the ministry of John lasted a year and a half. That during all this time he continued to bear this testimony, direct and indirect, to the character and claims of Jesus as Messiah. That within this period a multitude of the Jews, perhaps a majority of them, were personally present, and heard his declarations. It is to be remembered also that, all this while, he was unsparing in the blows he dealt with such crushing force, upon their formalism, their self-righteousness, and their hypocrisy. All this while his solemn, startling cry was, "Repent, repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at

hand;" thus seeking to turn their eyes inward upon themselves, and to lead them to feel that Messiah's coming and kingdom had reference to their spiritual state and wants, to their deliverance from sin, and not from temporal evils. His ministry was, therefore, in the highest and fullest degree, preparatory to Christ's coming and work. It was a literal fulfilment of the prophecy, that he was "to prepare the way of the Lord." It was in all its parts a testimony from God to Jesus as Messiah.

Of its remarkable effects upon all classes of the Jewish people, except the leading Pharisees, we have already spoken. It produced a movement among the dry bones, which had the strong semblance of a great and general revival of true religion. But alas, the permanent effects of it appear to have been slight and meagre. A very few accepted and believed his testimony. On the vast majority it fell like seed upon a naked rock: like a flash of the noonday sun upon the eyes of the dead.

In the manner of their reception of the ministry of John, therefore, in their refusal to give practical and permanent weight to the testimony he bore to the Son of God, the Jewish rulers and people manifested their first open rejection of Christ.

We come now to their treatment of our Lord himself. We shall aim to bring before the reader the chief occasions when their rejection was open and decided, and, at the same time, show the nature and the force of the testimony he offered to them of his character and claims. In doing this we shall not enter at all upon the intricate chronological questions which relate to the date of the commencement of his public ministry, to the length of time it continued, and to the number of the great national festivals he attended, as this would be wholly foreign to the object we have in view. We shall follow, in general, the chronological order adopted by the Rev. S. M. Andrews in his able and exhaustive "Life of our Lord."

The first occasion after his baptism, on which our Lord publicly revealed himself to the Jewish rulers and people, was at the Passover mentioned by John ii. 12. Though he did not on that occasion in words claim to be Messiah, his acts, in the strongest manner, set forth this claim.

On the plea that God's worship was promoted by having the

animals offered in sacrifice near at hand, that strangers who came to worship might readily procure them, the authorities permitted men to erect stalls within the outer court of the temple, where oxen and sheep and doves were exposed for sale. Under the same plea, those who exchanged ordinary money for the sacred shekel, had tables there for the transaction of this business. When, on coming to the temple, our Lord found these men and animals there, he made a scourge of small cords and drove them all out, saying to them, "Take these things hence: make not my Father's house an house of merchandise."

This bold and decisive act could not fail to excite a great commotion, and to draw the attention of all to himself. It was a public declaration of his Divine authority, and a stern rebuke of those who were trafficking within the sacred enclosures of God's house, and of the rulers who permitted this profanation. That they so understood it, and that they keenly felt it, is obvious from their demand for his authority in thus summarily overthrowing a custom sanctioned by their highest court. "What sign," said they, "showest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things." In reply he gave them a sign by referring to his own death and resurrection, but they did not understand him. They supposed he was making a vain boast when he said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," because they understood him to speak of the temple of God, within which they were standing, while he referred to his own body. He did not correct their mistake, because he knew their motives. They did not seek for evidence of his character and claims; their demand was prompted by displeasure at the act of purification he had performed, and their desire was to obtain grounds for his arrest and punishment. It is surprising that they did not at once do this; and it is a strong proof that his person, and character, and teachings, in connection with the testimony of John, had made a deep impression upon them.

The truth we wish to bring out from this account of our Lord's first public revelation of himself to the Jewish rulers and people is, that they knew he claimed to be Messiah, and that there was before them a body of evidence which ought to

have commanded their candid and careful attention. This they rejected. True, many of the people did for the time "believe in his name when they saw the miracles which he did." But that this was one of those waves of popular opinion, which soon subside and leave scarcely any traces of their existence behind, is clear from the words immediately following, "but Jesus did not commit himself unto them." This was the second public and decisive rejection of Christ by the Jewish rulers and people.

Leaving Jerusalem after the passover was concluded, he went into the surrounding region and preached his gospel and baptized, through his disciples, those who came to him. It soon appeared, however, that the eyes of the chief Pharisees at Jerusalem were upon him, and that they would proceed to violent measures to arrest his growing influence with the people. He therefore retired into Galilee, and probably continued for a time in comparative seclusion.

His next public appearance before the Jewish rulers and people is thus announced in John v. 1, "After this there was a feast of the Jews; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." While there he again fixed their attention upon him, and with great distinctness set forth his Messiahship by healing on the Sabbath a lame man, who was lying in one of the porches surrounding the pool of Bethesda, and by the reasons he gave for the act, when charged with having profaned the day. The probability is he was arraigned before the Sanhedrim to answer to the charge of having desecrated God's day, as there is full proof that the Jewish rulers were greatly offended. The historian says they "persecuted Jesus and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the Sabbath-day." John v. 16. His defence is in every respect remarkable. He does not say that in forbidding works of necessity and mercy the Pharisees had given a wrong and oppressive interpretation of the fourth commandment, but he takes infinitely higher ground. He claims to be Lord of the Sabbath. He asserts his community of nature with God the Father, and demands for himself equal honour. He declares that all judgment is committed to him by the Father. He distinctly proclaims himself the Saviour of men, invites all to hear him and to believe in him, and promises

to all who do this, eternal life. He repeatedly asserts his power to raise the dead, and declares that the day is coming when all the dead shall, at the sound of his voice, come forth from their graves to the final judgment. To all this he says, God the Father bears witness through the miracles he was commissioned to perform. And he finally appeals to the Old Testament Scriptures, for they testify of him.

Let the reader carefully examine this wonderful revelation of himself by our Lord in John v. 17—47; let him remember that this was probably spoken before the Sanhedrim in Jerusalem, and that the man whom Jesus had healed of a lameness that had prevented him from walking for thirty-eight years, simply by the command, "Rise, take up thy bed, and walk," probably, was standing with him before that prejudiced court, and he will find that the Jewish rulers, then and there, had the most overwhelming proof that Jesus was Messiah. He will also, probably, come to the conclusion that it was the nature and power of that evidence which so overawed them that they could not put in force their determination to arrest and punish him, even with death. All this, however, they deliberately and of purpose rejected, smothering for the time their intense hatred, and waiting for a more fit opportunity to destroy him. This was their third open and decisive rejection of him.

He now returned to Galilee. He had a great work to do in the delivery of those precious teachings which occupy so large a space in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke; in the performance of a multitude of miracles, that were to be the witness of God, not only to that age, but to all succeeding ages; and in the selection and training of the men who were to lay the foundations of his church, and to carry his gospel to the nations of the world.

He chose Galilee for this purpose, because the enmity and persecutions of the chief men of the nation did not permit him to do it within the limits of Judea. During the succeeding year and a half, he remained in Galilee, pursuing his great work with wonderful activity. On the Sabbath he entered the synagogues, and read and expounded the Scriptures, applying the prophecies to himself. On several of these occasions he wrought miracles of healing upon the diseased and infirm, who

were present. On other days of the week he made circuits through the cities, and towns, and country, preaching to the multitudes who followed him. Frequently he spent whole days in thus delivering his divine instructions.

During this entire period he was constantly performing stupendous miracles. Healing the sick; causing the lame to walk; the blind to see; the deaf to hear; the dumb to speak; casting out devils; and raising the dead. Twice he stilled a tempest on the Sea of Galilee. Twice he fed thousands who were faint and hungry, with a few loaves and fishes. Thus he manifested his omnipotent power over nature, over diseases, over evil spirits, and over death. Thus he furnished in his person, in his life, in his teachings, and in his mighty works, a constantly accumulating, constantly brightening volume of evidence that he is Messiah, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. Yet when we come to sum up the fruits of our Lord's ministry in Galilee in the matter of gathering in those who should be saved, and in gaining the confidence of the people to whom he ministered, how few and small they are! His mournful, fearful prophetic denunciation of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum applies to the whole of Galilee, for with few exceptions they all rejected him.

His work in Galilee was now closed. While from the intense hatred, and the violence of the rulers of Judea proper, it was not performed in their country, and, from being but imperfectly known to them, could produce but little impression upon them, it has been, and it will be to all succeeding ages and generations, second in importance only to that great final action by which his atonement was completed—his death upon the cross. The account of it fills a very considerable part of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The body of precious spiritual truth, the vast number of miracles each and all manifesting the deep and tender love and sympathy of our Lord for perishing men, not less than his Divine nature, character, and office, and the selection and training of the apostles who laid the foundations of his church, and under the teachings and guidance of the Holy Ghost wrote so large a portion of the New Testament, are among the greatest gifts of God to men. That mind must be indeed dark and dull, that heart must be indeed hard and insen-

sible, that can resist the enlightening and saving influence, which beams from every page like the light of an unclouded sun.

The Feast of Tabernacles occurred in October of the year in which our Lord finished his work in Galilee; the last year of his public ministry and of his life. He went up from Galilee to attend that feast secretly, as to the time and direction of his journey, but with the purpose, it would seem, of revealing himself more openly to the Jewish rulers and people at Jerusalem, and of submitting to the indignities and cruelties they were to heap upon him, as the appointed time for the completion of his great work of redemption drew near.

There seems to have been a general expectation that he would attend that feast. During the early part of it many inquiries were made for him, and his character and claims were privately much discussed by the people. Some expressed a favourable opinion, while others denounced him as a deceiver. About the middle of the feast he appeared in the temple, and openly taught the people. His enemies were greatly surprised at the knowledge and skill he displayed. It is probable the Sanhedrim had formally determined to arrest him, and put him to death, if he came to the feast. We infer this from his own declaration that they sought to kill him; from their many inquiries for him during the early part of the feast; from the restraint upon the people while speaking of him; and from the question asked by some who were resident at Jerusalem, while they listened to his wonderful words, "Is not this he whom they seek to kill? But, lo, he speaketh boldly, and they say nothing unto him." John vii. 25, 26. During the four or five days of the feast which remained after his arrival, he seems to have sought, rather than avoided, contact with his enemies; and when they replied to his Divine teachings with cavils, and sneers, and abuse, he answered them with unsparing plainness and severity. He declared that they were utterly ignorant of God; that manifesting the spirit of their father, the devil, they believed a lie, rather than the truth which God had commissioned him to declare; that they were wholly under the power of sin and would die in sin. At the same time he openly and repeatedly set forth his Divine commission and authority, his oneness of nature with God the Father, and in the courts of the

temple, while the thousands of the assembled worshippers were standing around him, he proclaimed, in a loud voice, his character and office, as the Saviour of men. John vii., viii., ix., x.

On the Sabbath, either the last of the feast, or that of the week following, he healed a man born blind. This miracle created a great commotion among his enemies. They at first refused to believe in its reality; but being compelled at last to admit this, by the testimony of the man and his parents, they attempted to turn aside the force of the miracle, by giving him this astounding direction, "Give God the praise: we know that this man is a sinner!" His reply to them is the most complete overthrow that ever a set of bigoted and blood-thirsty wretches received. See John ix. 25—33.

During this period, they four times attempted to take his life. Once, in their blind rage, they were on the point of stoning him, and three times they sought to arrest him, but they were restrained by the unseen hand of God; as the historian expresses it, "His hour was not yet come."

This was their fourth open and decided rejection of him, and it was more fierce and determined than any which had preceded it.

The Feast of the Dedication commemorated the purifying of the temple, B. C. 167, by Judas Maccabeus, after the profanation by Antiochus, king of Syria. The time of its celebration occurred about the middle of December. Our Lord embraced this occasion to again present himself to the rulers and people at Jerusalem. Soon after his arrival, "the Jews" (John uses this term to designate the heads of the nation) "came round about him and said unto him, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly." Jesus answered them, "I told you, and ye believed not: the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me. But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you." He did not give them a direct answer for two reasons, viz., the evidence they had already was more than sufficient. His teachings and miracles, which they had heard and witnessed, fully answered their question. And again he knew their motives; it was not evidence they wanted, but grounds upon which to found a charge against him. As he

proceeded in his reply he declared that his own sheep knew him and followed him. To *them* he would give eternal life, and none could pluck them out of his hand. They were given to him by his Father, who is greater than all. And then he used that remarkable language which expresses so fully his community of nature with God the Father, "I and my Father are one." Regarding this as blasphemy, they took up stones to stone him. He calmly continued his address, and appealed to his mighty miracles for proof of the claim he had thus made, and finally repeated it in these emphatic words, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me and I in him." John x. 22—38. They now sought again to take him, but he escaped out of their hands, probably by a miraculous disappearance.

This was their fifth open and decided rejection of him.

Leaving Jerusalem he now passed over into Perea, beyond Jordan, and remained there until recalled to Bethany by the messengers who came to inform him of the dangerous illness of Lazarus. The raising of Lazarus from the dead, perhaps the most illustrious of our Lord's miracles, produced a deep and general impression on the people at Jerusalem. A very considerable number of the principal men of that city, of which Bethany was a suburb, were present when it was performed, and therefore the evidence they had of its genuineness was beyond denial or even doubt. The rulers were compelled to admit this, but its only effect on them was to alarm them and to increase their hatred, and their efforts to destroy him. When the news of it reached them, they held a council, and formally resolved to make more active efforts to arrest him, and to put him to death. John xi. 47—53. It is a fact which evinces in the most remarkable manner their deep-seated prejudice, and their fiendish hatred of our Lord, that the miracle, which, more fully than any other he performed, proved his claim to be Messiah, should have been the one that led them to resolve that, from that hour, no effort should be spared to accomplish his destruction. To escape from their violence, he immediately retired, with his disciples, to a secluded spot, and remained there until the approach of the Passover, which was the time

appointed for the completion of his great work of atonement, by his death on the cross.

In speaking of the tragic scene of our Lord's death, which, with the events immediately preceding, constitutes his final rejection by the Jewish rulers and people, we shall touch only those points which bear directly on the object of this article. Here their blindness, their stubborn unbelief, and their fiendish malice attained their full satanic growth and power. That dead formalism which abhorred everything spiritual, and covered their reeking corruption with a cloak of self-righteousness that nothing could penetrate, and those false interpretations of prophecy which led them only to desire and look for a Messiah, who came to relieve them from temporal evils and sufferings, and to raise them to temporal distinction and glory, brought forth their mature fruits. Our Lord standing in the courts of the temple during the days of that memorable Passover, pure and lovely in character, speaking with divine wisdom, exposing their formalism and hypocrisy, the Godhead within him flashing forth with exceeding splendour, in the miracles he wrought, yet entirely devoid of those temporal distinctions which they supremely loved and valued, eschewing them all, turning from them as from things unworthy of a word or thought, and holding up to view only spiritual and eternal things, was in all respects the opposite of the Messiah they desired and expected. They hated him intensely. They gnashed their teeth with rage when the impression his teachings and miracles made upon the multitude compelled them to restrain their violence. They thirsted for his blood, and were constantly, amid the solemn services of that great religious festival, plotting his destruction.

At length the time came for accomplishing their designs. One of our Lord's twelve bosom friends and disciples, inspired by the love of money, conceived and executed the purpose of betraying him. He went to the rulers and engaged for a sum, the amount of which had been fixed in prophecy six hundred years before, (Zech. xi. 12,) to betray his Lord and Master to them. He led the officers to the garden to which our Lord had retired for prayer to prepare himself for the awful agonies of the succeeding day. There they arrested him, and under the cover of night took him to the palace of the high priest. Here

the Sanhedrim was hastily assembled, and our Lord was put on his trial. The crime which they endeavoured to fix upon him was blasphemy; the penalty for which, according to the law of Moses, was death. But when they came to examine their bribed witnesses, their testimony was so indefinite and contradictory that the charge could not be sustained. To the charge and the testimony our Lord made no reply or defence. His enemies were therefore at a loss what to do to compass their determination to put him to death.

What a testimony is borne by this fact to his purity of character and life, and to the Divine wisdom and excellence of his teachings. For three years these crafty and unscrupulous men, before whom he was arraigned, had sought for the grounds of a charge that would justify them, according to their own unfair interpretation of the law of Moses, in condemning him to death, and now, when he stood before them silent and unresisting, without an advocate to plead his cause, and without a single witness in his favour, they were unable to do it.

At length the high priest thus addressed him: "I adjure thee, by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death." Matt. xxvi. 63—66.

The Jewish rulers are now about to accomplish their designs. Their hatred and fierce rejection of Messiah are about to take a practical form. They have condemned him to death, but they cannot execute this penalty, without the consent of the Roman governor. Moreover, it is their purpose that he shall be put to death with every possible circumstance of ignominy and cruelty.

Conscious that they can bring no charge against him to which Pilate will listen as a ground for his condemnation, they resolve to overcome his expected objections by the urgency and violence of their demands. They therefore proceed in a body to the

judgment-seat of Pilate, leading our Lord bound, and there demand his condemnation. Their accusation is, "We found this fellow perverting the nation and forbidding to give tribute unto Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ, a king." But after listening to their charges and testimony, and examining our Lord himself, he declares to the chief priests and people, "I find no fault in this man." Luke xxiii. 1—4. But this declaration only excited them to greater violence in their demands.

As in the course of the examination, it appeared that our Lord belonged to the province of Galilee, which was under the jurisdiction of Herod, who was then in Jerusalem, Pilate, to escape from the importunity of the Jews, and to avoid the responsibility of condemning an innocent man, sent our Lord to him, remitting the case to him for a final decision. The Jewish rulers followed to Herod's tribunal, and there vehemently repeated their accusations. But Herod could find nothing in their charges and testimony to warrant the pronouncing of the sentence of death, and while he treated our Lord with flagrant injustice and indignity, because he declined to gratify his curiosity by answering his questions, yet he sent him back to Pilate.

Pilate now gathered the chief priests, and rulers, and the people around him, and again declared our Lord innocent. "Ye have brought this man to me," he said, "as one that perverteth the people; and behold, I, having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him; no, nor yet Herod; for I sent you to him; and, lo, nothing worthy of death is done unto him. I will therefore chastise him, and release him. And they cried out all at once, saying, Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas." Pilate still hesitated, and again pronounced our Lord innocent. But with increased violence they cried, "Crucify him, crucify him."

At length yielding to their demands, "he took water and washed his hands before the multitude" (intending by this and his accompanying declaration, to free himself from responsibility, but in vain, for it is, if possible, more fully the solemn duty of a ruler to protect the innocent than to punish the guilty), and pronounced the sentence, and delivered our Lord to be crucified." Matt. xxvii. 24, 25.

In this final rejection of Christ, our Lord, by the Jewish rulers and people, three things appear with great clearness and force. The first is, that his character and claims as Messiah was the distinct and single ground of his condemnation by them. It was in reference to these that he was placed under oath. "I adjure thee, by the living God," said the high priest, "that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God." It was his answer to this adjuration, "Thou hast said," that moved the court to pronounce the sentence of death upon him. Obviously it was the purpose of God that this issue should be thus distinctly made, and that this great crime should be thus fastened upon the Jewish rulers.

The second feature of this final rejection of our Lord is, that it is in the fullest sense and degree, a national act. The trial is conducted and the sentence is pronounced by the body of men who represent the secular and religious authority and dignity of the nation.

But in addition to this, the people are themselves called upon to ratify or reject this action. The custom, that some great criminal should be pardoned on the recurrence of the Passover, was used by Pilate to enable him to avoid condemning to death a man whom he knew to be innocent. He proposed to release Jesus, and, in doing it, employed language, without being himself conscious of it, that compelled them to reject our Lord under his Messianic title. "Whom will ye that I release unto you, Barabbas or Jesus, which is called CHRIST? For he knew that of envy they had delivered him. But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus. The governor answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said, Barabbas. Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do with Jesus, which is called CHRIST? They *all* say unto him, Let him be crucified. And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified. When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but rather that a tumult was made, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it. Then answered all the people, and said, HIS BLOOD BE ON US, AND ON OUR

CHILDREN." A prophetic imprecation, which is still in process of fulfilment. His blood *is* on them, and on their children.

The last feature of this final rejection of our Lord is, that in all the circumstances of it, his spotless purity, his Divine virtue and holiness, appear with infinite clearness and lustre. The crafty, bitter, intensely malignant Sanhedrim, were unable, even through bribed witnesses, to sustain the charge of blasphemy upon which they arraigned him, and were finally obliged to give some semblance of justice to their predetermined act of condemnation, by placing him under oath to assert or deny his claim to be Messiah.

The Roman governors, Herod and Pilate, also carefully examined his case, with the evident desire to gratify the fierce and violent demand of the Jewish rulers for his condemnation, but they were compelled by the entire absence of reliable testimony to declare him innocent.

We close this article by repeating the sentiment which introduces it. From whatever point of observation this rejection is viewed, it stands out boldly, as one of the most remarkable phenomena in the religious history of man. It presents an unparalleled instance of moral and spiritual blindness, and of unmitigated and inexcusable wickedness. It constitutes the greatest and the blackest crime that ever has been committed, or, so far as we can see, can be committed in the universe of God.

SHORT NOTICES.

Analogy, considered as a guide to Truth, and applied as an aid to Faith. By James Buchanan, D. D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, New College, Edinburgh, author of "Faith in God and Modern Atheism compared," &c., &c. Edinburgh: Johnstone, Hunter & Co. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1864. Pp. 626.

This is an elaborate and profound work, which must be carefully studied in order to be duly appreciated. For such study much time would be required. We have not had such time at command since the volume came into our hands. We can therefore only state the general plan and design of the work, which the distinguished position, and high reputation of the writer, must commend to the attention of those interested in such discussions.

The work is divided into three parts. I. The General Doctrine of Analogy. II. Sources of Analogy in Matters of Faith. III. Analogy applied to Modern Religious Questions. In the first division the several definitions of analogy are analyzed and examined; the difference between analogy and metaphor is carefully stated; the different kinds of analogy, the logical, symbolic, and theological, and the grounds of each are presented, and the principles thus evolved are traced in their widely extended applications. In the second part, the author, among other topics, treats of analogy between the volumes of nature and revelation; between the interpretation of nature and Scripture; between human and divine testimony; between human and divine relations; between natural and revealed laws; between Scripture and experience, &c., &c. In the third part, the doctrine of the book is applied to the questions of Theism, Rationalism, Spiritualism, Belief in Mysteries, Relation of Reason and Faith, Rituals, Rules of Faith, &c. A richer programme than the above can hardly be presented to the intelligent student in philosophy and religion.

Brazil and the Brazilians portrayed in Historical and Descriptive Sketches. By Rev. James C. Fletcher and Rev. D. P. Kidder, D. D. Illustrated by one hundred and fifty engravings. Sixth edition, revised and enlarged. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. London: Sampson, Low, Son & Co. 1866. Pp. 640.

Brazil, from its extent, geographical position, climate, soil, and productions, is destined to be one of the most important parts of the American continent. It has attracted, therefore,

an ever-increasing degree of attention of every class of men, commercial, scientific, and religious. It opens an almost boundless field for enterprise and improvement, and has entered upon an encouraging career of progress. Its emperor is one of the most enlightened and exemplary monarchs in the world; the friend of every scheme of improvement and favourable to religious liberty. As a field of missionary labour, Brazil is one of the most inviting on this continent, and a prosperous beginning has been made in occupying this field, by various denominations of Christians. The work of Messrs. Fletcher and Kidder is one of established reputation. Its having already passed through five editions, is a proof both of the interest taken in the subject and of its intrinsic worth. This new edition has appeared at the proper time, when public attention is renewedly directed to that important country.

The New Birth; or, The Work of the Holy Spirit. By Austin Phelps, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard & Co. 1867. Pp. 253.

Conversion, or, the new birth, Professor Phelps teaches is not a ritual change, neither is it a constitutional change, nor yet mystical, but it is a radical change of character. God is its author. The work is supernatural. It is not a development of anything in man, nor is it effected by merely natural or moral causes, but by the Holy Spirit. Man, therefore, is dependent on God for his regeneration. But this is a dependence not for power, but for will. Fallen men are able *to be*, as well as *to do*, all that God requires. This is assumed as a moral axiom; an intuition, which does not admit of dispute. Inability is a fiction. Ability is a necessary condition of responsibility. The old aphorism, which started the Augustinian controversy, "I can, because I ought," is repeated over and over as an ultimate truth. The two criteria by which intuitive truths are determined, are, universality and necessity. What all men do believe, and what every man must believe, is beyond doubt true. So far from the principle that ability limits obligation being universally believed, no man believes it; and so far from its being a necessary belief, no man can believe it. It is one of the most familiar facts of consciousness that we are bound to do much that we cannot do. Not that we are bound to see without eyes, or hear without ears, but to love what we hate, and to hate what we love. It is no less a matter of consciousness that these states of mind are not under the control of the will in any sense of that word. We are captives sold under sin; and cannot do the things that we would. These are facts

which no sophistry can elude; and which no enlightened conscience can ignore. We know as surely as we know our existence, that moral principles, dispositions, and feelings, owe their character not to their origin, but to their nature. If good, they are good no matter where they come from; and if evil, evil, no matter how they originated. Such we believe is the common judgment of mankind, and such is the doctrine of Scripture. Professor Phelps's book, although founded in its explanations, as we conceive, on a false philosophy, contains a great amount of valuable matter clearly and forcibly presented.

Studies on the Book of Psalms: being a critical and expository Commentary, with practical and doctrinal remarks on the entire Psalms. By William S. Plumer, D D., LL.D., author of "The Bible," "The Grace of Christ," "The Law of God," &c. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866. Pp. 1211.

This book bears the well-known characteristics of Dr. Plumer's writing. It is sound, practical, and devout. The Book of Psalms is so constantly in the hands of the people of God, that a commentary so well adapted to general use, and so replete with wholesome truth, must, as we hope, find general acceptance.

Great in Goodness. A Memoir of George N. Briggs, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts from 1844 to 1851. By William C. Richards. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard & Co. 1866. Pp. 452.

George Nixon Briggs was born at South Adams, Massachusetts, 1796. His parents were from Rhode Island. His father was of Puritan origin, his mother was Huguenot. He was at first apprenticed to a hatter; but turned to the study of law as early as his seventeenth year. In 1818 he was admitted to the bar, where he distinguished himself, not more for his abilities than for his courtesy and integrity. In 1830 he was elected to Congress, of which body he continued a member for twelve years. In 1844 he was chosen governor of his native State by a triumphant vote, greatly to the delight of the good people of the land. After a life of great distinction and usefulness he died September, 1861, in consequence of a wound occasioned by the accidental discharge of a gun. The principal distinction of Governor Briggs was his moral and religious excellence. From early life he was an exemplary member of the Baptist church, and a prominent actor in all schemes of pious benevolence. So much of the weal or woe of nations depends on the character of their rulers, that we cannot be too thankful when God gives such men as Governor Briggs a place and a voice in our national councils.

The Life of Daniel Dana, D. D. By Members of his Family. With a Sketch of his Character. By W. B. Sprague, D. D. Boston: J. E. Tilton & Co. 1866.

Dr. Dana was born at Ipswich, July 24, 1771. At the age of fourteen, in connection with his brother two years older, he commenced a singing-school, which proved a great success. In 1786 he entered Dartmouth College. After graduation, he was appointed preceptor of Moor's School, in connection with the College; he also taught two years at Exeter. In 1791 he returned to Ipswich, and took charge of the Classical School in that place, while he pursued his theological studies. In 1793 he was licensed, or "approbated and recommended," "as a qualified candidate preacher of the gospel of Christ." In 1794 he was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian church in Newburyport, and after a successful ministry of twenty-six years was transferred to Hanover, New Hampshire, as President of Dartmouth College. He soon withdrew from that position as uncongenial with his feelings, and settled in Londonderry as pastor of the church, where he remained four years and a half. In 1826 he became pastor of the Second Presbyterian church at Newburyport, which position he resigned in 1845, in the seventy-fifth year of his age. Dr. Dana was regarded as "one of the most able, devoted, and useful ministers of the period in which he lived." He died August 26, 1859, in the eighty-ninth year of his age. His publications were numerous, and his activity in all benevolent enterprises was distinguished. Mild, courteous, and engaging in person and manners, he gained in an eminent degree the affection as well as the respect of those who knew him. He was faithful in his adherence to the faith of his fathers, and had the moral courage to remonstrate against the departures from orthodoxy, when he stood almost alone.

The Draytons and Davenants. A Story of the Civil War. By the author of "Chronicles of the Schönberg Cotta Family." New York: M. W. Dodd, 506 Broadway. 1866. Pp. 509.

No writer of the age has exhibited greater talent for historical portraiture than the author of this work. She reproduces the characteristic features of the period in which her stories are laid with wonderfully fidelity. The reader himself lives in the scenes which are made to pass before him. To produce these effects, more is required than knowledge of historical details. Power of imagination, and skill in description are no less essential. All these gifts are united in the writer of the series of works to which this volume belongs, in an eminent degree. With these are combined a sound religious faith and a devout

spirit. All her books are written in the interest of evangelical religion, and they have been not only successful, but useful, to an extent which must be a lasting satisfaction to the author.

Jules César. Cours Professe à la Sorbonne en 1844 *et* 1863. Par E. Rosseau Saint-Hilaire. Paris: Charles Meyrueis, 174 Rue de Rivoli. Furne, Jounet et Cie. 45 Rue Saint-André-des-Arcs. 1866. Pp. 320.

Louis Napoleon's life of Cæsar is written in the interest of despotisms. He assumes that Providence from time to time raises up men to rule the world at will. Men who are not subject to law, being themselves the law. They have the right, because they have the power, to reign. Their genius, or intellectual superiority, invests them with autocratic authority. Happy, he says, are those who obey and follow them. Those who oppose them are at once blind and guilty. Blind, because they do not see the divine mission of such exceptional men; guilty, because their opposition can only delay and embarrass progress, but not hinder its advance. The assassination of Cæsar did not prevent the establishment of the empire, but it plunged Rome into the horrors of the civil war. The banishment of Napoleon to Elba did not extinguish the "Napoleonic ideas," but only retarded their development and adoption. Julius Cæsar is presented as the ideal of such a providentially commissioned autocrat. The principles on which he acted are evolved and held up as those which should guide men and nations in similar emergencies. That this work of the French Emperor is an extraordinary production, a work of research and genius, is generally conceded. It is conceded also that his hero is the foremost man of antiquity. As warrior, statesman, orator, and historian, he is preëminent, and in the combination of his gifts, unequalled. But after all, what was he? and what are the real lessons which his history teaches? These are the questions which Professor Saint Hilaire undertakes to answer. He places himself on the ground of moral right and wrong. His standard of judgment is the elevated Christian standard, which alone is worthy of trust. He admits Cæsar to have been all that is claimed for him as to his intellectual power, fascination, and force of character. Nevertheless, he was a bad man. He was supremely selfish. In youth, pleasure, in maturity, power; from first to last, self was his engrossing object. This being the case, he falls from his elevated pedestal. He ceases to be truly great. On this point, M. St. Hilaire says in the close of his review: "Is Cæsar then the greatest man of ancient times? No, I unhesitatingly reply, for my touchstone is moral greatness—the forgetfulness of self. . . . The truly great men, are the great citizens, as Phocion, Lycurgus, and Cato,

among the ancients, and William the Silent, Washington, and Lincoln, among the moderns; all those, in a word, who have not lived for themselves; who have lived or died for one conviction, one idea, one faith, one country."

The great lesson, according to our author, taught by the life of Cæsar, is the supreme and immutable authority of moral law. No superiority of genius, no assumed necessity, no apparent expediency, can justify its violation, or secure impunity to the transgressor. "It is impossible," says Professor St. Hilaire, "long to impose either on history or posterity. The verdict of ages has been pronounced; the judgment on Cæsar has been rendered. There is no longer an appeal. All the sophisms in the world only, in the end, break against the rock of truth. This eternal morality, against which each age delivers its assault, without which all human societies would crumble, does not need to be avenged on those who would do it violence; it does not even need to reply; it is only necessary for it to wait and to endure." These are grand words. We feel it to be a privilege to reutter them in the ears of our readers. M. St. Hilaire's book is little more than a brochure; and yet it will have more power over the reason and conscience than the costly tomes of the emperor, notwithstanding all the learning and talent lavished in their production.

The College Days of Calvin. By the Rev. William M. Blackburn, author of "William Farrel and his Times," "The Rebel Prince," &c. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut street. Pp. 156.

Young Calvin in Paris, and the Little Flock that he Fed. By Rev. W. M. Blackburn. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 156.

These volumes are much above the standard of ordinary Sunday-school books. They are well written, interesting, and instructive.

The Resurrection of the Dead. By Rev. George S. Mott, author of "The Prodigal Son." New York: N Tibbals, 37 Park Row. 1866. Pp 230.

The scriptural doctrine of the resurrection and its moral bearings are presented in this volume, in a clear, judicious, and edifying manner.

Our Passover, or the Great Things of the Law. By the Rev. William J. McCord, Wassaic, N. Y. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. Pp. 120.

The first thirty-four pages of this book are specially devoted to the passover, as a type of the sacrifice of Christ; the latter part treats of the moral and ceremonial law, of the neces-

sity of redemption, and the mode of its application. It seems to be full of sound doctrine.

A Vindication of the "Letters on Psalmody" from the Strictures of John T Pressly, D. D. By William Annan. Pittsburgh: Printed by W. S. Haven. 1866. Pp. 144.

Mr. Annan had published a volume designed to prove that the church is not bound to the exclusive use of the Book of Psalms in the worship of God in songs of praise. Of that volume Dr. Pressly wrote a review, to which the present publication is a reply. That Mr. Annan has the better in this controversy, is not saying a great deal, and that his arguments have not, and cannot be refuted, will be conceded by nine-tenths of his readers. It has always appeared to us one of the marvels of the Scottish mind, with all its strength and clearness, that it could be held in trammels so often by cobwebs, and those of its own spinning. There is, as far as most men can see, no more reason for affirming that the church is limited to the use of the Psalms, or even other inspired productions contained in the Bible, in the work of praise, than that it is restricted to the use of the Lord's Prayer, or other inspired petitions, in the work of prayer.

A Discourse delivered at the Opening of the Synod of New Jersey, October 16th. 1866. By the Moderator, Rev. John T. Duffield, D.D. With Notes and Appendix. Published by request. Philadelphia: James S. Claxton. 1214 Chestnut street. 1866.

As to the second coming of our Lord, there are certain points as to which the great body of Christians are agreed. 1. That there is to be a second advent of Christ. 2. That advent is to be personal, visible, and glorious. 3. That the time of his coming is unknown. He is to come as a thief in the night. Some indeed assume to have ascertained the year during which this great event is to occur; but they are comparatively a small part of the Christian public.

The points about which there is diversity of opinion are,

1. As to whether there are any events predicted in the Scripture, which are to precede the second advent, which have not yet occurred. Some believe that there are no such events, and therefore that there is no revealed reason why Christ may not come in a week or a day. The great body of Christians believe, on the other hand, that the national conversion of the Jews, as foretold in the Old Testament, and by the apostle Paul in Rom. xi., and the preaching of the gospel to all nations, as predicted by Christ; and the general prevalence of the true religion, are all to occur before Christ comes again the second time unto salvation.

2. There is difference of opinion as to the object of the second advent. Some say that Christ is to come to establish a visible, earthly kingdom, the seat of which is to be in Jerusalem; that the conversion of the Jews is to be the consequence of his coming; and that not until his second advent are the nations to be converted, or the knowledge of God to cover the earth.

The common faith of the church has been, and is, that Christ has ordained the preaching of the gospel under the dispensation of the Spirit, as the means of converting the world; and consequently that when Christ comes, it will not be to convert men, but to take vengeance on those who obey not the gospel, and to be glorified in all them that believe; that he will come to raise the dead, both the righteous and the wicked; to judge the world, and to introduce the final consummation. The second advent, the general resurrection, the final judgment, and the end of the world, are represented in Scripture as synchronous events. With what rapidity the one is to follow the other, is not revealed; but the first is in order to the others.

Dr. Duffield confines himself in this discourse mainly to one point, viz., to an attempt to prove that no predicted event, (such as the general prevalence of the gospel) remains to be accomplished, before the second coming of Christ; so that, for aught we know, he may come to-morrow, though he may not appear for a thousand years. The second advent, as death, is an imminent event; it may occur at any time; and we should be always expecting it, and always ready. The same is assumed to be true with regard to Christ's appearing. The whole power of the doctrine, he supposes, depends on this fact. If the whole world is to be converted before Christ comes, then we may be sure his advent cannot take place for a long time to come, and we cannot be in that state of constant expectation and desire, which the sacred writers enjoined. Such is the argument. Its fallacy appears from two sources. First, it is not true that the moral power of a future event depends on the apprehension that it may occur at any moment. The apostle Peter, after predicting that the heavens and earth are to be burned up, asks, in view of that event, what manner of men ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness; yet, according to the Premilleniasts themselves, Christ is to come, and a multitude of events are to occur before this final conflagration. The Scriptures hold up the great realities of the distant future, the resurrection, the judgment, and the final consummation, as adapted to produce a present effect on the minds of men, as reasons why they should constantly live

in reference to those events. Secondly, although our Lord and the apostles present his second coming as an object of expectation and desire, something to be longed for and watched for, by the men of their generation, yet they assured them that certain events were to occur before his coming could take place. Christ predicted the destruction of Jerusalem, the overthrow of the Jewish policy, and the spread of the gospel, as events antecedent to his second coming; yet he required his disciples to watch and pray for his appearing.

The apostles did the same thing. They urged the people to watch and pray for the coming of the Lord, and yet Paul told them that that day was not at hand; that a great apostacy was first to occur. So the church has believed, and does, as a general thing, now believe, in the national conversion of the Jews, and the preaching of the gospel to all nations, as events which are to take place before the second advent. Nevertheless believers long and pray for the Lord's coming, as the consummation of their redemption.

The Church Union. Brooklyn, January 5th, 1867. A weekly paper published at $2.50 in advance.

This paper is established to promote Christian unity. The desire of greater union among the disciples of our Lord is widely diffused and constantly increasing in power. There are some who contemplate and labour to effect an organic external union of all Christians under one form of church polity. This we believe to be chimerical in the present state of the world. All efforts directed immediately to that end, are sure to issue, so far as successful, in merging those denominations who place doctrine before forms, into those who put the form before the substance; or who, at least, regard a practical external form of organization essential to the being of the church. There are others, however, who while repudiating any such scheme, earnestly desire to see the scriptural principles of Christian and ministerial communion everywhere practically recognized. They desire that all Christians should regard and treat as brethren in the Lord, all who truly love, worship, trust, and obey the Lord Jesus Christ. They desire also that ministers of every denomination, holding the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, should recognize each other as the true ministers of Christ. This we believe to be a high, worthy, and, to some extent at least, even now, a practicable object. We understand this paper to take the ground just indicated, and in this view we earnestly hope for its success. The bond of Chris-

tian and ministerial fellowship, (*i. e.*, of mutual recognition) which it holds up is contained in the following pledge:

"*We, the undersigned, believers in the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures as set forth in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, do hereby pledge ourselves to secure, under God, an open communion, and the recognition of one evangelical ministry, by the interchange of pulpits, thus to make visible the unity of the Church.*

"*And we furthermore solemnly pledge ourselves to stand by each other in securing these ends.*"

Life of Emanuel Swedenborg, together with a brief Synopsis of his Writiags, both Philosophical and Theological. By William White. With an Introduction by B. F. Barrett. First American edition. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866.

The Divine Attributes, including also the Divine Trinity, a Treatise on the Divine Love, Wisdom and Correspondence. From the "Apocalypse Explained" of Emanuel Swedenborg. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866.

The beautiful paper, typography, and general style of these volumes, especially the clear-cut lettering and cream-tinted hue of the latter, do great credit to the publishers. So far as we can see, the execution is quite up to that of the famous Riverside Press on similar works.

We are also much indebted to the enterprising publishers for placing what is most significant in the writings of this "most unknown man in the world," within easy reach of divines, philosophers, and scholars. Notwithstanding his enormous errors, on every theory which may be formed of him and his teachings, Swedenborg was an extraordinary man. His writings have always had a strange fascination for a certain class of refined and cultivated minds, and, though his following has been small as to numbers, it has never died out, or failed to comprise men of mark, among whom it is said are now included some eminent civilians. It is therefore desirable to possess the means of knowing what his doctrines really are, so that they may not be blindly applauded or blindly attacked. Probably there is no easier way of becoming acquainted with his views, than through these two volumes. The first presents the great outlines and salient features of his life, the circumstances under which his principal works were written, together with a digest of each of them which brings out its prominent traits. The latter is Swedenborg's great work on the Trinity and Divine Attributes, which is sure to contain the seminal principles he advanced in philosophy, ethics, and religion. We hope that opportunity may arise ere long to unfold and discuss

in our pages the distinctive principles of Swedenborgianism, as developed in the works of its great author.

The Authorship of Shakespeare. By Nathaniel Holmes. New York: Published by Hurd & Houghton. 1866. Princeton: William W. Smith.

Some years ago Miss Delia Bacon, a gifted writer, published first an article in a magazine, and afterwards in a volume, maintaining that the real author of what are known as Shakespeare's plays, was not Shakespeare himself, but Lord Bacon and some coadjutors. Mr. Holmes has followed up this idea more elaborately, and in a large volume undertakes to prove that Lord Bacon was the sole author of them. Of course the attempt must be a failure, and its serious prosecution betrays something akin to fatuity. Yet it does not follow that the book is in all respects worthless. Most inquiries that advance human knowledge are made under the guidance of tentative hypotheses, many of which turn out to be false. Yet without the lead of these hypotheses, such inquiries would not be pursued. Hence it happens that false, and even absurd hypotheses have sometimes been the means of increasing knowledge. Even so, the groundless theory advocated in this book leads to the observation of analogies, correspondencies, minute shades of thought, and delicate refinements of imagination and feeling, which otherwise had passed unobserved.

The Rise and the Fall; or, The Origin of Moral Evil. In three parts. New York: Published by Hurd & Houghton. Princeton: William W. Smith. 1866.

The doctrine maintained in this volume is, that the act of Adam which Christendom has taken to be the fall of him and his race, was not such, but the opposite. It was his rise into a state of moral agency in which he was not created. That the author brings all the ingenuity to bear in support of this vagary which any one could, may perhaps be conceded. One might also show ingenuity in maintaining that men are but a species of apes. But in neither case could we attribute much value to the book or its doctrine.

The Life and Times of Martin Luther. By W. Carlos Martyn. Author of the Life and Times of John Milton. Published by the American Tract Society, New York. Princeton: sold by William W. Smith.

This is a very considerable volume in which the biography of Luther is inwoven with the history of the Reformation. We know not where so much of both may be learned at so little cost of time and money. The book is withal readable as well as instructive.

Phil. Kennedy. By H. N. N. Published by the American Tract Society, New York. Princeton: sold by William W. Smith.

Author of the series entitled, "Life Illustrated."

Our Lord's View of the World's Evangelization. An Address before the Synod of New York, by its appointment, delivered in the First Presbyterian Church, Newburgh, New York, October 16th, 1866. By the Rev. William Irvin, pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Rondout, New York. Published at the request of the Executive Committee of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. New York: Mission House, No. 23 Centre Street. 1866.

This clear, vivid, and earnest presentation of the duty of the church in the work of evangelizing the world, cannot fail to do good wherever it is read. We trust it will be widely circulated.

A History of the Huguenots. By John Carlos Martyn, author of "The Life and Times of John Milton," and "The Life and Times of Martin Luther." Published by the American Tract Society, New York. For sale by W. W. Smith, Princeton.

Mr. Martyn, till recently unknown to us as an author, has issued three works in rapid succession, which evince his fecundity and high respectability as a writer. He has chosen the department of religious history and historic biography. The particular subjects, thus far selected by him, are of the highest interest—none more fascinating and instructive, and outside of the beaten track, than the "History of the Huguenots." Few episodes of church history have so deep and tragic an interest. It abounds in striking instances of Christian heroism. It is the history of a martyr church.

The Freedman's Home. By Rev. O. A. Kingsbury. American Tract Society, New York. For sale by W. W. Smith, Princeton.

An attractive little book, showing "how an humble cottage may be the abode of order, virtue, intelligence, and piety."

Bible Emblems. By the late Rev. Edward E. Seelye, D. D., Schenectady, New York. American Tract Society, New York. Sold by W. W. Smith, Princeton.

This book unfolds the import of many of the scriptural emblems, and points out their beauty in a graphic style, which will "attract devout readers old and young."

Jesus Christ's Alluring Love; or Persuasives drawn from the Titles of Christ to allure hearts unto Him. By John Flavel. American Tract Society, New York. Sold by W. W. Smith, Princeton.

The title of this book and the name of its author are its best passport to all who desire to know the love of Christ.

In the World and out of the World. Thoughts on Christian Casuistry. By William Adams, D. D. American Tract Society, New York. Sold by W. W. Smith, Princeton.

This little volume contains a judicious and timely discussion of Christian ethics in regard to actions in themselves indifferent. While it vindicates Christian liberty in such matters, it still more strenuously asserts the necessity of inspiring and guiding this liberty by Christian love. In regard to the whole *questio vexata* respecting fashionable amusements, games, &c., it unfolds the motto of Vinet, "Love is the best casuist."

Charlie Scott; or, There's Time Enough. American Tract Society, New York. Sold by W. W. Smith, Princeton.

Another of the series named "Life Illustrated."

Nuts for Boys to Crack. By John Todd, D. D., Pittsfield, Mass. American Tract Society. Sold by W. W. Smith, Princeton.

Dr. Todd's peculiar gifts for this kind of writing are well known to all who read the youth's columns in our religious weeklies.

The Harmony Society at Economy, Pennsylvania; Founded by George Rapp, A. D. 1805. With an Appendix, by Aaron Williams, D. D. Pittsburgh: W. S. Haven.

A curious book, in every way. It is a brief history of the only communism that ever lasted half a century with any kind of prosperity. The author is a sound and judicious Presbyterian divine, and writes with great skill and in a lucid and beautiful style. It is interesting and instructive to a high degree; but it is too palliative and apologetic. No one could divine from its pages what is the author's own point of view, and this is more than impartiality requires of any historian.

How the *pietism* of Lutheran Germany could be responsible for such an offshoot in American soil; how it came to stifle the individuality of man in a country and age that combine to intensify individual enterprise and individual responsibility; how it could renounce the institution of marriage, years after the society was formed, as the fruit of a revival of religion among them; how it could retain the solemnities of religion in the hands of ministers who are their factors in business, superintending their farms and workshops, railroads and lawsuits; how the hope of holding on to their accumulated wealth, while they are all dying off, without children to succeed them, is identified with the millenarian expectation that our Lord will come in person before the old survivors expire—these curious topics are all touched in this little volume with intelligence and taste; but rather too adroitly varnished for a just animadversion upon the absurdities of such a socialism.

But Once. By the author of "Let Well Alone." Philadelphia: J. P. Skelly & Co., No. 732 Chestnut Street. 1867.

The Story of the Red Velvet Bible. By M. H. Philadelphia: J. P. Skelly & Co., 732 Chestnut Street. 1867.

John Hatherton. By the author of "Effie's Friends." Philadelphia: J. P. Skelly & Co., 732 Chestnut Street.

Brook Silverton. By Emma Marshall. Philadelphia: J. P. Skelly & Co., 732 Chestnut Street.

Weeds and Seeds, and other Tales. Compiled for the Presbyterian Board of Publication. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street.

The Arithmetic of Life; or The Nine Digits. By Sister Ruth. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street.

Kitty Dennison and her Christmas Gifts. By the author of "Madeline, or The Lost Bracelet." Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street.

Annie Lincoln's Lesson; or, A Day in the Life of a Thankful Child. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street.

Harry and his Dog Fidele. By the author of "Madeline, or, The Lost Bracelet." Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street.

Mary Raymond; or, The Girl who wanted to be a Christian. By Nellie Grahame, author of "The Three Homes," "Diamonds Reset," &c. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 821 Chestnut Street.

Bertie and his Best Things. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street.

A Week in Lilly's Life. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 821 Chestnut Street.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

L. Reinke, Contributions to the Explanation of the Old Testament. Vol. VI. Genuineness of the Prophet Zechariah, with a Translation and Commentary on its non-Messianic portions. 8vo. pp. 472. Vol. VII. The Masoretic Text and the Ancient Versions, their errors and discrepant readings corected and traced to their sources. 8vo. pp. 340.

Buxtorf's Chaldee, Talmudic and Rabinical Lexicon, edited anew and enlarged by B. Fischer and H. Gelbe. Nos. 1 and 2. 4to. pp. 80.

J. Ley, The Metrical Forms of Hebrew Poetry systematically presented. 8vo. pp. 212.

Fürst's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament, translated from the German, by S. Davidson. 8vo. pp. 1200.

F. Hasler, On the Relation of Heathen and Christian Ethics, based on a Comparison of Cicero de Officiis and that of St. Ambrose. 8vo. pp. 48.

T. Benfey, On the Problem of Plato's Cratylus. 4to. pp. 144.

J. Schwane, History of Doctrine in the Patristic Period, A. D. 325—787. In three Numbers. No. 1. 8vo. pp. 328.

A. Ebrard, Handbook of the History of Doctrine and of the Christian Church. Vol. III. 8vo. pp. 714.

R. Plehwe, The Persecutions of the Christians in the first three Centuries. 4to. pp. 24.

C. A. Wilkens, Fray Louis de Leon. A Biography from the History of the Spanish Inquisition and Church in the 16th Century. 8vo. pp. 418.

F. Haupt, The Episcopate of the German Reformation. Part 2. Luther and the Episcopate. 8vo. pp. 289.

H. Brugsch, Trip to the Türkis-mines and the Sinaitic Peninsula. 8vo. pp. 96.

Brugsch has prepared, and is about publishing, a Hieroglyphic and Demotic Dictionary. It is estimated that it will occupy about 1200 quarto pages, and is to appear in 12 numbers at intervals of one or two months. A brief hieroglyphic Grammar is to follow in a supplementary volume. The subscription price is $110 gold.

P. F. Keerl, Man the Image of God. Vol II. Part I. The God-man, the Image of the invisible God. A contribution to Christology. 8vo. pp. 564.

G. K. Mayer, Messianic Prophecies Explained. Vol. II. Part III. Prophecies of Daniel. 8vo. pp. 158.

J. J. Stähelin, The Life of David. 8vo. pp. 116.

O. F. Fritzsche, The Book of Judges, according to the LXX., with a review of the three-fold text, various readings, and fragments of an old Latin version. 8vo. pp. 89.

C. F. Keil, Biblical Commentary on the twelve Minor Prophets. 8vo. pp. 700.

H. Gelbe, Contribution to Introduction to the Old Testament. 8vo. pp. 132.

F. Bleek, Introduction to the New Testament. Second edition. 8vo. pp. 808.

L. Klofutar, Commentarius in Evangelium S. Matthæi concinatus. 8vo. pp. 404.

C. A. Hase, On the Gospel of John. 8vo. pp. 71.